LEVEL 4

HUBBARD ADVANCED AUDITOR

a) Table of Contents, in Checksheet order:

b) Table of Contents, in alphabetical order:

c) Table of Contents, in chronological order:

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

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

ALL LEVELS

KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING

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

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

The only thing now is getting the technology applied.

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

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

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

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

Getting the correct technology applied consists of:

One: Having the correct technology.

Two: Knowing the technology.

Three: Knowing it is correct.

Four: Teaching correctly the correct technology.

Five: Applying the technology.

Six: Seeing that the technology is correctly applied.

Seven: Hammering out of existence incorrect technology.

Eight: Knocking out incorrect applications.

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

Ten: Closing the door on incorrect application.

One above has been done.

Two has been achieved by many.

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

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

Five is consistently accomplished daily.

Six is achieved by instructors and supervisors consistently.

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

Eight is not worked on hard enough.

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

Ten is seldom done with enough ferocity.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Do them and we'll win.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

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

(Revision in this type style)

URGENT AND IMPORTANT

TECHNICAL DEGRADES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Failing to strike from any checksheet remaining in use meanwhile any such comments as "historical", "background", "not used", "old", etc. or **verbally stating it to students.**

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

6. Running only one process for a lower grade between 0 to IV, where the grade EP has not been attained.

7. Failing to use all processes for a level where the EP has not been attained.

8. Boasting as to speed of delivery in a session, such as "I put in grade zero in three minutes." etc.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

                                                    L. RON HUBBARD
                                                    Founder

LRH:nt.rd.lf.jg

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

Remimeo
All Hats
BPI

SAFEGUARDING TECHNOLOGY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Squirreling is today destructive of a workable system.

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

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jw.jp.rd

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 22 NOVEMBER 1967R

(Revised and Reissued 18 July 1970)

Student Hat
Remimeo

ALL STUDENTS

ALL COURSES

OUT TECH

If at any time a supervisor or other person in an org gives you interpretations of HCOBs, policy letters or tells you, "That's old. Read it but disregard it, that's just background data", or gives you a chit for following HCOBs or tapes or alters tech on you or personally cancels HCOBs or policy letters without being able to show you an HCOB or policy letter that cancels it, **you must report the matter complete with names and any witnesses on direct lines to the international ethics officer at worldwide. If this is not immediately handled, report in the same way to your nearest Sea Org MAA.**

The only ways you can fail to get results on a pc are:

1.   Not study your HCOBs and my books and tapes.

2.   Not apply what you studied.

3.   Follow "advice" contrary to what you find on HCOBs and tapes.

4.   Fail to obtain the HCOBs, books and tapes needed.

There is no hidden data line.

All of Dianetics and Scientology works. Some of it works faster.

The only real error auditors made over the years was to fail to stop a process the moment they saw a floating needle.

Recently the felony has been compounded by disclosure of the facts that data and tapes have been deleted from checksheets, data has been "relegated to background" and grades have not been in use fully to complete end phenomena as per the process column on the classification and gradation chart. This caused an almost complete unmock of the subject and its use. I am counting on you to see it is not allowed to happen **ever again**.

Any supervisor or executive who interprets, alters or cancels tech is liable to the assignment of a condition of enemy. All the data is in HCOBs or policy letters or on tape.

Failure to make this mimeo known to every student carries a $10 fine for every student from which it is withheld.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 23 OCTOBER 1980

Remimeo   ISSUE II
Tech
Qual   CANCELS BPL 25 June 70RB rev.
Execs   27.4.75 EXPANDED LOWER GRADES,
C/Ses   CHART OF ABILITIES GAINED
KOTs
Auditors   (Also issued as HCO Bulletin
Reges   same title, same date)
Examiners
Qual Secs
HCO
C & A

CHART OF ABILITIES GAINED FOR LOWER

LEVELS AND EXPANDED GRADES

Ref: Classification, Gradation and Awareness Chart
        HCOB 11 Nov 73 Preclear Declare? Procedure

BPL 25 June 1970RB, rev. 27 April 75, Expanded Lower Grades, Chart of Abilities Gained is hereby **cancelled** as it failed to state the ability gained for all flows of the Expanded Lower Grades.

Expanded Grades are attested to by the pc declaring the full statement of the ability gained for all four flows.

The chart given below lists the ability gained for each of the Lower Levels plus the four flows of the Expanded Grades.

It is used by the Examiner when a pc is sent to "Declare?". The Examiner has the pc read the entire statement for the ability gained for that Grade (including all four flows) or Level and must accept only the pc declaring the full statement for the ability gained.

Declare procedure is done exactly as stated in HCOB 11 November 1973 Preclear Declare? Procedure.

LEVEL	ABILITY GAINED
GROUP PROCESSING Completion (Not a mandatory level)	Awareness that change is available.
DIVISION 6 CO-AUDIT PROCESSES (Not a mandatory level)	Personal case improvement in oneself and the ability to help others with co-auditing.

REPAIR OF ONE'S LIFE (Not a mandatory level)	Awareness of truth and the way to personal integrity.

Note: At C/S discretion, where a pc needs Two Way Comm or rudiments or other repair put in on his life and livingness previous to his doing a major beginning action such as the Purification Rundown, such repair can be done initially. This is not a mandatory action and would only be done as directed by the C/S.)

PURIFICATION RUNDOWN	Freedom from the restimulative effects of drug residuals and other toxins.
SURVIVAL RUNDOWN	Feeling in present time and able to control and put order into the environment. Greatly increased survival potential.
NED DRUG RUNDOWN	Freedom from harmful effects of drugs, alcohol and medicine and free from the need to take them.
DIANETICS CASE COMPLETION	A well and happy pc.
SCIENTOLOGY DRUG RUNDOWN	Freedom from harmful effects of drugs, medicine or alcohol and free from the need to take them.
EXPANDED ARC STRAIGHTWIRE	Knows he/she won't get any worse.
EXPANDED GRADE 0 COMMUNICATION RELEASE, FLOW 1	Willing for others to communicate to him on any subject; no longer resisting communication from others on unpleasant or unwanted subjects.
EXPANDED GRADE 0 COMMUNICATION RELEASE, FLOW 2	Ability to communicate freely with anyone on any subject; free from, or no longer bothered by, communication difficulties; no longer withdrawn or reticent; likes to outflow.
EXPANDED GRADE 0 COMMUNICATION RELEASE, FLOW 3	Willing for others to communicate freely to others about anything.
EXPANDED GRADE 0 COMMUNICATION RELEASE, FLOW 0	Willingness to permit one's self to communicate freely about anything.
EXPANDED GRADE 1 PROBLEM RELEASE, FLOW 1	Ability to recognize the source of problems and make them vanish; has no problems.
EXPANDED GRADE 1 PROBLEM RELEASE, FLOW 2	No longer worried about problems he has been to others; feels free about any problems others may have with him and can recognize source of them.
EXPANDED GRADE 1 PROBLEM RELEASE, FLOW 3	Free from worry about others' problems with or about others, and can recognize source of them.
EXPANDED GRADE 1 PROBLEM RELEASE, FLOW 0	Free from worry about problems with self and can recognize the source of them.

EXPANDED GRADE 2 RELIEF RELEASE, FLOW 1	Freedom from things others have done to one in the past. Willing for others to be cause over him.
EXPANDED GRADE 2 RELIEF RELEASE, FLOW 2	Relief from the hostilities and sufferings of life; ability to be at cause without fear of hurting others.
EXPANDED GRADE 2 RELIEF RELEASE, FLOW 3	Willing to have others be cause over others without feeling the need to intervene for fears of their doing harm.
EXPANDED GRADE 2 RELIEF RELEASE, FLOW 0	Relief from hostilities and suffering imposed by self upon self.
EXPANDED GRADE 3 FREEDOM RELEASE, FLOW 1	Freedom from upsets of the past; ability to face future; ability to experience sudden change without becoming upset.
EXPANDED GRADE 3 FREEDOM RELEASE, FLOW 2	Can grant others the beingness to be the way they are and choose their own reality; no longer feels need to change people to make them more acceptable to self; able to cause changes in another's life without ill effects.
EXPANDED GRADE 3 FREEDOM RELEASE, FLOW 3	Freedom from need to prevent or become involved in the change and interchange occurring amongst others.
EXPANDED GRADE 3 FREEDOM RELEASE, FLOW 0	Freedom from upsets of the past one has imposed upon oneself and ability to cause changes in one's own life without ill effects.
EXPANDED GRADE 4 ABILITY RELEASE, FLOW 1	Ability to tolerate, and freedom from others' fixed ideas, justifications and make-guilty of self; free of need to respond in like kind.
EXPANDED GRADE 4 ABILITY RELEASE, FLOW 2	Moving out of fixed conditions into ability to do new things; ability to face life without need to justify own actions or defend self from others; loss of make-guilty mechanisms and demand for sympathy; can be right or wrong.
EXPANDED GRADE 4 ABILITY RELEASE, FLOW 3	Can tolerate fixed conditions of others in regard to others; freedom from involvement in others' effort to justify, make guilty, dominate, or be defensive about their actions against others.
EXPANDED GRADE 4 ABILITY RELEASE, FLOW 0	Ability to face life without need to make self wrong; loss of make-self-guilty mechanisms, and self-invalidation.

L. RON HUBBARD

FOUNDER

Approved and accepted by the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:bk

HUBBARDS TABELLE DER EINSTUFUNG

DES MENSCHEN UND DES DIANETISCHEN PROZESSING

Freies Theta (Näherungswerte)	A Angeboren akut chronisch	B Dianetische Einstufung	C Verhalten und Psychologie	D Psychiatrischer Bereich
1000	40.0	Unbekannt	Letzliche Fähigkeit unbekannt.	
900 -100	36.0-4.0	Theta-MEST-Clear	Fähigkeit nur teilweise erforscht.	
100	4.0	MEST-Clear	Ausgezeichnet bei Vorhaben und in der Durchführung. Kurze Reaktionszeit (im Verhältnis zum Alter)	
70	3.5	Dianetik-Release	Gut bei Vorhaben, in der Durchführung und im Sport.	
47	3.0	Sehr hohe Normalstufe	Zu einer recht ordentlichen Menge an Aktion befähigt, ziemlich befähigt im Sport.	Hoher Normalzustand
32	2.5	Langeweile	Relativ inaktiv, aber zu Aktion fähig.	Normal ———— Neurotisch
22	2.0	Offene Feindseligkeit	Fähig zu destruktiven und unbedeutenderen konstruktiven Aktionen.	Neurotisch
15	1.5	Wut	Fähig zu destruktiver Aktion.	Psychotisch
10	1.1	Versteckte Feindseligkeit	Befähigt zu unbedeutender Durchführung.	Psychotisch
6	0.5	Apathie	Befähigt zu relativ unkontrollierter Aktion.	Psychotisch (Apathie)
3	0.1	Scheintod	Lebendig als Organismus.	Psychotisch (katatonisch)
1	0 -1	Etwas verbleibendes zellulares Theta. Somatik ———— Entitäts-Theta nicht in Kontakt.	Zelle leben.	
0	-3	MEST bleibt in MEST. Theta nicht in Kontakt.	Anorganische Chemikalien.	

Freies Theta (Näherungswerte)	A Angeboren akut chronisch	E Medizinischer Bereich	F Emotion	G Affinität
1000	40.0			
900 -100	36.0-4.0			
100	4.0	Nahezu unfallsicher. Keine psychosomatischen Krankheiten. Nahezu immun gegen Bakterien.	Tatendrang, Überschwang	Liebe, stark und nach aussen gerichtet.
70	3.5	Im hohen Masse widerstandsfähig gegenüber den üblichen Infektionen. Keine Erkältungen.	Starkes Interesse	Zögernde annähernde Schritte, Freundlichkeit.
47	3.0	Widerstandsfähig gegenüber Infektionen und Krankheiten. Wenige psychosomatischen Krankheiten.	Mildes Interesse — Zufrieden	Toleranz ohne viel nach aussen gerichtete Aktion. Akzeptieren von angebotenen entgegenkommenden Schritten.
32	2.5	Gelegentlich krank. Anfällig für übliche Krankheiten.	Gleichgültigkeit — Langeweile	Vernachlässigung der eigenen Person oder von Leuten, Zurückziehen von ihnen.
22	2.0	Gelegentliche ernsthafte Krankheiten.	Offen gezeigter Unmut	Antagonismus
15	1.5	Ablagerungskrankheiten (Arthritis). (Bereich von 1.0 bis 2.0 austauschbar)	Wut	Hass, heftig und zum Ausdruck gebracht.
10	1.1	Endokrine und neurologische Krankheiten.	Versteckter Groll — Furcht	Versteckte Feindseligkeit
6	0.5	Chronische Fehlfunktion von Organen (Neigung zu Unfällen).	Gram — Apathie	Akute Schüchternheit, sich um Gunst bemühen, Zurückziehen von Leuten.
3	0.1	Chronisch krank. (Verweigert Nahrungsaufnahme).	Tiefste Apathie	Anflehen, Flehen um Mitleid. Völliges Zurückziehen von sich selbst und anderen.
1	0 -1	Tot		Zellularer Zusammenhalt
0	-3	Tot		Normale physikalische Gesetze der Kohäsion und Adhäsion.

Freies Theta (Näherungswerte)	A Angeboren akut chronisch	H Sonik	I Visio	J Somatik
1000	40.0			
900 -100	36.0-4.0			
100	4.0	Vollständiger Rückruf. (Deutlicher, detaillierter Empfang[1] von der Umgebung.)	Vollständiger Rückruf. (Vlg. **Sonik** bez. Empfang+ von der Umgebung.)	Keine zurückrufbaren Somatiken. Widersteht Schmerz in der Gegenwart automatisch, wenn er ihn empfängt.
70	3.5	[2] Ungleichmässiges Sonik. Starker Eindruck, wo kein Sonik vorhanden ist. (Guter Empfang von der Umgebung.)	Gutes Visio, aber in Massstab und Farbe nicht perfekt.	Somatiken stark und korrekt. Jedes Somatik lässt sich hervorholen. Empfang von Schmerz in der Gegenwart weniger intensiv.
47	3.0	[2] Etwas Sonik; starke Eindrücke, wo kein Visio vorhanden ist.	° Ungleichmässiges Visio. Starke Eindrücke, wo kein Visio vorhanden ist.	Somatiken korrekt. Viele Somatiken können abgesperrt sein. Empfang von Schmerz in der Gegenwart mit durchschnittlicher Intensität.
32	2.5	[2] Gute Eindrücke. (Empfang von der Umgebung mässig.)	[2] Etwas Visio; starke, korrekte Eindrücke.	Rückrufe korrekt. Intensität von gegenwärtigem Schmerz kann zu gross sein.
22	2.0	[2] Eindrücke, geringfügiges Dub-in. (Schlechter Empfang.)	[2] Gute Eindrücke.	Somatiken an der richtigen Stelle, aber oft abgesperrt. Schmerz in der Gegenwart heftig.
15	1.5	[2] Ungleichmässige Eindrücke. Dub-in. Empfang verdreht, Bedeutungen falsch.)	[2] Eindrücke, Geringfügiges Dub-in.	Rückruf von Schmerz möglich, aber der Rückruf ist verzerrt. Unempfindlichkeit gegen Schmerz in der Gegenwart.
10	1.1	[2] Sehr schlechte Eindrücke. Viel Dub-in. (Empfang von der Umgebung wird als Bedrohung interpretiert.)	[2] Ungleichmässige Eindrücke. Dub-in.	Nur sehr gelegentlicher Rückruf von Schmerz als solchem. Körperlicher Schmerz ist zu Furcht umgewandelt. Ein Somatik repräsentiert viele Somatiken.
6	0.5	[2] Beinahe keine Eindrücke.	[2] Sehr schlechte Eindrücke. Viel Dub-in.	Rückruf von Schmerz als solchem unmöglich. Körperlicher Schmerz ist zu Gram umgewandelt. Somatiken an den falschen Stellen, wenn sie verspürt werden.
3	0.1	Kein Rückruf. (Keine Reaktion auf die Umgebung.)	Beinahe kein Rückruf. Minimalste Reaktionen auf die Umgebung.	Organismus als ganzer reaktionslos. Schmerzunempfindlichkeit. Zellen zeichnen auf.
1	0 -1	Zellulare Reaktion auf Geräusche in der Umgebung.	Zellulare Reaktion auf Licht in der Umgebung.	Zellen imstande, noch immer einzeln Schmerz zu fühlen.
0	-3	Schallwellen vorhanden, aber keine Aufzeichnung.	MEST-Lichtwelle vorhanden, aber keine Aufzeichnung.	MEST-Kräfte vorhanden. Keine Aufzeichnungen, ausser in

[1] Anmerkung: Bedeutet vom "Ich" empfangen, nicht "Aufzeichnung"

[2] Anmerkung: Bei einem weit offenen Fall können Sonik und/oder Visio vollständig vorhanden sein.

				Form von MEST.

HUBBARDS TABELLE DER EINSTUFUNG DES MENSCHEN UND DES DIANETISCHEN PROZESSING5

Freies Theta (Näherungswerte)	A Angeboren akut chronisch	K Gespräch: Sprechen ——— Gespräch: Zuhören	L Wie jemand als Übermittler mit geschriebener oder gesprochener Kommunikation umgeht	M Realität (Übereinstimmung)
100 0	40 .0			
900 -100	36 .0-4.0			
100 0	4. 0	Starker, geschickter, schneller und vollständiger Austausch von Überzeugungen und Ideen.	Gibt Theta-Kommunikation weiter, trägt dazu bei. Schneidet Entheta-Linien ab.	Sucht nach verschiedenen Standpunkten, um die eigene Realität zu erweitern. Verändert Realität.
70	3. 5	Ist bereit, über tiefinnere Überzeugungen und Ideen zu sprechen. ——— Ist bereit, tiefinnere Überzeugungen und Ideen zu akzeptieren und sie in Erwägung zu ziehen.	Gibt Theta-Kommunikation weiter. Ärgert sich über Entheta-Linien und schlägt gegen sie zurück.	Fähigkeit, die Realität anderer zu verstehen und auszuwerten und den Standpunkt zu ändern. Bereitschaft zur Übereinstimmung.
47	3. 0	Bringt zögernd eine begrenzte Anzahl persönlicher Ideen zum Ausdruck. ——— Empfängt Ideen und Überzeugungen, wenn sie vorsichtig vorgebracht werden.	Gibt Kommunikation weiter. Konservativ. Neigt zu gemässigtem Aufbauen und Erschaffen.	Ist sich der möglichen Richtigkeit einer anderen Realität bewusst. Konservative Übereinstimmung.
32	2. 5	Belanglose, nichtssagende Konversation. ——— Hört nur alltäglichen Dingen zu.	Entkräftet jede Kommunikation einer höheren oder niedrigeren Tonstufe. Mindert Dringlichkeiten herab.	Weigerung, zwei Realität miteinander in Einklang zu bringen. Gleichgültigkeit gegenüber Realitätskonflikten. Zu teilnahmslos, um zuzustimmen oder zu widersprechen.
22	2. 0	Spricht in Drohungen. Wertet andere Leute ab. ——— Hört Drohungen zu. Macht sich offen über Theta-Konversation lustig.	Befasst sich mit feindseliger oder drohender Kommunikation. Lässt nur eine kleine Menge Theta durch.	Spricht Zweifel aus. Verteidigung der eigenen Realität. Versucht, andere zu untergraben. Stimmt nicht überein.
15	1. 5	Spricht nur über Tod, Zerstörung und Hass. ——— Hört nur Tod und Zerstörung zu. Zerschlägt Thetalinien.	Verdreht Kommunikation zu Entheta ungeachtet des ursprünglichen Inhalts. ——— Stoppt oder verdreht Theta-Kommunikation. Gibt Entheta weiter.	Zerstörung entgegengesetzter Realität. "Du hast unrecht." Stimmt mit der Realität anderer nicht überein.
10	1. 1	Spricht scheinbares Theta, aber mit tückischer Absicht. ——— Hört wenig zu, hauptsächlich Intrigen, Klatsch und Lügen.	Gibt nur böswillige Kommunikation weiter ——— Schneidet Kommunikationslinien ab. Leitet nicht weiter.	Zweifel an der eigenen Realität. Unsicherheit. Zweifel an entgegengesetzter Realität.
6	0. 5	Spricht sehr wenig und nur in apathischen Tönen. ——— Hört wenig zu, hauptsächlich apathischen Äusserungen und Gejammer.	Schenkt Kommunikation wenig Beachtung. Leitet nicht weiter.	Scham, Ängstlichkeit und starke Zweifel an der eigenen Realität. Lässt sich leicht die Realität anderer aufzwingen.
3	0. 1	Spricht nicht. ——— Hört nicht zu.	Leitet nicht weiter. Ist sich Kommunikation nicht bewusst.	Vollständiges Zurückziehen vor gegensätzlicher Realität. Keine Realität.

HUBBARDS TABELLE DER EINSTUFUNG DES MENSCHEN UND DES DIANETISCHEN PROZESSING6

1	0 -1		MEST-Körper, keine Kommunikation. Theta kann mit der existierender Technologie nicht mit Sicherheit kontaktiert werden.	Subjektive Realität gleich null. Zellulare Realität.
0	-3		Das gleiche wie bei -1.	MEST-Realität

Freies Theta (Näherungswerte)	A Angeboren akut chronisch	N Zustand von Time-Track und Valenzen	O Wie sich Engramme und Locks äussern	P Sexuelles Verhalten _____ Einstellung gegenüber Kindern
1000	40.0			
900 -100	36.0-4.0			
100	4.0	Bewegt sich nach eigenem Willen. Geht selten aus der Gegenwart heraus. Befindet sich überall in seiner eigenen Valenz.	Keine gegenwärtigen Engramme oder Locks. Reagiert nach einem bildungsbedingten Muster, modifiziert durch Vernunft. Wird nicht restimuliert.	Grosses sexuelles Interesse, aber oft in kreatives Denken sublimiert. _____ Intensives Interesse an Kindern.
70	3.5	Bewegt sich mit sehr grosser Leichtigkeit. Kommt rasch in die Gegenwart, bleibt da.	Dramatisiert nur selten den Vorstellungsinhalt einer Kette von Engrammen.	Grosses Interesse am anderen Geschlecht. Beständigkeit. _____ Liebt Kinder.
47	3.0	Bewegt sich leicht auf dem Time-Track. Ist in seiner eigenen Valenz.	Dramatisiert Engramme, ändert aber deren Inhalt.	Interesse an Fortpflanzung. _____ Interesse an Kindern.
32	2.5	[3] Bewegt sich auf dem Time-Track. Manchmal schwer an Geschehnissen zu interessieren. Grösstenteils in seiner eigenen Valenz.	Dramatisiert Engramme unterhalb der Tonstufe 2,5.	Desinteresse an Fortpflanzung. _____ Vages Tolerieren von Kindern.
22	2.0	[3] Bewegt sich auf dem Time-Track, aber nicht gut. Befindet sich innerhalb und ausserhalb der eigenen Valenz. Fällt aus der Gegenwart ab.	Dramatisiert einige Locks und die meisten Engramme. Zahlreiche Dramatisationen.	Abscheu vor Sex; Ekel. _____ Herumnörgeln an Kindern und Gereiztheit über sie.
15	1.5	[3] Bewegt sich auf dem Time-Track in der Valenz des dominierenden Elternteiles oder "Vorbildes".	Dramatisiert wortwörtlich Engramme und Locks auf der Seite der gewinnenden Valenz.	Vergewaltigung. Sex als Bestrafung. _____ Brutale Behandlung von Kindern.
10	1.1	[3] In einer synthetischen Valenz. Bewegt sich auf einem falschen Time-Track oder steckt fest. Betrachtet Szenen aus einem seltsamen Blickwinkel.	Dramatisiert Locks und Engramme auf der Seite der verlierenden Valenz.	Promiskuität, Perversion, Sadismus, abwegige Praktiken. _____ gebraucht Kinder für sadistische Zwecke.
6	0.5	[3] Steckt gewöhnlich in Apathie- und Gram-Engrammen fest. Dort wo er feststeckt, befindet er sich ausserhalb seiner eigenen Valenz.	Locks und Engramme sind äusserst wirksam, falls sie sich unterhalb von 1,0 befinden. In einem Zustand von Anaten.	Impotenz, Ängstlichkeit, möglicherweise noch Fortpflanzungsbemühungen. _____ Ängstlich besorgt um Kinder.
3	0.1	Ist sich gewöhnlich keinerlei Vergangenheit bewusst. Lässt sich schwer in die Gegenwart bringen.	Jedes Geschehnis hat Wirkung. Locks sind genauso wirksam wie Engramme.	Keine Bemühung zur Fortpflanzung.
1	0 -1	Kein Time-Track.		Physiologen berichten von zellularen Bemühungen zur Fortpflanzung.
0	-3	Kein Time-Track.		

[3] Anmerkung: Ein weit offener Fall wird sich in der eigenen Valenz befinden und sich auf dem Time-Track bewegen.

HUBBARDS TABELLE DER EINSTUFUNG DES MENSCHEN UND DES DIANETISCHEN PROZESSING8

Fre ies Theta (Näherungswerte)	A Angeboren akut chronisch	Q Herrschaft über die Umwelt	R Tatsächlicher Wert für die Gesellschaft im Vergleich zum scheinbaren Wert	S Ethikniveau
100 0	40 .0			
900 -100	36 .0-4.0			
100	4. 0	Hohe Selbstbeherr-schung. Energisch gegenüber der Umwelt. Mag es nicht, Leute zu kontrollieren. Hohe Vernunft, leb-haft wechselnde Emotionen.	Hoher Wert. Scheinba-rer Wert wird verwirklicht. Kreativ und konstruktiv.	Gründet Ethik auf Ver-nunft. Sehr hohes Ethikniveau.
70	3. 5	Gute Vernunft. Gute Kontrolle. Akzeptiert Eigentum. Emotionen frei. Liberal.	Guter Wert für die Ge-sellschaft. Passt die Umwelt zu seinem eigenen Nutzen und zum Nutzen anderer an.	Beachtet die Ethik der Gruppe, aber entwickelt sie höher, entsprechend den Forderungen der Vernunft.
47	3. 0	Kontrolliert die Körper-funktionen. Gute Vernunft. Freiheit der Emotionen noch eingeschränkt. Gesteht anderen Rechte zu. De-mokratisch.	Jeglicher scheinbare Wert ist tatsächlicher Wert. Recht guter Wert.	Folgt der Ethik, in der er geschult wurde, so ehrlich wie möglich. Moralisch.
32	2. 5	Kontrolle über Funktio-nen und ein gewisses Mass an vernunftmässigem Denken. Be-gehrt nicht viel Besitz.	Fähig zu konstruktiver Aktion, die selten grösseren Um-fangs ist. Geringer Wert. "Gut angepasst".	Behandelt Ethik unauf-richtig. Weder besonders ehrlich noch unehrlich.
22	2. 0	Antagonistisch und zerstörerisch gegenüber sich selbst, anderen und der Umwelt. Begehrt Herrschaft, um zu scha-den.	Gefährlich. Jeder scheinbare Wert wird hinfällig gegenüber dem möglichen Scha-den für andere.	Unterhalb dieses Punk-tes: autoritär. Chronisch und grob unehrlich, wenn sich die Gelegen-heit ergibt.
15	1. 5	Vernichtet oder zerstört andere oder die Umwelt. Wenn dies nicht gelingt, kann er sich selbst vernichten. Faschistisch.	Unaufrichtig. Schwere Belastung. Möglicher Mörder. Wird selbst bei erklärtermassen guten Absichten Zerstörung herbeiführen.	Unterhalb dieses Punk-tes: kriminell. Unmoralisch. Aktiv unehrlich. Zerstörerisch gegen jegliche Ethik.
10	1. 1	Keine Kontrolle über Vernunft oder Emotionen, aber anscheinend organische Kontrolle. Benutzt hinterhältige Methoden, um andere zu kontrollieren, insbeson-dere Hypnose. Kommunistisch.	Aktive Belastung. Entur-buliert andere. Heimtückische verborgene Absicht fallen schwerer ins Gewicht als der scheinbare Wert.	Sexualverbrecher. Ne-gative Ethik. Verschlagene Unehr-lichkeit ohne Vernunft. Pseudo-ethische Aktivitäten verbergen die Perversion der Ethik.
6	0. 5	Dürftigste Funktionskon-trolle, nur über sich selbst.	Belastung für die Ge-sellschaft. Möglicher Selbstmörder. Kümmert sich um andere über-haupt nicht.	Nicht vorhanden. Denkt nicht. Gehorcht jedem.
3	0. 1	Keine Herrschaft über sich selbst, andere oder die Um-welt. Selbstmord.	Hochgradige Belastung. Braucht Betreuung und Mühe anderer, ohne irgendeinen Beitrag zu leisten.	Keines.
1	0 -1	Keine.	Wert des Körpers hängt von früheren Wert für seine Gruppe ab.	
0	-3	Keine.	(Wie bei 0 bis -1.)	

Freies Theta (Näherungswerte)	A Angeboren akut chronisch	T Umgang mit der Wahrheit	U Mutniveau	V Fähigkeit im Umgang mit Verantwortung
100 0	40 .0			
900 -100	36 .0-4.0			
100	4. 0	Hoher Begriff von Wahrheit.	Hohes Mutniveau.	Innewohnender Sinn für Verantwortung auf allen Dynamiken.
70	3. 5	Wahrheitsliebend.	Zeigt Mut bei annehmbarem Risiko.	Fähig, Verantwortlichkeiten zu übernehmen und auszuüben.
47	3. 0	Vorsichtig im Eintreten für Wahrheit. Gesellschaftliche Lügen.	Konservatives Entfalten von Mut, wenn das Risiko gering ist.	Geht mit Verantwortung nachlässig um.
32	2. 5	Unaufrichtig. Gleichgültig gegenüber Tatsachen.	Weder Mut noch Feigheit. Missachtung von Gefahr.	Zu gleichgültig. Nicht vertrauenswürdig.
22	2. 0	Verdrehung der Wahrheit, um sie dem Antagonismus anzupassen.	Reaktive, unüberlegte Vorstösse gegen Gefahr.	Benutzt Verantwortung um seine eigenen Zwecke zu verfolgen.
15	1. 5	Unverblümtes und destruktives Lügen.	Unvernünftige Tapferkeit, gewöhnlich schädlich für die Person selbst.	Übernimmt Verantwortung um zu zerstören.
10	1. 1	Erfindungsreiche und arglistige Verdrehungen der Wahrheit. Kunstvolles Bemänteln des Lügens.	Gelegentlich machen sich heimliche und hinterhältige Aktionen bemerkbar, ansonsten feige.	Unfähig, launenhaft, verantwortungslos.
6	0. 5	Zählt einzelne Fakten auf, ohne eine Vorstellung von ihrer Realität.	Vollständige Feigheit.	Keine.
3	0. 1	Keine Reaktion.	Keine Reaktion.	Keine.
1	0 -1			
0	-3			

Freies Theta (Näherungswerte)	A Angeboren akut chronisch	W Beharrlichkeit auf einem bestimmten Weg	X Wörtlichkeit der Aufnahme von Aussagen	Y Methode im Umgang mit anderen
100 0	40.0			
900 -100	36.0-4.0			
100	4.0	Hohe schöpferische Beharrlichkeit.	Hohe Differenzierung. Gutes Verständnis aller Kommunikation, modifiziert durch die Bildung des Clears.	Gewinnt Unterstützung durch schöpferische Begeisterung und Vitalität hinter denen Vernunft steht.
70	3.5	Gute Beharrlichkeit und Gradlinigkeit auf konstruktive Ziele hin.	Gutes Erfassen von Aussagen. Guter sinn für Humor.	Gewinnt Unterstützung durch schöpferisch Vernunft und Vitalität.
47	3.0	Recht gute Beharrlichkeit, wenn die Hindernisse nicht zu gross sind.	Gute Differenzierung der Bedeutung von Aussagen.	Lädt durch praktische Vernunft und gesellschaftlichen Charme zur Unterstützung ein.
32	2.5	Müssig. Schlechte Konzentration.	Akzeptiert sehr wenig, weder wörtlich noch sonst wie. Neigt dazu, Humor buchstäblich zu nehmen.	Kümmert sich um Unterstützung durch andere.
22	2.0	Beharrlichkeit hinsichtlich der Vernichtung von Feinden. Unterhalb diese Punktes keine konstruktive Beharrlichkeit.	Nimmt Bemerkungen der Tonstufe 2,0 wörtlich auf.	Nörgeln und grobe Kritik, um Befolgung seiner Wünsche durchzusetzen.
15	1.5	Zerstörerische Beharrlichkeit, die kräftig beginnt und rasch erlahmt.	Nimmt alarmierende Bemerkungen wörtlich auf. Brutaler Sinn für Humor.	Benutzt Drohungen, Bestrafung und alarmierende Lügen, um andere zu beherrschen.
10	1.1	Schwankend auf jedem Weg. Sehr schlechte Konzentration. Unbeständig.	Überhaupt keine Bemerkung wird angenommen. Weicht der Neigung, alles wörtlich zu nehmen, durch gezwungenen Humor aus.	Macht andere zunichte, um sie auf eine Stufe zu bringen, wo sie benutzt werden können. Verschlagene und heimtückische Mittel. Hypnose, Klatsch. Strebt nach versteckter Kontrolle.
6	0.5	Sporadische Beharrlichkeit in Richtung Selbstzerstörung.	Wörtliche Aufnahme jeder Bemerkung, die zur Tonstufe passt.	Enturbuliert andere, um sie zu kontrollieren. Winselt um Mitleid. Wildes Lügen, um Mitgefühl zu erheischen.
3	0.1	Keine.	Alles wird wörtlich aufgenommen.	Gibt vor, tot zu sein, damit andere ihn für ungefährlich halten und weggehen.
1	0 -1			
0	-3			

Freies Theta (Näherungswerte)	A Angeboren akut chronisch	Z Befehlskraft von Aktionssätzen	AB Gegenwart	AC Direkterinnerung
100 0	40 .0			
900 -100	36 .0-4.0			
100	4. 0	Keine Engramme. Sätze in der Gegenwart haben keine reaktive Kraft. Keine Locks.	Sehr stabil in der Gegenwart. Verlässt die Gegenwart nicht. Alle Wahrnehmung klar.	Kann sich willentlich alles zurückrufen oder an alles erinnern, was wahrgenommen wurde.
70	3. 5	Ketten von Engrammen haben Wirkung. Einzelne Sätze haben schwache Wirkung.	Sehr wache Aufmerksamkeit gegenüber der Gegenwart. Stabil in der Gegenwart.	Direkterinnerung von Daten automatisch.
47	3. 0	Aktionssätze von Engrammen haben Wirkung.	Preclear hat keine Schwierigkeiten, die Gegenwart zu erreichen oder in der Gegenwart zu bleiben.	Wenden Sie Direkterinnerung auf Auditing und Locks an.
32	2. 5	Engramme haben Wirkung. Ketten von Secondaries haben Wirkung.	Wenn der Preclear einmal in die Gegenwart gebracht worden ist, bleibt er für gewöhnlich bis zum nächsten Prozessing in der Gegenwart.	Wenden Sie Direkterinnerung an, um Wut-, Furcht- und Apathie-Dramatisationen von Leuten im Leben des Preclears zu kontaktieren.
22	2. 0	Engramme haben Wirkung. Secondaries haben Wirkung. Lock-Ketten haben Wirkung.	Preclear muss in Gegenwart gebracht und dort stabilisiert werden.	Wenden Sie Direkterinnerung auf A-R-C-Locks, gebrochene Dramatisationen und Vergnügungsmomente an.
15	1. 5	Locks, Secondaries und Engramme haben Wirkung wenn sie der Tonstufe entsprechen. Kontrollsätze sind am wirksamsten.	Preclear ausserhalb der Gegenwart. Reduzieren Sie Locks, und bringen Sie ihn in die Gegenwart	Wenden Sie Direkterinnerung auf A-R-C-Locks an und auf Anstrengung anderer, den Preclear zu kontrollieren.
10	1. 1	Locks, Secondaries und Engramme haben Wirkung. Valenz-Shifter sehr wirksam.	Preclear bleibt die meiste Zeit ausserhalb der Gegenwart. Erreicht er die Gegenwart, so fällt er wieder zurück. Schaffen Sie Ladung von Locks weg, und bringen Sie ihn in die Gegenwart.	Wenden Sie Direkterinnerung auf Dinge an, von denen er weiss, dass sie real sind, und auf gebrochene Dramatisationen.
6	0. 5	Gegenwartswahrnehmungen, Locks, Secondaries und Engramme haben Wirkung. Groupers besonders wirksam.	Man kann versuchen den Preclear in die Gegenwart zu bringen. Er fällt sofort wieder zurück.	Wenden Sie nur Direkterinnerung und Kontakt mit der Gegenwart an.
3	0. 1	Alle Sätze in der Gegenwart oder aus der Vergangenheit haben Wirkung.	Der Preclear kann mit sanfter Geduld dazu bewegt werden, Wahrnehmungen der Gegenwart zu erfahren.	Verwenden Sie Direkterinnerung nur als Hilfsmittel, um die Umgebung zu kontaktieren.
1	0 -1		Zellen in der Gegenwart. Entitäts-Theta nicht in Kontakt.	Genetischer Rückruf.
0	-3		MEST in der Gegenwart. Theta vollständig ausser Kontakt.	Keine Erinnerung im MEST-Körper.

Freies Theta (Näherungswerte)	A Angeboren akut chronisch	AD Vergnügungsmomente	AE Imaginäre Geschehnisse	AF Locks
1000	40.0			
900 -100	36.0-4.0			
100	4.0	Spricht auf alle Vergnügungsreize der Umgebung an. Geniesst das Leben. Alle vergangenen Vergnügungsmomente zugänglich.	Das Verfahren ist nicht erforderlich.	Alle Locks entladen.
70	3.5	Durchläuft Vergnügungsmomente leicht. Der grösste Teil des vergangenen Vergnügens ist zugänglich.	Das Verfahren ist nicht erforderlich. Unterscheidet gut zwischen Realität und Phantasie.	Locks verschwinden, sobald das Engramm ausgelöscht wird.
47	3.0	Durchläuft Vergnügungsmomente leicht, aber ein grosser Teil des vergangenen und gegenwärtigen Vergnügens ist zugänglich.	Verwenden Sie imaginäre Vergnügungsmomente, um die Tonstufe anzuheben.	Behandlung von Locks als Einzelgeschehnissen nicht erforderlich.
32	2.5	Durchläuft Vergnügungsmomente. Gegenwärtiges und vergangenes Vergnügen gelegentlich abgesperrt.	Das Verfahren ist zu Beginn des Falles nützlich. Imaginäre Vergnügungsmomente.	Behandlung von Locks als Einzelgeschehnissen relativ ergiebig.
22	2.0	Einige wirkliche Vergnügungsmomente können erreicht werden. Findet Vergnügen darin, Antagonismus frei zu äussern.	Imaginäre Rache wird einen Hinweis darauf geben, was dem Preclear angetan worden ist.	Es kann vorkommen, dass Locks kontaktiert und restimuliert werden, ohne sich dadurch reduzieren zu lassen.
15	1.5	Wahre Vergnügungsmomente lassen sich nur schwer finden. Reaktive Genugtuung im Zerstören.	Das Verfahren kann nutzbringend angewendet werden. Alle Geschehnisse scheinen imaginär.	Behandeln Sie gebrochene Dramatisationen und A-R-C-Locks wie Engramme, bis die Ladung entfernt ist.
10	1.1	Es lassen sich gelegentlich vergnügliche Erinnerungen finden, aber sehr selten. Reaktives Entzücken darin, hilflose Personen oder Gegenstände sadistisch zu verletzen.	Zu hypnotisch. Bringen Sie keine solchen Geschehnisse zur Sprache.	Behandeln Sie A-R-C-Break-Locks wie Engramme.
6	0.5	Keine Vergnügungsmomente zugänglich. Erlebt wenig oder gar keine Vergnügungsmomente in der Gegenwart.	Zu hypnotisch. Verwenden Sie kein solches Verfahren.	Behandeln Sie nur die allerleichtesten Locks nahe der Gegenwart. Schwere Locks zu behandeln zieht den Preclear in Engramme hinein.
3	0.1	Keine Reaktion.	Keine.	Berühren Sie nur leichteste Momente der Vergangenheit, falls überhaupt.
1	0 -1			
0	-3			

Fre ies Theta (Näherungswerte)	A Angeboren akut chronisch	AG Locks-Scanning	AH Secondary-Engramme	AI Engramme
100 0	40 .0			
900 -100	36 .0-4.0			
100	4. 0	Alle Locks sind mit Lock-Scanning behandelt worden.	Alle Secondaries sind weg.	Alle MEST-Engramme des gegenwärtigen Lebens sind verschwunden.
70	3. 5	Wenden Sie Lock-Scanning auf Auditing und Locks von gerade behandelten Engram-men an.	Auditieren Sie alle Se-condaries aus. Sie werden von Ladung befreit werden, wenn sie wie Locks mit Scanning durchlau-fen werden.	Jedes Engramm des Falles lässt sich mit allen Wahr-nehmungen behandeln.
47	3. 0	Schärfen Sie die Wahr-nehmungen durch Lock-Scanning.	Secondaries können erst von dieser Stufe an aufwärts ohne negativen Auswirkungen berührt und wieder verlassen werden.	Der Auditor kann frühe , spezifische Engramme zur Behand-lung auswählen, sollte aber mit dem Archivar zusammenarbeiten.
32	2. 5	Machen Sie Lock-Scanning, bis Engramme sich deutlich zeigen. Behandeln Sie diese. Machen Sie weiteres Lock-Scanning, um neue Engramme zu erhalten.	Jedes Secondary kann behandelt werden. Es wird sich normalerweise entladen.	Behandeln Sie nur je-weils vom Archivar angebotene Engramme.
22	2. 0	Machen Sie Lock-Scanning, wobei Sie Ketten bear-beiten, die der Archivar herausge-geben hat. Reduzieren Sie alle kontaktierten Ketten.	Behandeln Sie jedes Secondary. Behandeln Sie es gründlich, bis es entladen ist.	Behandeln Sie vorsichtig jene Engramme, die der Archivar anbietet. Zwingen Sie den Preclear nicht in Engramme hinein.
15	1. 5	Machen Sie Lock-Scanning so lange, bis der Preclear in einem Lock hängen bleibt. Be-handeln Sie es wie ein Engramm. Vermeiden Sie es, beim Lock-Scanning irgendwelche körperli-chen Schmerzen zu durchlaufen.	Behandeln Sie Furcht-, Gram- oder Wut-Secondaries. Normalerweise ist es schwierig sie zu entladen.	Vorsicht. Behandeln Sie nur Engramme, die sich leicht anbieten. Seien Sie vorsichtig.
10	1. 1	Das gleiche wie bei 1,5 aber vorsichtiger. Wenn dies zuviel Enturbulierung zur Folge hat, verwenden Sie die Technik der Direkterinnerung, die für diese Stufe angemessen ist.	Vorsicht. Behandeln Sie jedes Furcht-Secondary, das der Archivar anbietet. Normalerweise werden sie sich nicht vollständig entladen.	Berühren sie auf dieser Stufe nie ein Engramm.
6	0. 5	Mache kein Lock-Scanning.	Vorsicht. behandeln Sie Furcht-Secondary nur wenn sie vom Archivar vorgelegt werden. Weisen Sie den Preclear nicht an, in Secondaries hineinzugehen.	Berühren sie auf dieser Stufe nie ein Engramm.
3	0. 1	Wenden Sie niemals Scanning an.	Lassen Sie den Preclear in keinerlei Secondaries hineinge-raten.	Berühren sie auf dieser Stufe niemals ein Engramm.
1	0 -1			

0	-3			

Freies Theta (Näherungswerte)	A Angeboren akut chronisch	AJ Engrammketten	AK Circuits	AL Zustand des Archivars
100 0	40 .0			
900 -100	36 .0-4.0			
100	4. 0		Alle Kontrolle liegt beim "Ich". Keine Circuits.	Berechnet genau mit Blitzantworten.
70	3. 5	Engramm-Scanning kann gemacht werden, wenn die Tonstufe des Falles sorgfältig geprüft ist.	Circuits vom Fall entfernt.	Archivar sehr aktiv und verlässlich.
47	3. 0	Machen Sie niemals Engramm-Scanning.	Wenig wirksame Circuits.	Archivar aktiv und verlässlich.
32	2. 5	Machen Sie niemals Engramm-Scanning.	Einige Circuits. In Secondaries und vorgeburtlichen Engrammen nicht wirksam.	Archivar spricht gut an. Bei Secondaries gelegentlich abgesperrt.
22	2. 0	Machen Sie niemals Engramm-Scanning.	In vorgeburtlichen Engrammen zahlreich. In Locks nicht wirksam.	Archivar funktioniert meistens.
15	1. 5	Machen Sie niemals Engramm-Scanning.	Relativ stark und zahlreich. Wirksam in Secondaries.	Archivar funktioniert gelegentlich. Meistens abgesperrt.
10	1. 1	Machen Sie niemals Engramm-Scanning.	Stark und zahlreich, besonders in vorgeburtlichen Engrammen.	Circuit-"Archivar" gibt Daten mittels seltsamer Mechanismen. Nicht verlässlich.
6	0. 5	Machen Sie niemals Engramm-Scanning.	Sehr stark und zahlreich, besonders in der vorgeburtlichen Periode und in der Kindheit. Wirksam in frühen Locks.	Keine Reaktion vom wirklichen Archivar. Manchmal reagieren Circuits.
3	0. 1	Machen Sie niemals Scanning.	Auf der ganzen Spanne des Time-Tracks stark und zahlreich vertreten. Sogar späte locks enthalten Circuits.	Keine Spur von Archivar.
1	0 -1			
0	-3			

Freies Theta (Näherungswerte)	A Angeboren akut chronisch	AM Stufe der Hypnotisierbarkeit	AN Bewusstseins-Niveau der Mind-Ebene (Näherungswerte)	AO Anteil an Entheta beim Fall (Näherungswerte)
1000	40.0			
900 -100	36.0-4.0			
100	4.0	Unmöglich ohne Drogen zu hypnotisieren.	Vollkommen analytisch.	Alle Locks, Secondaries und Engramme umgewandelt.
70	3.5	Schwer in Trance zu versetzen, ausser er besitzt noch ein Trance-Engramm.	Analytischer Mind arbeitet zu etwa 70%.	Die wesentlichen Lock-Ketten und beinahe alle Secondaries sind umgewandelt. Leichte Ladung auf einigen Engrammen.
47	3.0	Könnte hypnotisiert werden, ist aber hellwach, wenn wach.	Analytischer Mind arbeitet zu etwa 47%.	Einige sehr stark geladene Lock-Ketten. Einige Secondaries, geringfügige Ladung. Engramme nur leicht geladen.
32	2.5	Kann Hypnose unterzogen werden, ist aber meistens hellwach.	Analytischer Mind arbeitet zu etwa 32%.	Einige sehr stark geladene Lock-Ketten. Grössere Secondaries vorhanden. Etwa $1/3$ der Engramme so stark geladen, dass sie überhaupt nicht kontaktierbar sind.
22	2.0	Leistet einigen Widerstand, kann aber hypnotisiert werden.	Analytischer Mind spricht gut an. Reaktiver Mind voll wachsam.	Viele sehr stark geladene Lock-Ketten. Viele grössere Secondaries. Hälfte der Engramme in der Bank überhaupt nicht kontaktierbar.
15	1.5	Leistet heftigen Widerstand gegen Äusserungen, nimmt sie aber in sich auf.	Analytischer Mind ist dabei, seine Funktionen einzustellen. Reaktiver Mind recht aktiv.	Sehr stark geladene Lock-Ketten. Schwere Secondaries. $3/4$ der Engramme in der Bank überhaupt nicht kontaktierbar.
10	1.1	In einer andauernden leichten Trance, leistet aber Widerstand.	Analytischer Mind beinahe abgestellt. Reaktiver Mind spricht leicht an.	Die meisten Lock-Ketten beinahe so stark wie Secondaries geladen. Ladungen von Secondaries grösstenteils in Engramme hineingesunken. Beinahe alle Engramme nicht kontaktierbar.
6	0.5	Sehr leicht hypnotisierbar. Jede Bemerkung, die gemacht wird kann sich als "positive Suggestion" auswirken.	Analytischer Mind abgestellt. Reaktiver Mind beginnt seine Funktion einzustellen.	Beinahe eine feste Schicht von Ladung.
3	0.1	Gleicht in seinem gewöhnlichen "Wachzustand" einer hypnotisierten Person.	Reaktiver Mind nur sehr gering in Tätigkeit.	Time-Track für alles ausser Direkterinnerung zu stark geladen.
1	0 -1			
0	-3			

Freies Theta (Näherungswerte)	A Angeboren akut chronisch	AP Fähigkeit, Vergnügen in der Gegenwart zu erleben	AQ Tonstufe des Auditors, die zur Behandlung des Falles erforderlich ist	AR Wie man den Fall auditiert
1000	40.0			
900 -100	36.0-4.0			
100	4.0	Findet das Dasein randvoll von Vergnügen.	Kann alles ausser einem schweren Drogen-Engramm ohne Auditor ausauditieren.	Jedes Engramm kann ausauditiert werden, sobald das Bewusstsein wiederkehrt.
70	3.5	Findet das Leben die meiste Zeit vergnüglich.	3,0 Überlegene Position nicht erforderlich.	Durchlaufen Sie Engramme und Secondaries und alle Lock-Ketten mit Scanning, bis der Fall Clear ist.
47	3.0	Erlebt zeitweise Vergnügen.	3,0	Behandeln Sie Engramme und Secondaries. Bereinigen Sie das Auditing regelmässig durch Lock-Scanning.
32	2.5	Erlebt Augenblicke des Vergnügens. Geringe Intensität.	3,0	Führen Sie routinemässig Lock-Scanning und die Behandlung von Secondaries und Engrammen durch. Durchlaufen Sie alle Circuits, die in Locks zu finden sind, mit Lock-Scanning.
22	2.0	Erlebt gelegentlich in ausserordentlichen Augenblicken etwas Vergnügen.	3,0	Machen Sie Lock-Scanning. Behandeln Sie Secondaries. Behandeln Sie nur Engramme, die der Archivar ohne weiteres anbietet. Lokalisieren Sie Circuits in Locks.
15	1.5	Erlebt selten irgendwelches Vergnügen.	3,0	Machen Sie Lock-Scanning. Behandeln Sie Lock und Secondaries wie Engramme. Grosse Vorsicht mit jeglichem Engramm. Wenden Sie Direkterinnerung auf Circuits an.
10	1.1	Fröhlichkeit meist gezwungen. Wirkliches Vergnügen jenseits seiner Reichweite.	3,5 oder darüber. (Solche Fälle sind sehr restimulierend.)	Stellen Sie A-R-C her. Nehmen Sie falls erforderlich, die Tonstufe des Preclears an (Nachahmung). Wenden Sie Direkterinnerung auf Locks an, und machen Sie Lock-Scanning. Berühren Sie keine Engramme.
6	0.5	Keine.	3,5 oder darüber.	Stellen Sie A-R-C her. Sehr viel Affinität. Bereinigen Sie einige kleinere Apathie-Locks. Berühren Sie keine Engramme.
3	0.1	Keine.	3,5 oder darüber.	Stellen Sie A-R-C her und bringen Sie den Preclear in Kontakt mit der Gegenwart. Berühren Sie keine Engramme oder Secondaries.
1	0 -1			

0	-3			

Remimeo
Tech Personel   Corrected 4 April 1974
Qual-Personel   (Corrections in this type style)
Students

SCALES

(HCOB 10 May 1960, "Scales" Revised)

Following is a list of some scales used in Scientology, including a table of reality-spotting by E-Meter.

EMOTIONAL TONE SCALE

	40,0	Serenety of Beingness
	8,0	Exhilaration
	4,0	Enthusiasm
	3,0	Conservatism
THETAN PLUS	2,5	Boredom
BODY	2,0	Antagonism
	1,8	Pain
Social	1,5	Anger
Training and	1,2	No Sympathy
education	1,1	Covert Hostility
sole guarantee	1,0	Fear
of sane	0,9	Sympathy
conduct	0,8	Propititation
	0,5	Grief
	0,375	Making Amends
	0,05	Apathy
THETAN	0,0	Being a Body (Death)	Failure
SCALE RANGE	-0,2	Being Other Bodies	Shame
Well below body	-1,0	Punishing Other Bodies	Blame
death at "0" down	-1,3	Resbonsibility as Blame	Regret
to complete	-1,5	Controlling Bodies
unbeingness	-2,2	Protecting Bodies
as a thetan	-3,0	Owning Bodies
	-3,5	Approval From Bodies
	-4,0	Needing Bodies
	-8,0	Hiding

C-D-E-I-SCALE

Interest
Desire
Enforce
Inhibit
Unknown

C-D-E-I-SCALE EXPANDED

K   Know
U   Unknow
C   Curious
D   Desire
E   Enforce
I   Inhibit
0   Absence of (No __)
F   Falsify

SCALE OF IDENTIFICATION

Differenciate
Associate
Identify
Disassociate

EFFECT SCALE

From: Can cause or receive any effect
To: Must cause total effect, can receive none
To: Is total effect, is hallucinatory cause

SCALE OF KNOWINGNESS

Know
Not-Know
Know About
Forget
Remember

EXPANDED KNOW TO MYSTERY SCALE

Native State
Not Know
Know About
Look
Emotion
Effort
Think
Symbols
Eat
Sex
Mystery
Wait
Unconscious

HAVINESS SCALE

Create
Responsible for (willing to control)
Contribute to
Confront
Have
Waste
Substitute
Waste Substitute
Had
Must be Confronted
Must be contributed to
Created

REALITY SPOTTING BY E-METER

Needle characteristics plotted on scale with numerical tone scale values, "old" Reality Scale and "new" Reality Scale.

TONE	REALITY SCALE (OLD)	REALITY SCALE (NEW	NEEDLE CHARACTERISTICS
40 to 20	Postulate	**Pan-Determiend Creation**	Produces meter phenomena at will.
20 to 4	Consideration	**Self-Determined Creation**	Free needle.
4.to 2	Agreements	**Experience**	Free needle, drop at will
1.5	Solid Terminals	**Confront**	Drop
1.1	Terminals too solid Lines solid	**Elsewhereness**	Theta Bop.
1 to 0.5	No terminal, Solid line	**Invisibility**	Stuck, sticky
0.5 to 0.1	No terminal Less solid Line	**Blackness**	
0.1	No real terminal	**Dub-In** (no confront, not-isnees)	Rising needle
0.0	No terminal no line	**Unconsciousness Stuck**.	Also stage four needle. (All machine – no pc.)

For complete description of human behaviour at the above tone levels, study SCIENCE OF SURVIVAL with the Chart of Human Evaluation by L. Ron Hubbard. Learn also the Hubbard Chart of Attitudes.

The above chart of correlations applies in two ways:

1.   by the chronic standard reaction of the preclear
2.   by type of material (facsimiles) contacted.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jp.rd.ams.rd

[The 18 September 1967 issue corrected HCO B 3 February 1967 by reversing the position of "K Know" and "U Unknow" in the C-D-E-I SCALE EXPANDED, which was the only change. The correction of 4 April 1974 was to exchange the positions of "Shame" and "Regret" in the EMOTIONAL TONE SCALE. The HCO B 10 May 1960 referred to was not written by LRH.]

Remimeo
Auditor 43
Class VIII
All Auditors

THE AUDITOR'S CODE

In celebration of the 100% gains attainable by Standard Tech.

I hereby promise as an Auditor to follow the Auditor's Code.

1. I promise not to evaluate for the preclear or tell him what he should think about his case in session.

2. I promise not to invalidate the preclear's case or gains in or out of session.

3. I promise to administer only Standard Tech to a preclear in the standard way.

4. I promise to keep all auditing appointments once made.

5. I promise not to process a preclear who has not had sufficient rest and who is physically tired.

6. I promise not to process a preclear who is improperly fed or hungry.

7. I promise not to permit a frequent change of Auditors.

8. I promise not to sympathize with a preclear but to be effective.

9. I promise not to let the preclear end session on his own determinism but to finish off those cycles I have begun.

10. I promise never to walk off from a preclear in session.

11. I promise never to get angry with a preclear in session.

12. I promise to run every major case action to a floating needle.

13. I promise never to run any one action beyond its floating needle.

14. I promise to grant beingness to the preclear in session.

15. I promise not to mix the processes of Scientology with other practices except when the preclear is physically ill and only medical means will serve.

16. I promise to maintain Communication with the preclear and not to cut his comm or permit him to overrun in session.

17. I promise not to enter comments, expressions or enturbulence into a session that distract a preclear from his case.

18. I promise to continue to give the preclear the process or auditing command when needed in the session.

19. I promise not to let a preclear run a wrongly understood command.

20. I promise not to explain, justify or make excuses in session for any Auditor mistakes whether real or imagined.

21. I promise to estimate the current case state of a preclear only by Standard Case Supervision data and not to diverge because of some imagined difference in the case.

22. I promise never to use the secrets of a preclear divulged in session for punishment or personal gain.

23. I promise to see that any fee received for processing is refunded following the policies of the Claims Verification Board, if the preclear is dissatisfied and demands it within three months after the processing, the only condition being that he may not again be processed or trained.

24. I promise not to advocate Scientology only to cure illness or only to treat the insane, knowing well it was intended for spiritual gain.

25. I promise to cooperate fully with the legal organizations of Dianetics and Scientology as developed by L. Ron Hubbard in safeguarding the ethical use and practice of the subject according to the basics of Standard Tech.

26. I promise to refuse to permit any being to be physically injured, violently damaged, operated on or killed in the name of "mental treatment".

27. I promise not to permit sexual liberties or violation of the mentally unsound.

28. I promise to refuse to admit to the ranks of practitioners any being who is insane.

Auditor:_____   Date: _____

Witness: _____   Place: _____

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

Remimeo
Courses
Checksheets

(Revisions in this type style)

TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED

(Revises 17 April 1961.
This HCOB cancels the following:

Original	HCOB 17 April 1961	TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED
Revised	HCOB 5 Jan 71	TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED
Revised	HCOB 21 June 71	TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED Issue III
	HCOB 25 May 71	THE TR COURSE

This HCOB is to replace all other issues
of TRs 0-4 in all packs and checksheets.)

Due to the following factors, I have modernized TRs 0 to 4.

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 Scientology training courses, **the balance of the course will fail and supervisors at Upper Levels will be teaching not their subjects but TRs.**

4. Almost all confusions on meter, Model Sessions and Scientology or Dianetic processes stem directly from inability to do the TRs.

5. A student who has not mastered his TRs will not master anything further.

6. Scientology or Dianetic processes 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.

Public courses on TRs are **not** "softened" because they are for the public. Absolutely no standards are lowered. **The public are given real TRs – rough, tough and hard.** To do otherwise is to lose 90% of the results. There is nothing pale and patty-cake about TRs.

This HCOB means what it says. It does not mean something else. It does not imply another meaning. It is not open to interpretation from another source.

These TRs are done exactly per this HCOB without added actions or change.

NUMBER: OT TR 0 1971

NAME: Operating Thetan Confronting.

COMMANDS: None.

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other with eyes closed, a comfortable distance apart – about three feet.

PURPOSE: To train student to be there comfortably and confront another person. The idea is to get the student able to **be** there comfortably in a position three feet in front of another person, to **be** there and not do anything else but **be** there.

TRAINING STRESS: Student and coach sit facing each other with eyes closed. There is no conversation. This is a silent drill. There is *no* twitching, moving, confronting with a body part, "system" or vias used to confront or anything else added to **be** there. One will usually see blackness or an area of the room when one's eyes are closed. **Be there, comfortably and confront.**

When a student can **be** there comfortably and confront and has reached a *major stable win*, the drill is passed.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in June 71 to give an additional gradient to confronting and eliminate students confronting with their eyes, blinking, etc. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in August 1971 after research discoveries on TRs.

NUMBER: TR 0 CONFRONTING REVISED 1961

NAME: Confronting Preclear.

COMMANDS: None.

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other a comfortable distance apart – about three feet.

PURPOSE: To train student to confront a preclear with auditing only or with nothing. The whole idea is to get the student able to be there comfortably in 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, blink, 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 confronting 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. Confronting with a body part can cause somatics in that body part being used to confront. The solution is just to confront and **be** there. Student passes when he can just **be** there and confront and he has reached a *major stable win*.

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 by L. Ron Hubbard in August 1971 after research discoveries on TRs.

NUMBER: TR 0 BULLBAIT REVISED 1961

NAME: Confronting Bullbaited.

COMMANDS: Coach: "Start" "That's it" "Flunk."

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other a comfortable distance apart – about three feet.

PURPOSE: To train student to confront a preclear with auditing or with nothing. The whole idea is to get the student able to **be** there comfortably in a position three feet in front of the preclear without being thrown off, distracted or reacting in any way to what the preclear says or does.

TRAINING STRESS: After the student has passed TR 0 and he can just **be** there comfortably, "Bullbaiting" can begin. Anything added to **being there** is sharply flunked by the coach. Twitches, blinks, sighs, fidgets, anything except just being there is promptly flunked, with the reason why.

PATTER: Student coughs. Coach: "Flunk! You coughed. Start." This is the whole of the coach's patter as a coach.

PATTER AS A CONFRONTED SUBJECT: The coach may say anything or do anything except leave the chair. The student's "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). Student passes when he can **be** there comfortably

without being thrown off or distracted or react in any way to anything the coach says or does and has reached a *major stable win*.

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 by L. Ron Hubbard in August 1971 after research discoveries on TRs.

NUMBER: TR 1 REVISED 1961

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 said" omitted) is picked out of the book ALICE IN WONDERLAND and read to the coach. It is repeated until the coach is satisfied it arrived where he is.

POSITION: Student and coach are seated facing each other a comfortable distance apart.

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.

The coach must have received the command (or question) clearly and have understood it before he says "Good."

PATTER: The coach says "Start," says "Good" without a new start if the command is received or says "Flunk" if the command is not received. "Start" is not used again. "That's it" is used to terminate for a discussion or to end the activity. If session is terminated for a discussion, coach must say "Start" again before it resumes.

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.

NUMBER: TR 2 REVISED 1978

NAME: Acknowledgments.

PURPOSE: To teach the student that an acknowledgement is a method of controlling preclear communication and that an acknowledgement is a full stop. The student must **understand** and **appropriately** acknowledge the comm and in such a way that it does not continue the comm.

COMMANDS: The coach reads lines from Alice in Wonderland omitting the "he said" and the student thoroughly acknowledges them. The student says "Good," "Fine," "Okay," "I heard that," **anything** only so long as it is appropriate to the pc's comm – in such a way as actually

to convince the person who is sitting there as the preclear that he has heard it. The coach repeats any line he feels was not truly acknowledged.

POSITION: Student and coach are seated facing each other at a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: Teach student to acknowledge exactly what was said so preclear knows it was heard. Ask student from time to time what *was* said. Curb over and under acknowledgement. Let student do anything at first to get acknowledgement across, then even him out. Teach him that an acknowledgement is a stop, not beginning of a new cycle of communication or an encouragement to the preclear to go on and that an acknowledgement must be appropriate for the pays comm. The student must be broken of the habit of robotically using "Good," "Thank you" as the only acks.

To teach further that one can fail to get an acknowledgement across or can fail to stop a pc with an acknowledgement or can take a pc's head off with an acknowledgement.

PATTER: The coach says "Start," reads a line and says "Flunk" every time the coach feels there has been an improper acknowledgement. The coach repeats the same line each time the coach says "Flunk." "That's it" may be used to terminate for discussion or terminate the session. "Start" must be used to begin a new coaching after a "That's it."

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956 to teach new students that an acknowledgement ends a communication cycle and a period of time, that a new command begins a new period of time. Revised 1961 and again in 1978 by L. Ron Hubbard.

NUMBER: TR 2½   1978

NAME: Half Acks.

PURPOSE: To teach the student that a half acknowledgement is a method of encouraging a pc to communicate.

COMMANDS: The coach reads lines from "Alice in Wonderland" omitting "he saids" and the student half asks the coach. The coach repeats any line he feels was not half asked.

POSITION: The student and coach are seated facing each other at a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: Teach student that a half acknowledgement is an encouragement to the pc to **continue** talking. Curb over-acknowledgement that stops a pc from talking. Teach him further that a half ask is a way of keeping a pc talking by giving the pc the feeling that he is being heard.

PATTER: The coach says "Start," reads a line and says "Flunk" every time the coach feels there has been an improper half ask. The coach repeats the same line each time the coach says "Flunk." "That's it" may be used to terminate for discussion or terminate the session. If the session is terminated for discussion, the coach must say "Start" again before it resumes.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in July 1978 to train auditors in how to get a pc to continue talking as in R3RA.

NUMBER: TR 3 REVISED 1961

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.

TRAINING STRESS: One question and student acknowledgement 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 a command and receive an answer and to acknowledge it in one unit of time.

The student is flunked if he or she fails to get an answer to the question asked, if he or she fails to repeat the exact questions, if he or she Q and As with excursions taken by the coach.

PATTER: The coach uses "Start" and "That's it," as in earlier TRs. The coach is not bound after starting to answer the student's question but may comm lag or give a commenting type answer to throw the student off. Often the coach should answer. Somewhat less often the coach attempts to pull the student into a Q and A or upset the student. Example:

> Student: "Do fish swim?"
>
> Coach: "Yes"
>
> Student: "Good"
>
> Student: "Do fish swim?"
>
> Coach: "Aren't you hungry?"
>
> Student: "Yes"
>
> Coach: "Flunk."

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, acknowledgement and as needed, the repeat statement is flunked. Unnecessary use of the repeat statement is flunked. A poor command is flunked. A poor acknowledgement is flunked. A Q and A is flunked (as in example). Student misemotion or confusion is flunked. Student failure to utter the next command without a long comm lag is flunked. A choppy or premature acknowledgement is flunked. Lack of an acknowledgement (or with a distinct comm lag) is flunked. Any words from the coach except an answer to the question, "Start," "Flunk," "Good" or "That's it" should have no influence on the student except to get him to give a repeat statement and the command again. By repeat statement is meant, "I'll repeat the auditing command."

"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 a flunk. 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 acknowledgement. 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 a flunk and the coach must say so.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956, to overcome variations and sudden changes in sessions. Revised 1961 by L. Ron Hubbard. The old TR has 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

NAME: Preclear Originations.

PURPOSE: To teach the 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 supervisor. 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 origination 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 student 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 a flunk.

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.) Flunks are given if the student does more than 1. Understand; 2. Acknowledge; 3. Return pc to session.

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 coach's remarks about self as "pc" is a flunk.

Student's failure to persist is always a flunk 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.

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.

As TR 5 is also part of the CCHs it can be disregarded in the Comm Course TRs despite its appearance on earlier lists for students and staff auditors.

TRAINING NOTE

It is better to go through these TRs several times getting tougher each time than to hang on one TR forever or to be so tough at start student goes into a decline.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jw:JR:JS:nt.pe.rd.lfg

(This Bulletin has been revised to fully define TRs and to include data on the cycle of communication upon which the TRs are based.)

TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED

This HCOB cancels the following:

Original	HCOB 17 Apr 61	TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED
Revised	HCOB 5 Jan 71	TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED
Revised	HCOB 21 Jun 71 III	TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED
	HCOB 25 May 71	THE TR COURSE

(REFERENCES: HCOB 5 Apr 73R   AXIOM 28 AMENDED
                      Rev. 4.9.80
                      HCOB 23 Sep 79   CANCELLATION OF DESTRUCTIVE BTBs AND BPLs ON TRs
                      HCOB 24 Dec 79   TRs BASICS RESURRECTED
                      HCOB 18 Apr 80   TR CRITICISM
                      HCOB 5 Apr 80   Q & A, THE REAL DEFINITION)

This HCOB is to replace all other issues of TRs 0-4 in all packs and checksheets, excepting those TRs Booklets specifically designed for Div 6 Courses.

TRs DEFINITION

The term "TRs" is an abbreviation for Training Regimen or Routine. TRs are also often referred to as Training Drills.

While each individual TR drill has its own specific purpose, the overall purpose and definition of TRs is given here fully and finally:

TRs are methods of drilling the communication formula and becoming expert in its handling and use.

That definition applies to any TR. At times over the years when it has been dropped out or obscured or misunderstood, auditor training quality and results have suffered.

Therefore, this full and final definition is to be posted in **large** letters in any course room where Professional TRs are taught. It should be emblazoned upon the foreheads and minds of TR Course Supervisors and all students on TRs Courses in training to become auditors. It should be known broadly and understood and emphasized.

In 1971, due to the following factors, I found it necessary to modernize TRs 0 to 4.

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 Scientology training courses, **the balance of the course will fail and supervisors at upper levels will be teaching not their subjects but TRs.**

4.   Almost all confusions on Meter, Model Sessions and Scientology or Dianetic processes stem directly from inability to do the TRs.

5.   A student who has not mastered his TRs will not master anything further.

6.   Scientology or Dianetic processes 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.

These factors hold very true today and always will.

Academies were tough on TRs up to 1958 and have since tended to soften. Professional TRs Courses are not a tea party.

The 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.

A more gradient approach to TRs is taught on specially packaged co-audits for those with no prior technical training, where the same degree of flawlessness and skill demanded of a professional auditor is not demanded of the untrained co-auditor.

And there is still another gradient of TRs found on courses for new public in Division 6, where the person is getting his first experience in handling communication in his life and livingness.

But on a Professional TRs Course for auditors absolutely no standards are lowered. **Professional auditors in training are given real TRs – rough, tough and hard.** To do otherwise is to lose 90% of the results. There is nothing pale and patty-cake about TRs.

This HCOB means what it says. It does not mean something else. It does not imply another meaning. It is not open to interpretation from another source.

THE A-R-C TRIANGLE

As TRs are methods of drilling the communication cycle, one cannot expect to master TRs without familiarity with that cycle. And basic to the drilling or any real use of the comm

cycle is an understanding of Affinity, Reality and Communication, which make up the ARC Triangle.

There is no attempt here to repeat all of the existing data on the ARC Triangle and its use. Any student put on TRs must first have done a sound study of this theory. The data exists in the books:

THE PROBLEMS OF WORK, Chapter 6: Affinity, Reality and Communication

THE FUNDAMENTALS OF THOUGHT, Chapter 5: The ARC Triangle

DIANETICS 55!

and in various HCOB Bulletins in the Technical Volumes.

A student ready for TR drills would know and would have demonstrated how Affinity, Reality and Communication interrelate. He would be familiar with how one improves the level of ARC by first raising one side of this important triangle in order to raise the next side and the next, and how ARC brings about Understanding.

When he has that data he's better prepared to handle the comm cycle.

THE FULL CYCLE OF COMMUNICATION

Communication Defined

If one were to put it very simply, it could be said, correctly, that communication is the interchange of ideas across space.

A finer statement of this is given in the following definition from Axiom 28:

Communication is the consideration and action of impelling an impulse or particle from source-point across a distance to receipt-point, with the intention of bringing into being at the receipt-point a duplication and understanding of that which emanated from the source-point.

The simplest statement of the formula of communication is **Cause-Distance-Effect.**

When we do a close inspection of this formula and the cycle involved, its many elements come to view.

The Parts Of The Full Communication Cycle

The full cycle of communication is made up of these components:

Observation, Confront, Consideration, Intention, Attention, Cause, Source-point, Particle or Impulse or Message, Distance, Estimation of Distance, Control (Start-Change-Continue-Stop), Direction, Time and Timing, Velocity, Volume, Clarity, Interest, Impingement, Effect, Receipt-point, Duplication, Answer, Acknowledgement, Understanding. It also includes Nothingness or Somethingness.

Each TR drill is designed to train the student in one or more of these various components, until he has become expert in handling each part of the communication cycle and the communication cycle as a whole.

When a student understands and has fully demonstrated the basic theory of communication in clay, including the theory of the ARC Triangle and how it works in practice and the use of the communication cycle and all of its parts, he is well equipped to begin his training in TRs.

DRILLING TRs ON A PROFESSIONAL TRs COURSE

The student first studies the TR, clears any misunderstood words in it and makes sure he understands it. Then he **drills** it. He must **do** TRs.

If during the drilling he has questions about the TR, he restudies it and gets right back onto drilling it.

At no time may a coach or supervisor give a verbal interpretation of the HCOB. All queries and questions are handled by referring the student to the HCOB, getting him to restudy or re-word clear the drill. Then getting him to *do* the drill.

In addition to this Bulletin, the supervisor may have the student and his twin study, in HCOB 18 Apr 80 TR CRITICISM, the section on the specific TR drill they are trying to do.

On professional TRs, done the hard way, students drill each TR to a pass, one at a time.

This is the rough, tough way it was done earlier, in the '60s, with *results*. The earlier action of getting a student through each TR itself, one at a time, and increasing the gradient of toughness as he does *that* TR, is what has proven successful.

If a student has trouble and hangs up and can't pass an upper TR, he hasn't made it on the lower TRs. This has been proven conclusively. Start him back at the beginning of the TRs again. He re-drills each TR until he does it competently to a pass.

If he then hangs up on the lower TRs, you would put him all the way back to restudy ARC and the cycle of communication, as there will be something there he hasn't grasped.

TRs are coached and supervised with attention and with the intention of getting the student to win. By win we mean honestly mastering each TR as he goes.

There's got to be a supervisor **there** to ensure this occurs.

Lax, permissive coaching or lax, permissive supervision have no place on a Professional TRs Course. They are simply an extension of the permissiveness of modern education where nobody winds up educated. This is not how we train. Permissiveness is nothing more than a symptom of the inability to confront.

A professional TRs Course is **taught** and taught **hard**, not permissively.

The above points are those which make up the expertise of how it is done. There are not many of these points but they have to be emphasized.

TRAINING DRILLS 0-4

These TRs are done exactly per this HCOB without added actions or change.

NUMBER: **OT TR 0 1971 REVISED 1980**

NAME: Operating Thetan Being There

THEORY: OT TR 0 is the drill which provides an undercut to the actual use of the communication formula. For any communication to take place, it requires somebody there. On OT TR 0 the student is drilling simply being there as potential Cause or Source-point or potential Effect or Receipt-point.

COMMANDS: None.

POSITION: Two students sit facing each other with eyes closed, a comfortable distance apart – about three feet.

PURPOSE: To train the student simply to be there comfortably. The idea is to get the student able to **be** there comfortably in a position three feet in front of another person, to **be** there and not do anything else but **be** there.

TRAINING STRESS: Students sit facing each other with eyes closed. There is no conversation. This is a silent drill. There is **no** twitching, moving, confronting with a body part, "system" or vias used or anything else added to **be** there. One will usually see blackness or an area of the room when one's eyes are closed. **Be there, comfortably**. This does not mean the student is supposed to be completely unfeeling or unaware. And he does not get into a figure-figure or go into weird additives or considerations. There is **no** complexity to this drill. It means exactly what it says – simply **be there, comfortably**.

Students do not coach each other on OT TR 0. The Supervisor does the coaching, covering the whole classroom, spotting any twitches, squirming, etc., and flunking them. If a student goes to sleep or starts boiling off, the supervisor gets him back onto the drill. He simply keeps the students at it.

PATTER: None for students. Supervisor starts the drill with "Start" and uses "That's it" to terminate the drill. When he needs to flunk a student he uses "Flunk" and indicates what the flunk is on. When a student can BE there comfortably for some time, the drill is passed.

NOTE: OT TR 0 would only be coached on a student by his twin if the student had flunked a later TR and been put back onto OT TR 0. It is then up to his twin to get him through, coaching him as the supervisor would, with the supervisor also keeping an eye on it. This means the student coach (who would have his eyes open for this coaching) sits across from the student who is doing OT TR 0, observing him and flunking twitches, squirming, etc. During this coaching, the coach would use "Start" "Flunk" and "That's it" as given in the Patter section above.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in June 71 to give an additional gradient to confronting and eliminate students Confronting with their eyes, blinking, etc. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in August 1971 after research discoveries on TRs. Further revised by L. Ron Hub-

bard in 1980 to clarify coaching of OT TR 0 and emphasize the drill as a gradient to actual confronting.

NUMBER: **TR 0 CONFRONTING REVISED 1961 RE-REVISED 1980**

NAME: Confronting.

THEORY: On TR 0, in addition to potential Cause or Source-point or potential Effect or Receipt-point, the following parts of the comm cycle are entered in: Observation, Distance, Consideration, Attention, Confront.

COMMANDS: None.

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other with eyes open, a comfortable distance apart – about three feet.

PURPOSE: To train student to confront another person with auditing only or with nothing. The whole idea is to get the student able to be there comfortably in a position three feet in front of another person, to **be** there comfortably and **confront** and not do anything else but **be there and confront**

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, be embarrassed or anaten, or exhibit any reactive body motion which would be distractive to a preclear.

TR 0 requires some coaching. It can be done uncoached for an initial period to accustom students to confronting and to permit some time for student to get through the initial manifestations he may encounter when first doing the drills. Thereafter, the drill is coached on a student by his twin, and vice versa, on a turnabout basis.

It will be found the student tends to confront **with** a body part, rather than just confront, or tends to use a system of confronting rather than just **be** there. This can show up in any number of ways including fidgeting, giggling, twitching, or any distractive motion or manifestation. Flunks are given for those as they are indications of non-confront, and they would be taken up and coached on the drill.

Automatic body functions which are not distractive, such as normal breathing, swallowing, blinking, are not taken up by the coach or the supervisor.

To clarify what has been known in the past as "Blinkless TR 0", the statement should be made that this does **not** mean the person never blinks. It is defined here finally and in full to mean that when a person's TR 0 is in he doesn't exhibit manifestations of inability to confront, including blinking nervously or flinching or doing anything else that would be distractive to a pc and shows a non-confront.

PATTER: When TR 0 is coached, coach uses "Start" to begin the coaching period. He uses "Flunk" when the student shows any manifestation of non-confront, indicates what the non-confront is, and uses "Start" to begin the drill again. "That's it" is used to terminate the drill.

NOTE: The drill is mis-named if Confronting means to **do** something to the person. The whole action is to accustom an auditor to **being there** three feet in front of another person without apologizing or moving or being startled or embarrassed or defending self. Confronting with a body part can cause somatics in that body part being used to confront. The solution is just to **be** there and **confront**.

On a Professional TRs Course the student passes when he can just be there and do a straight, uninterrupted 2 hours of good, acceptable confront.

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 by L. Ron Hubbard in August 1971 after research discoveries on TRs. Further revised in 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard to clarify "Blinkless TR 0" and coaching, and to include theory on the communication cycle.

NUMBER: **TR 0 BULLBAIT REVISED 1961 RE-REVISED 1980**

NAME: Confronting Preclear Bullbaited.

THEORY: On TR 0 Bullbaited the student drills being there as potential Cause or Source-point and being there as Effect or Receipt-point, with Duplication. He is also drilling Observation, Distance, Consideration, Attention, Confront and particularly confronting a preclear who is being Cause or Source-point. The gradient of confront is increased on this drill, with emphasis on the fact that the student is *confronting a preclear* no matter what the preclear says or does.

COMMANDS: Coach: "Start" "That's it" "Flunk".

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other a comfortable distance apart – about three feet.

PURPOSE: To train student to confront a preclear with auditing or with nothing. The whole idea is to get the student able to **be** there comfortably and confront a preclear in a position three feet in front of the preclear without being thrown off, distracted or reacting in any way to what the preclear says or does. It is on TR 0 Bullbaited that the student learns to **confront a preclear.**

TRAINING STRESS: After the student has passed TR 0 and he can just BE there comfortably and confront, "bull baiting" can begin. Anything added to **being there and confronting the preclear** is sharply flunked by the coach. Twitches, sighs, fidgets, anything except just being there is promptly flunked, with the reason why.

PATTER: Student coughs. Coach: "Flunk! You coughed. Start." This is the whole of the coach's patter as a coach. Coach then repeats whatever he had said or done that caused the student to react. He continues to coach the student on that "button", flattening it to a win for the student before going on to another button or other bullbaiting.

Button: An item, word, phrase, subject, voice tone, mannerism, anything that causes a person to react, causes him discomfort, embarrassment, upset or to laugh uncontrollably, etc. It is called a "button" because when you push it you get a reaction.

PATTER AS A CONFRONTED SUBJECT: Bullbaiting is done on a gradient, giving the student lighter situations to begin with so student is not plunged into overwhelm at the start. Coach gets the student through the lighter situations and confronting those, then gradually stiffens the gradient, giving the student more and more to confront. The coach may say anything or do anything except leave the chair. The student's "buttons" should be found (these will be spotted by the coach during drilling) and each button flattened before it is left. A button is never left unflat. Any words that are not coaching words may receive no response from the student. If the student responds, the coach is instantly a coach (see patter above). Student passes when he can BE there comfortably and confront a preclear without being thrown off or distracted or reacting in any way to anything the coach 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 technical skill than earlier processes. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in August 1971 after research discoveries on TRs. Further revised by L. Ron Hubbard in 1980 to emphasize the purpose of TR 0 Bullbaited and to include data on "buttons" and the comm cycle.

NUMBER: TR-1 REVISED 1961 RE-REVISED 1980

NAME: Dear Alice

THEORY: On TR 1, the student is using Observation, Consideration and confront as previously drilled. He is also drilling being Cause or Source-point, awareness of Effect or Receipt-Point, and as Cause getting a Message (or Impulse or Particle) across a Distance to Receipt-point with Attention, Interest, Control, correct Direction, correct estimation of Distance, Time and correct Timing, correct Velocity, correct Volume, Clarity and Impingement, and with the Intention that it is received and duplicated at Receipt-point.

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, and to deliver a command with the intention that it is received.

COMMANDS: A phrase (with the "he said" omitted) is picked out of the book Alice *in Wonderland* and read to the coach. It is repeated until the coach is satisfied it arrived where he is. In other words it must be received by the coach.

POSITION: Student and coach are seated facing each other a comfortable distance apart.

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.

The coach must have received the command (or question) clearly and have understood it before he says "Good". The operative word here is *received*. The communication must be *received* at Receipt-point as when that has occurred duplication can take place.

Any datum that every command must sound exactly like the last command is false. Each question or command is delivered in a new unit of time. When that does *not* occur the same tonality will be noted, command after command, and the student appears robotic. A command delivered naturally is one that is delivered newly in a new unit of time.

Don't buy an unchanging student or a wrongly done TR.

If a student is unchanging (delivers 3 or 4 robotic TR-1s in a row) flunk him, coax him to do it correctly, make sure he knows and understands the drill and do all possible to get him delivering a command naturally that arrives. But if there is still no change, put him back on OT TR 0 as he hasn't made it on his lower TRs.

PATTER: The coach says "Start", says "Good" without a new start if the command is received. He says "Flunk" if the command is not received. "Start" is not used again. "That's it" is used to end the activity or to terminate for a brief discussion. Any discussion is kept to a minimum. If student has a question it is acknowledged, student studies the TR again for any necessary clarification and is put back on the drill. If session is terminated for a discussion, coach must say "Start" again before it resumes.

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. When the coach thinks the student has done it he asks the student if he has done it. If the coach is satisfied that he is receiving the commands, each newly in a new unit of time, and the student is satisfied that he has done it, he passes on to the next TR.

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. Further revised by L. Ron Hubbard in 1980 to emphasize the purpose of the drill and to include theory on the comm cycle.

NUMBER: **TR 2 REVISED 1978 RE-REVISED 1980**

NAME: Acknowledgments.

THEORY: On TR 2, the student is using all of those parts of the comm cycle previously drilled. He is also drilling switching from Cause (Source-point) to Effect (Receipt-point) in order to receive, Understand and Duplicate the preclear's Answer, and then back to Cause to give the Acknowledgement.

The real emphasis here is on the drilling of Control (the Start-Change-Stop of a communication), as he uses the Acknowledgement to bring the communication to a full stop. Timing, Velocity, Volume and Impingement also enter into this drill.

PURPOSE: To teach the student that an acknowledgement is a method of controlling preclear communication and that an acknowledgement is a full stop. The student must *understand* and *appropriately* acknowledge the comm and in such a way that it does not continue the comm.

COMMANDS: The coach reads lines from "Alice in Wonderland" omitting the "He said" and the student thoroughly acknowledges them. The student says "Good", "Fine", "Okay", "I heard that", *anything* only so long as it is appropriate to the pc's comm – in such a way as actually to convince the person who is sitting there as the preclear that he has heard it. The coach repeats any line he feels was not truly acknowledged.

POSITION: Student and coach are seated facing each other at a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: Teach student to acknowledge exactly what was said so preclear knows it was heard. Ask student from time to time what *was* said. Curb over and under acknowledgement. Let student do anything at first to get acknowledgement across, then even him out. Teach him that an acknowledgement is a stop, not beginning of a new cycle of communication or an encouragement to the preclear to go on and that an acknowledgement must be appropriate for the pc's comm. The student must be broken of the habit of robotically using "Good", "Thank you" as the only acks.

To teach further that one can fail to get an acknowledgement across or can fail to stop a pc with an acknowledgement or can take a pc's head off with an acknowledgement.

PATTER: The coach says "Start", reads a line and says "Flunk" every time the coach feels there has been an improper acknowledgement. The coach repeats the same line each time the coach says "Flunk". "That's it" may be used to terminate for discussion or terminate the session. "Start" must be used to begin a new coaching after a "That's it".

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956 to teach new students that an acknowledgement ends a communication cycle and a period of time, that a new command begins a new period of time. Revised 1961 and again in 1978 by L. Ron Hubbard. Further revised by L. Ron Hubbard in 1980 to include theory on the comm cycle.

NUMBER: TR 2½ REVISED 1978 RE-REVISED 1980

NAME: Half Acks.

THEORY: The same parts of the comm cycle are drilled on TR 2½ as on TR 2, with one exception; the emphasis here is on drilling Acknowledgement and Control in such a way as to bring about the "Continue" (or "change") part of the Control cycle.

PURPOSE: To teach the student that a half acknowledgement is a method of encouraging a pc to communicate.

COMMANDS: The coach reads lines from "Alice in Wonderland" omitting the "He said" and the student half acks the coach. The coach repeats any line he feels was not half acked.

POSITION: The student and coach are seated facing each other at a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: Teach student that a half acknowledgement is an encouragement to the pc to *continue* talking. Curb over-acknowledgement that stops a pc from talking. Teach him further that a half ack is a way of keeping a pc talking by giving the pc the feeling that he is being heard.

PATTER: The coach says "Start", reads a line and says "Flunk" every time the coach feels there has been an improper half ack. The coach repeats the same line each time the coach says "Flunk". "That's it" may be used to terminate for discussion or terminate the session. If the session is terminated for discussion, the coach must say "Start" again before it resumes.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in July 1978 to train auditors in how to get a pc to continue talking as in R3RA. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in 1980 to include theory on the comm cycle.

NUMBER: **TR 3 REVISED 1961 RE-REVISED 1980**

NAME: Duplicative Question.

THEORY: On TR 3 the student is drilling using all the parts of the comm cycle, with emphasis on getting a communication duplicated and completed.

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.

TRAINING STRESS: One question and student acknowledgement 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.

Duplicating the auditing question without variation in a new unit of time does **not** mean a robotic duplication of tone of voice, command after command. It means that the original question asked is asked in a new unit of time without variation of the question. Any idea that the student must give every command sounding exactly like the last command is a false datum and only serves to mis-train the student into robotic delivery.

The student must learn to give a command and receive an answer and to acknowledge it in one unit of time. The student is flunked if he or she fails to get an answer to the question asked, if he or she fails to repeat the exact questions, if he or she "Q and As" with excursions taken by the coach.

Q and A means: *Asking a question that is based on the last answer.* It never completes any cycle. (REF: HCOB 5 APR 1980, Q & A, THE REAL DEFINITION.) The student is also flunked for robotic delivery of the question or command.

PATTER: The coach uses "Start" and "Flunk". "That's it" is used to terminate the session. "Start" must be used to begin a coaching session again after a "That's it".

The coach is not bound after starting to answer the student's question but may comm lag or give a commenting type answer to throw the student off. Often the coach should answer. Somewhat less often the coach attempts to pull the student in to a Q and A or upset the student. Example:

Student: "Do fish swim?"

Coach: "Yes"

Student: "Good"

Student: "Do fish swim?"

Coach: "Aren't you hungry?"

Student: "Yes."

Coach: "Flunk"

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, acknowledgement and as needed, the repeat statement is flunked. Unnecessary use of the repeat statement is flunked. A poor command is flunked. A poor acknowledgement is flunked. A Q and A is flunked (as in example). Student misemotion or confusion is flunked. Student failure to utter the next command (or with a long comm lag) is flunked. A choppy or premature acknowledgement is flunked. Lack of an acknowledgement (or with a distinct comm lag) is flunked. Any words from the coach except an answer to the question, "Start", "Flunk", "Good" or "That's it" should have no influence on the student except to get him to give a repeat statement and the command again. By repeat statement is meant, "I'll repeat the auditing command."

"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 a flunk. 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 acknowledgement. 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 a flunk and the coach must say so.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956, to overcome variations and sudden changes in sessions. Revised 1961 by L. Ron Hubbard. The old TR has 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. Further revised by L. Ron Hubbard in 1980 to include the definition of Q and A, flunks for robotic delivery of question, and to include theory on the comm cycle.

NUMBER: **TR 4 REVISED 1961 RE-REVISED 1980**

NAME: Preclear Originations.

THEORY: On TR 4 the student drills handling another's origination of a communication cycle as well as handling his own cycle of communication, and ensuring that both of these cycles are completed. All the parts of the cycle of communication come into play in this drill.

PURPOSE: To teach the 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 (see Attachment of this HCOB, taken from the Preclear Origination Sheet at the back of The Book of E-Meter Drills). 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 origination 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 student into better handling.

PATTER: All originations concern the coach, his ideas, reactions or difficulties, none concern the auditor. Otherwise the coach's patter is the same as in TR 3 ("Start", "Flunk", "That's it" and "Start" to resume the coaching session after a "That's it").

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 a flunk.

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.) Flunks are given if the student does more than

      1. Understand;

      2. Acknowledge;

      3. Return pc to session.

Flunks are also given for too abrupt a shift of attention or too slow a shift of attention back to the session, or for failure to return the pc to session at all.

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 coach's remarks about self as "pc" is a flunk.

Student's failure to persist is always a flunk 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.

The coach uses the Comments & Originations Sheet, attached to this issue, choosing items at random to drill the student in handling.

When the student has mastered

>   1. Understanding;

>   2. Acknowledging;

>   3. Returning pc to session,

the gradient is upped and the student is flunked for any part of the comm cycle being out. This would include non-confront, failure to get a communication across, using a half acknowledgement improperly (and thus inviting the pc to continue endlessly when the pc isn't even answering the question asked) when a full stop acknowledgement is required, failure to encourage the pc to continue when it is necessary, failure to get the question answered or to deliver each command in a new unit of time, as well as any flub in handling preclear originations.

The drill is passed when the student can handle cycles of communication smoothly and naturally.

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, Further revised by L. Ron Hubbard in 1980 to include theory on the comm cycle.

As TR 5 is also part of the CCHs it can be disregarded in the comm course TRs despite its appearance on earlier lists for students and staff auditors.

ROBOTIC TRS

Stiff, unnatural TRs are robotic TRs. Students and auditors who haven't mastered the TRs will handle communication robotically.

Anatomy Of A Robot

It can be said of robots that:

1.   They don't know what a comm cycle is.

2.   They have never really passed OT TR 0.

3.   They have never really passed TR 0.

4.   They have never really passed TR 0 Bullbait.

5.   They don't do TR 1 in a new unit of time each time they give it, so they all sound alike and they probably have TR 3 mixed up with TR 1, or they are stuck in an unflat 0 Series (OT TR 0, TR 0, TR 0 BB).

6.   They don't realize their TRs are addressed to the person in front of them but are probably addressed to the instructors for a pass.

And so, with a combination of the above, these students and auditors will look like robots. They would never get the product of a pc interested in his own case and willing to talk to the auditor. And it's possible that they don't know that that is their product. The point is, however, that it would be almost impossible for any student or auditor to go on looking like a robot if he actually did the TRs. The remedy for robotic TRs is to put the student back onto restudy of the basics, the ARC Triangle and the cycle of communication, and then to re-drill the TRs from OT TR 0 on up, each one this time to a real pass. With these standard actions done he will reach the EP and wind up a Valuable Final Product.

VALUABLE FINAL PRODUCT AND
END PHENOMENON OF TRs
ON A PROFESSIONAL TRs COURSE

The **Primary Valuable Final Product** of TRs is:

A Professional auditor who with comm handling alone can keep a pc interested in his own case and willing to talk to the auditor.

The **Secondary Valuable Final Product** of TRs is:

A person with the session and social presence of a professional auditor and that presence can be summed up as a being who can handle anyone with communication alone and whose communication can stand up faultlessly to any session or social situation no matter how rough.

The **End Phenomenon** of TRs is:

A being who knows he can achieve both of the above flawlessly and from here on out.

With honest drilling of the cycle of communication on TRs these skills are fully achievable. And any being mastering these skills is capable in the extreme.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

LRH:dr

COMMENTS AND ORIGINATIONS FOR USE ON TR 4

Taken from the Book of E-Meter Drills Preclear Origination Sheet

COMMENT: A statement or remark aimed at the student or the room.

ORIGINATION: A statement or remark referring to the state of the coach or his fancied case.

- I have a pain in my stomach.
- The room seems bigger.
- My body feels heavy.
- I had a twitch in my leg.
- I feel like I'm sinking.
- The colors in the room are brighter.
- My head feels lopsided.
- I feel wonderful.
- I have an awful feeling of fear.
- You are the first auditor who ever paid attention to my case.
- I think I've backed up from my body.
- I just realized I've had a headache for years.
- This is silly.
- I feel all confused.
- That was a very good session yesterday.
- I've got a sharp pain in my back.
- When are we going to do some processing?
- I feel lighter somehow.
- I can't tell you.
- I feel terrible - like I'd lost something, or something.
- WOW - I didn't know that before.
- The room seems to be getting dark.

- Say, this really works.

- I feel awfully tense.

- You surely are a good auditor.

- That wall seems to move toward me.

- If you give me that command again, I'll bust you in the mouth.

- I feel like something just hit me in the chest.

- You surely have a nice office here.

- I feel warm all over.

- By the way, I won that tennis tournament yesterday.

- My head feels like it has a tight band around it.

- When are you going to get a haircut?

- I seem to see the wall behind my body.

- This processing is worth the fee.

- I feel like I was all hemmed in somehow.

- Who is going to win the Cup Final?

- It seems like I'm as tall as this building.

- This chair is so comfortable I could go to sleep.

- I feel like I could just suddenly break something.

- I keep thinking about that copper who blew his whistle at me this morning.

- I can see facsimiles better.

- Things suddenly look a lot brighter.

- Aren't we finished with this yet?

- I feel like I'm floating.

- It looks like the wall is caving in on me.

- That wall looks real thin.

- WOW!!! W-O-W!!!!!!!

- How long do we have to do this processing?

- OUCH, OH OUCH.

- My face tingles.

- I'm getting sleepy.

- This is the first time I have ever really been in session.

- I'm starving.

- Let's go to lunch.

- I remember a time when I fell down and hurt my zorch.

- Can I have a cigarette?

- What does this have to do with religion?

- Suddenly I'm so tired.

- Everything is getting blurry.

- What time do we get through?

- I thought we were going to use Dianetics.

- Is this room rocking?

- How much longer do we have to run this process?

- You are by far the worst auditor I've ever had.

- Your eyes stink.

- I just realized how wrong I've been all my life.

- Do these processes work differently on men than on women?

- I feel like there's a spider's web on my face.

- My left knee hurts.

- I feel so light!

- Isn't it getting hotter in here?

- I just remembered the first time I went swimming.

- My back has been aching like this for years.

- How much do you weigh?

- Are you clear?

- Can you make your body rise up in the air?

- I kind of ache all over. That's a somatic, isn't it?

- How many engrams have you had run out?

- What is this "Assist" I keep hearing about?

- What does Scientology say about ghosts?

- Have you ever seen an Operating Thetan?

- How are you going to prove to me that I have a soul?

- I feel like killing myself.

- How long will it take me to get clear?

- I just realized how terrible my mother actually was.

- Are you married?

- Hold my hand.

- I feel so lonesome.

- How many hours have you been processed?

- I feel like I can't talk.

- My body is starting to shake all over.

- My ribs hurt.

- I feel just like the time I got run over by that car.

- Everything seems to be getting dark.

- Could we stop and talk for a little while?

- Don't you get tired of listening to someone like me?

- Can you make my hair curly?

- How long will it take me to lose 20 pounds?

- Kiss me.

- You are my re-incarnated husband of 20,000 years ago.

- Why are you talking so much?

- That last process isn't flat.

- I'm sick. You're dead.

- I'm dead too.

- We are all dead.

- I love death.

- Kill me.

- Beat me.

- No, — No, no, no, NO!!!!!!

- Moo Gum Guy Pan.

- Sum Gum War Sue Up.

- Fizzle Wizzle Bum Crum.

- I am going to vomit on you if you don't stop.

- I absolutely love the way you handle originations

- You are sweet.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:dr

TR Courses

Q & A, THE REAL DEFINITION

There are several definitions for the term "Q & A".

In Scientologese it is often used to mean "undecisive", not making up one's mind.

Q stands for "Question". A stands for "Answer". In "perfect duplication" the answer to a Question would be the Question.

The real definition as it applies to TRs is "The Question proceeding from the last Answer."

Example:

Question: How are you?

Answer: I'm fine.

Question: How fine?

Answer: My stomach hurts.

Question: When did your stomach begin hurting?

Answer: About four.

Question: Where were you at four?

etc. etc.

The above example is a grievous auditing fault. As each question is based on the last answer, it is called "Q and A". It could also be called "Q based on last A".

It never completes any cycle. It tangles pcs up. It violates TR 3. Don't do it.

I trust the above handles any confusion on this subject.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:dr

Reissued from

21st Advanced Clinical Course Training Drills

ANTI-Q AND A TR

Name: Anti-Q and A TR.

Commands: Basically, "Put that (object) on my knee." (A book, piece of paper, ashtray, etc can be used for object.)

Position: Student and Coach sitting facing each other at a comfortable distance and one at which the Coach can reach the Student's knee with ease.

Purpose:

(a) To train Student in getting a Pc to carry out a command using formal communication **not** Tone 40.

(b) To enable the Student to maintain his TRs while giving commands.

(c) To train the Student to not get upset with a Pc under formal auditing.

Mechanics: Coach selects small object (book, ashtray, etc) and holds it in his hand.

Training Stress: Student is to get the Coach to place the object that he has in his hand on the knee of the Student. The Student may vary his commands as long as he maintains the Basic Intention (not Tone 40) to get the Coach to place the object on the Student's knee. The Student is not allowed to use any physical enforcement, only verbal commands. The Coach should try and get the Student to Q and A. He may say anything he wishes to try and get him off the track of getting the command executed. The Student may say what he wishes in order to get the command done, as long as it *directly* applies in getting the Coach to place the object on the Student's knee.

The Coach flunks for:

(a) Any communication not directly concerned with getting the command executed.

(b) Previous TR.

(c) Any upsetness demonstrated by Student.

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

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

</div>

LRH:nt.rd

Remimeo
All Students

MUTTER TR

Name: Mutter TR.

Purpose: To perfect muzzled auditing comm cycle.

Commands: "Do fish swim?" "Do birds fly?"

Position: Student and coach sit facing each other a comfortable distance apart.

Training Stress:

1. Coach has student give command.

2. Coach mutters an unintelligible answer at different times.

3. Student acknowledges.

4. Coach flunks if student does *anything* else but acknowledge.

   (Note. This is the *entirety* of this Drill. It is not to be confused with any other Training Drill.)

   Note. The whole trick in TR 2 and TR 4 is that it means one understands that the pc has said something or has answered. There is no demand the auditor understand the *meaning* in the pc's answer in muzzled auditing. In the above drill the coach just mutters or nods and looks wise instead of saying anything comprehensible. The only kind of auditing where you *must* grab the actual sense of the answer is in listing or in looking for something that will blowdown or trying to find out what the pc thinks is wrong. If the pc *has* said something he wants the auditor to really grasp, let him explain and of course, if the pc insists, grasp it. But this is rare and happens only when the pc is already ARC Broken. Otherwise the above is the right way to do it.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:rs.rd

Remimeo
HCOs
Tech Staff
Qual Staff
Confessional Courses
All Auditors, C/Ses,
Supervisors

(Cancels HCOB 5 Dec AD12 "2-12, 3GAXX, 3-21
and Routine 2-10 Modern Assessment.")
(Cancels HCOB 13 Aug AD12)
(Cancels HCOB 1 Aug AD12)

URGENT – URGENT – URGENT

DEFINITION OF A ROCK SLAM

The following is the only valid definition of an R/S:

Rock Slam: The crazy, irregular, left-right slashing motion of the needle on the E-Meter dial. R/Ses repeat left and right slashes unevenly and savagely, faster than the eye easily follows. The needle is frantic. The width of an R/S depends largely on sensitivity setting. It goes from one-fourth inch to whole dial. But it slams back and forth.

A rock slam (R/S) means a hidden evil intention on the subject or question under auditing or discussion.

Valid R/Ses are not always instant reads. An R/S can read prior or latently.

HCOB 5 DECEMBER AD12, "2-12, 3GAXX, 3-21 AND ROUTINE 2-10 MODERN ASSESSMENT" is an HCOB composited by others incorrectly and is **cancelled** as it misdefines an R/S as a single slash left or right. It contains the statements: "One or two slashes make an R/S… If it slashed up or down once call it an R/S." The data is utterly false. By this wrong definition a rocket read could be mistaken for an R/S, or any sudden rise could be mistaken for an R/S. **One slash doesn't begin to be an R/S. Nor two or three for that matter. The correct definition of an r/s includes that it slashes savagely left and right.**

DEFINITION OF A DIRTY NEEDLE

The following is the only valid definition of a dirty needle:

Dirty Needle: An erratic agitation of the needle which is ragged, jerky, ticking, not sweeping, and tends to be persistent. It is not limited in size.

A Dirty Needle is caused by one of three things:

1. **The auditor's TRs are bad.**

2. **The auditor is breaking the auditor's code.**

3. **The pc has withholds he does not wish known.**

The definitions of a dirty needle as "a small Rock Slam" and "a smaller edition of the rock slam" in HCOB 13 AUGUST AD12, "ROCK SLAMS AND DIRTY NEEDLES," are **cancelled**. The definition of a dirty needle as "a minute rock slam" in HCOB 1 AUGUST AD12, "ROUTINE 3GA, GOALS, NULLING BY MID RUDS," is **cancelled**.

All definitions which limit the size of a dirty needle to "one quarter of an inch" or "less than one quarter of an inch" are **cancelled**.

A dirty needle is **not to be confused** with an R/S. They are distinctly different reads. You never mistake an R/S if you have ever seen one. A dirty needle is far less frantic.

The difference between a Rock Slam and a dirty needle is in the character of the read. Not the size.

Persistent use of "fish and fumble" can sometimes turn a dirty needle into a rock slam. However until it does it is simply a dirty needle.

Auditors, C/Ses, supervisors must must must know the difference between these two types of reads cold.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nc

Remimeo
All Sec Checkers
All HCO Personnel
All Meter Operators

R/Ses, WHAT THEY MEAN

(Integrity Processing Checksheets)

(PTS Processing Checksheets)

(Expanded Dianetics Checksheets)

(Meter Operation Checksheets)

(Various Rundown Checksheets)

The violent left right ragged motion of the needle which sometimes occurs on a pc's meter is called "A Rockslam" or "R/S." The term was taken from a process in the 50s which sought to locate "A rock" on the pc's early timetrack; the "slam" is a description of the needle violence, meaning it "slams" back and forth. For a time all left right motions of the needle were considered and called "Rockslams" until it was found that a *smooth* left right flow was a symptom of release or key out and this became the "Floating Needle." There is yet another left right motion of the needle called the "Theta Bop." This occurs when the person has or is trying to exteriorize. "Theta" is the symbol for the person as a spirit or goodness; "bop" is an electronic term for a slight hitch in the sweep of a needle. A "Theta Bop" hitches evenly at each end of the sweep left and right and is very even in the middle of the sweep.

Neither the "Floating Needle" nor the "Theta Bop" can be confused with a "Rock-slam." The difference of the Rockslam is uneven, ragged agitation left and right; even the distances traveled left and right are likely to be different in each swing from the last.

A "Rockslam" can be caused sometimes by leaving rings on the pc's fingers or by a short circuit in the meter or by the cans (electrodes) touching something like a dress. These are the mechanical considerations and must be ruled out before the pc can be considered to have "Rockslammed." If the pc is not wearing rings and if the meter needle is calm with the lead unplugged, if the lead is okay, and if the pc is not jiggling the ends of the cans against his clothes, then the pc's Rockslam is caused by the pc's bank.

One has to be very careful about the correctness of the pc actually having Rock-slammed while on the meter that it was actually observed, that it was not mechanically caused as above. One puts the R/S down on the worksheet and also gives exactly what was asked. And also that the mechanical points were checked without distracting the pc.

One must always report a Rockslam in the auditing report, note it with session date and page inside the left cover of the pc's folder and report it to ethics including the question or subject which rockslammed, phrased exactly.

Why? Because the Rockslam is the most important needle manifestation! It gives the clue to the pc's case.

In 1970 I began a full-scale research project into the subject of insanity and its relationship to cases and case gains and suppression. It was only then that the full significance of the Rockslam was unearthed. This research developed into what is now called **Expanded Dianetics**, a series of special processes and actions with their drills and training which permits the auditor to handle a specific case type. This was, by the way, Man's first system of positive detection and handling of psychosis and the first full understanding of what psychosis is.

While this bulletin is not in any way a two minute course in or a substitute for full training in Expanded Dianetics, any auditor who audits, sec checks, or handles people on a meter has to know what a Rockslam is and how it behaves and what he should do about it.

The first thing is to be able to recognize one and to quickly with the scan of the eye and unplug of the meter cord (without any distraction of or notice by the pc) make the checks for a mechanical Rockslam as given above.

You can make a meter "Rockslam" with no pc or cord connected to it by (a) turning it on; (b) put the sensitivity at perhaps 2; (c) put the needle at "set"; (d) rapidly, very rapidly, move the TA back and forth maybe a quarter of an inch and do it unevenly. *That,* if you did it very fast and unevenly, would be something that resembled a Rockslam. But no matter how fast you made your fingers move, a real R/S is a trifle faster. If you do that you will see what an R/S looks like. The needle in this experiment is not made to hit the sides of the meter.

Now if you take the same setup and smoothly slowly move the tone arm back and forth about 2 times a second without any roughness and the same distance right and left, you will have a Floating Needle. Note it very well as this comes at a time of release and is the thing a good auditor hopes to see and gives him the end-off signal for a process. It has to be well known as you **never** bypass one in a session and to do so makes an uncomfortable pc. (The pc will often cognite – and get a realization about himself or life at this point and one does not stop him from doing this.) This is the thing you indicate to the pc. You don't ever indicate Rockslams or Theta Bops. When you see it and, without stopping or interrupting the pc's cognition, you always say, "Your needle is floating."

Now the Theta Bop can also be shown to yourself by you. Set up the meter as above. Only this time, you smoothly swing it to the right and give it a tiny twitch in the same direction. Then you smoothly, at once, swing it to the left and give it a tiny twitch in the same direction. Then do it to the right. And so on. This is a Theta Bop. It is different than a Floating Needle only in that it hitches at each end of the swing. So learn to recognize it.

There is a vicious smooth right direction slash that occurs when a pc hits a certain area of the bank that is called a "Rocket Read" and there is of course the small fall, long fall (which both go to the right and indicate a charged question or reaction) and there is the grad-

ual rise to the left. But these do not repeat back and forth which is the characteristic of the Rockslam, Floating Needle and Theta Bop.

All right, so we know exactly what it looks like when we talk about a **Rockslam** as a read of the meter. We know how it can be mechanically caused. And we know what we have to record and report when it is seen.

But exactly *what* does a Rockslam mean with regards to the pc?

If you don't know this you can miss on the pc, on the case, on the org and humanity.

A Rockslam means a hidden evil intention on the subject or question under discussion or auditing.

Two things underlie insanity, or to be more specific, there are two causes and conditions both of which have been lumped together by man and called insanity. He could not of course define it as he didn't know what caused it.

The first of these two things does not concern us overly much here and is the subject of a separate checksheet training and is called PTS or Potential Trouble Source handling. A "PTS" is a person who has been or is connected with somebody who has evil intentions. A PTS can feel uncomfortable in life or be neurotic or go insane because of the actions upon him of a person with evil intentions. Most of the people in institutions are probable PTSes.

The second of these two things is insanity caused to the individual himself (let alone others) by hidden evil intentions.

The extent of these intentions and what the person will do (and hide) in order to carry them out is quite shocking. These people are covert or overt criminals and many of them are insane – meaning beyond all rationality in their acts. Because their evil intentions are hidden and because they are often very plausible such individuals are what make "behavior so mysterious" and "man looks so evil when you see what mankind does" and all sorts of fallacies.

It is this last type, the chronic, heavy Rockslammer, which Expanded Dianetics handles.

One Rockslam doesn't make a psychotic. Or a total menace to everyone. But it does mean there could be more and it might in rare cases mean you have, seeing enough of these R/Ses, a very dangerous person on your hands and in your vicinity. And that person must be handled by Expanded Dianetics.

You won't see a great many Rockslams in auditing people so you could be totally thrown off by surprise when you see one. And mess it all up because you are surprised. So know what it is and don't get all quivery and make mistakes and blow your confront. Just carry on.

If you don't note the **exact** question that was asked and the **exactly** worded statement the pc made when the R/S was seen, you can muck it up for the Expanded Dianetics guys. They won't be able to get it turned back on again easily and will lose a lot of time. So you have to be sure your auditing report is accurate, that the R/S is written BIG on the column and circled and, no matter what else you do in the session, you have to get it recorded in the left front cover of the folder giving the date and page of the session and you have to report it to

Ethics. And also you don't third party the pc and give him a bad time in the session because of it.

Now R/Ses most easily turn on during Sec Checks or Integrity Processing or when pulling withholds or trying to investigate something. So the people who see these most often are those engaged in that activity and not routine auditing (when they can also but more rarely turn on). Further the most likely person to collide with "needing to be sec checked" is an R/Ser, which again increases the numbers of R/Ses seen in these activities compared to routine auditing. But a very heavy R/Ser will also turn them on in routine auditing.

It is the exact *point* of the R/S in the session, the exact question that was asked and the exact subject or phrase where the R/S turned on that are important. And these are very important as then the person can be fully handled with a full Expanded Dianetics rundown by a qualified Expanded Dianetics Specialist. When, of course, the person gets to that point on his grade chart. (The grade chart points are after Dianetics (like Drug RDs etc.) but before Grades, after Grades but before Power, after Power but before Solo, and after OT III or after any single grade above OT III. These are the only points where Expanded Dianetics can be delivered and the R/S fully and completely handled.)

Now here is how you can turn off an R/S and mistakenly think it is handled:

1.   The overt-motivator sequence has two sides. One is what the person has done (overt) and what is done to the person (motivator). You can ask, when the person R/Ses on something, if anyone has ever **invalidated** him on that subject or action. He will find some and the R/S will turn off **and won't even be faintly handled but only submerged**. One can believe he had "handled" the R/S. Not true. He has just turned it off and maybe made it harder to find next time. One can ask what the person has done TO the subject mentioned and while this may unburden the case and make the person a bit better, the R/S is **not** handled, only turned off or submerged. It's almost as if there are so many overts and motivators on this subject or in this area that the push-pull of it makes the needle go wild (R/S). And indeed, this may be the energy cause, in the bank, of the needle reaction.

But neither overt nor motivator handles an R/S finally because the **cause** of the R/S is an **intention** to harm and it isn't all that likely the basic intention will be reached.

2.   Another apparent way the R/S can get "handled" and isn't is to take the R/Ser earlier-similar on the subject of the R/S. The R/S will probably cease, go "clean." But in actual fact it is still there, hidden.

3.   The third way an R/S can be falsely "handled" is to direct the person's attention to something else. If, when this is done, the exact subject of the R/S is not noted by the auditor, it will be difficult to find it again when the person goes into Expanded Dianetic auditing.

4.   Yet another, and probably the last way to falsely "handle" an R/S is to abuse the person about his conduct or behavior or the R/S, or to "educate" him to do better, or to "modify" his behavior with shocks or surgery or other tortures like the psychiatrists do. In other words one can seek to suppress the R/S in numerous ways. Maybe the R/S

won't occur (being too overburdened now) but it is still there, buried very deep and possibly beyond reach now.

So if you understand the above four points you will see that although you can ease off the R/S, you have not handled it. It has merely gone out of sight.

All right, what then **does handle** an R/S?

I warned you that this isn't a two minute course on Expanded Dianetics and it isn't. An R/S is **handled** by a fully qualified Expanded Dianetics auditor delivering full Expanded Dianetics to the person at that point on the grade chart where Expanded Dianetics is supposed to be delivered. If anyone thinks it can be done effectively any other way or if he C/Ses it to be done and the auditor is stupid enough to try to do that C/S, then it's Committees of Evidence and Suspended Certificates all around.

With that warning, and only with that warning, I can briefly state what has to be done with the case. This is not what **you** do if you are not delivering full Expanded Dianetics at the right point on the grade chart. It is a brief statement so that you can understand what lies under that R/S.

The pc with an R/S on any given subject and who R/Ses while discussing that or related subjects **has an evil intention toward the subject discussed or some closely related subject**. The pc intends that subject or area of life nothing but calculating, covert, underhanded HARM which will be at all times carefully hidden from that subject.

Thus, the Expanded Dianetics Specialist, in handling that case (at the proper point on the grade chart) has to be able to locate each and every subject and question and R/S in that person's folder as noted by Sec Checkers and previous auditors or cramming officers or why finders. He has to have the complete list of R/S subjects. If they are noted as to session date and page and if all sec checking papers and cramming papers are in that person's folder, then the Expanded Dianetics Specialist can do a full and complete job. Otherwise he has to do a lot of other time wasting actions to get the R/Ses found and turned on again.

What the Expanded Dianetics Specialist actually does is locate **exactly** the actual evil intention for every R/S on the case and handle each one to total conclusion. When he is finished, if he has done his job well, the person's behavior will be magically improved and as to his social presence, menace and conduct, well that will be toward survival.

When you see an R/S, if you are not an Expanded Dianetic Specialist doing Expanded Dianetics at the correct point on the grade chart, you don't say, "Hey, you've got an evil intention!" and you don't ask "Say, what's that evil intention?" or do corny things like that because you'll get the pc self listing, you may get a wrong item, you won't know what to do with it and you're just likely to get the auditing room wrapped around your neck right there.

No, you quietly note it, make sure it isn't a mechanical fault, write it big on the worksheet, write down everything the pc is saying swiftly, note what question you were asking and let the pc talk and ack him and go on with what you are doing with the pc at the time. And after session you note it in the left-hand cover of the folder and send a report to Ethics.

And some day, when he's done his Drug Rundown or gotten to one of the points on the grade chart where a full XDn can be done, why then it will be handled. And a good C/S will program or tip the case for that to be done.

So that's the know-how you have to know about R/Ses to really help the guy and the society and your group.

We're not in the business of curing psychos. The governments at this writing pay the psychiatrists billions a year to torture and kill because of R/Ses they don't know anything about. The crime in the society out there is caused by people who R/S. Stalin, Hitler, Napoleon and Caesar were probably the most loaded R/Sers of all time unless it was Jack the Ripper or your local friendly psychiatrist.

So know what you are seeing when you see it and know what to do about it. And don't kid yourself. Or vilify or mow down people who R/S; we're not in that business.

And the Expanded Dianetic Specialist *and* the pc someday will love you dearly for knowing your job and doing it right.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt

Remimeo
XDn Spclsts
Cl IVs & Above
C/Ss
HCO Dept 3 Hats
PTS/SP Detection Crs

ROCK SLAMS AND ROCK SLAMMERS

Reference: HCOB 3 September 1978 DEFINITION OF A ROCK SLAM

A lot of controversy has shown up this year on the subject of R/Ses and R/Sers. Therefore, the following bulletin was compiled from my materials to clarify the matter. My research on this was actually done years ago and remains very valid indeed.

R/Ses

An R/S or rock slam is defined as the crazy, irregular left-right slashing motion of the needle on the E-Meter dial. R/Ses repeat left and right slashes unevenly and savagely, faster than the eye easily follows. The needle is frantic. The width of an R/S depends largely on sensitivity setting. It goes from one-fourth inch to whole dial. But it slams back and forth. It is actually quite startling to see one. **It is very different from other meter phenomena.**

Recently auditors arriving on Flag were found not to know what an R/S was but were calling dirty needles, dirty reads, rocket reads, body motion and even ticks as R/Ses. That comes from never having been trained on what an R/S is and never having seen one. **R/Ses are unique in appearance.** On the other hand, far more serious is the fact that auditors have many times seen R/Ses, didn't mark them down and didn't report them! This is a High Crime as it injures society, the org and the person himself (see HCOB 10 Aug *76R* "R/SES, WHAT THEY MEAN").

Actually this is quite a serious matter because pcs get labelled as R/Sers and get run on evil purposes connected with this "R/S" that isn't one. You can really foul up a pc that way.

A meter also sometimes "goes crazy" on an R/Ser. You see it work, then it doesn't read, etc. While this is rare it does happen. Auditors have changed their meters just to find the new one was also crazy. But the R/S will show up through all this. An inoperational meter does not mean you have an R/Ser – you might have just forgotten to charge it or have faulty leads.

ROCK SLAMMERS

In a normal group of 400, the actual percentage of R/Sers is low. It's about 8 in 400, or 2-2½%. Those figures should seem familiar. They are the same percentage for SPs. And that gives you a clue to the identification of an R/Ser.

Where requirements for Scn or SO orgs have been established for R/Ses they apply to the 2-2½% of real R/Sers as these are high risks for staff purposes.

These people can of course be salvaged as pcs using Expanded Dianetics. Letting them on staff could be disastrous, however.

A handled R/Ser can be expected to eventually wind up in the same category as a cleared cannibal. His experiential track is too educated in evil and too uneducated in anything else. So even when cleaned up will need a lot of living.

R/Sers are also very expensive people to keep around. They waste the available resources and produce overt products. They cost a fortune in waste, repairs, lost business. They also cost a heartbreaking number of damaged people.

CHECKLIST

To assist you in the identification of R/Sers a checklist of characteristics and their reference has been done.

This checklist is to be used whenever a C/S is called upon to inspect a folder to determine whether a person is an R/Ser. That he R/Ses is the main thing. The other points simply help investigate whether he R/Ses. He doesn't have to have all these characteristics to be an R/Ser.

1. The R/Ses reported are actual R/Ses and not some other read or broken meter leads, a dusty or worn TA or trim "pot," or cans in contact with metal such as rings, bracelets, etc. _____

   Ref: *E-METER ESSENTIALS; BOOK OF E-METER DRILLS; THE BOOK INTRODUCING THE E-METER;*
   HCOB 8 Nov 62 "SOMATICS, HOW TO TELL TERMINALS AND OPPOSITION TERMINALS" pg 2 and 4;
   HCOB 6 Dec 62 "R2-10, R2-12, 3GAXX";
   BTB 14 Jan 63 "RINGS CAUSING ROCK SLAMS";
   HCOB "FALSE TA SERIES" 24 Oct 71R, 12 Nov 71RA, 15 Feb 72R, 18 Feb 72R, *21 Jan* 77R, 23 Nov 73RA.

2. R/Ses have to do with evil thoughts, overts or intentions. _____

3. Pc is slow or no case gain. _____

3A. Pc is in a chronically nattery or critical state. _____

   Ref: HCOB 23 Nov 62 "ROUTINE TWO-TWELVE";…
   HCOB 6 Dec 62 "R2-10, R2-12, 3GAXX";
   HCOB 28 Nov 70 C/S Series 22 "PSYCHOSIS";

BPL 31 May 71RG "PTS/SP DETECTION, ROUTING & HANDLING CHECKSHEET"
AND MATERIALS.   _____

4. Pc chronically ill or who acts most "PTS." This can be suppressed
    and hidden from view, however.   _____

    Ref: HCO PL 15 Nov 70R "HCO AND CONFESSIONALS";
    HCOB 28 Nov 70 C/S Series 22 "PSYCHOSIS";
    PTS/SP Pack.

4A. He covers up his crimes with lots of PR.   _____

5. Pc's product is consistently an overt act and his activities destruc-
    tive to others whether they have spotted this or not.   _____

    Ref: HCO PL 14 Nov 70 Org Series 14 "THE PRODUCT AS AN OVERT ACT";
    PTS/SP Pack;
    HCO MANUAL OF JUSTICE.

6. Pc's behavior or condition or OCA classifies as psychotic.   _____

    Ref: HCOB Ex Dn Series and tapes;
    HCOB 28 Nov 70.

7. The people near him get in trouble.   _____

Where some of the answers to this checklist are yes you can be certain an R/S will be found in auditing. HCO handles and Qual programs them for rehabilitation.

LIST ONE R/Ser

There are, for our purposes, two kinds of R/Sers. (a) Those who R/S on subjects not connected with Scn and (b) Those who R/S on subjects connected to Scientology. The latter is a "List One R/Ser" and it is of great importance to us that they be located and moved off lines when they are part of staffs as their intent is solely to destroy us whatever else they say: their long run actions will prove it.

The definition of a List One R/Ser is anyone who has R/Sed on List One. If that is confirmed fully, that's it. Not all points on the checklist have to be present. The full list of Scientology List One items can be found in HCOB 24 Nov AD 12 "ROUTINE 2-12 LIST ONE – ISSUE ONE, THE SCIENTOLOGY LIST."

Where there is any doubt as to the validity of a List One R/S, a verification should be done. The procedure is to vigorously Sec Check the pc on the subject of the reported List One R/S. This Sec Check must be done by an auditor who knows R/Ses and can make lists read and pull W/Hs connected with R/S.

PCs WHO R/S

Pcs who R/S are given Ex Dn. This does not change even though the pc is not an R/Ser. See HCOB C/S Series 93 and HCOB 10 Aug 76R "R/SES, WHAT THEY MEAN."

Where a pc R/Ses he will have evil purposes and be on a succumb as a result. R/Ses indicate an area of psychosis which will ruin the pc's life if allowed to go unhandled.

SUMMARY

This HCOB in no way changes Ex Dn as a requirement for R/Ses or makes it OK not to handle them.

Staff concerned must be able to identify an R/Ser which is different from someone with an R/S.

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

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

Assisted by CS-4/5
Revision by
L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

</div>

LRH:dr

Remimeo

Class III, Solo VI & VII, Academy and SHSBC
Required reviewed for Solo and VII

(Compiled from earlier HCOBs and TAPES of
the early 60's to give the exact stable data)

THE LAWS OF LISTING AND NULLING

(Star Rate. No attestations
allowed, clay and demos required)

The following laws are the **only** important rules of listing and nulling. If an auditor doesn't know these he will mess up pcs thoroughly and awfully. An auditor who doesn't know and can't apply these is not a Level III auditor.

LAWS

1. The definition of a complete list is a list which has only one reading item on list.

2. A TA rising means the list is being overlisted (too long).

3. A list can be underlisted in which case nothing can be found on nulling.

4. If after a session the TA is still high or goes up, a wrong item has been found.

5. If pc says it is a wrong item it is a wrong item.

6. The question must be checked and must read as a question before it is listed. An item listed from a non-reading question will give you a "Dead Horse" (no item).

7. If the item is on the list and nothing read on nulling, the item is suppressed or invalidated.

8. On a suppressed list, it must be nulled with suppressed. "On…has anything been suppressed."

9. On an item that is suppressed or invalidated the read will transfer *exactly* from the item to the button and when the button is gotten in the item will again read.

10. An item from an overlisted list is often suppressed.

11. On occasion when you pass *the* item in nulling, all subsequent items will read to a point where everything on list will then read. In this case take the first which read on first nulling.

12. An underlisted and overlisted list will ARC break the pc and he may refuse to be audited until list is corrected, and may become furious with auditor and will remain so till it is corrected.

13. Listing and nulling or any auditing at all beyond an ARC Br without handling the ARC Break first such as correcting the list or otherwise locating it will put a pc into a "sad effect".

14. A pc whose attention is on something else won't list easily. (List and null only with the rudiments in on the pc.)

15. An auditor whose TRs are out has difficulty in listing and nulling and in finding items.

16. Listing and nulling errors in presence of Auditor's Code violations can unstabilize a pc.

17. The lack of a specific listing question or an incorrect non-standard listing question which doesn't really call for item will give you more than one item reading on a list.

18. You cease listing and nulling actions when a floating needle appears.

19. Always give a pc his item and circle it plainly on the list.

20. Listing and nulling are highly precise auditing actions and if not done exactly by the laws may bring about a down tone and slow case gain, but if done correctly exactly by the laws and with good auditing in general will produce the highest gains attainable.

NOTE: There are no variations or exceptions to the above. (Does not alter 5A Power procedure.)

A failure to know and apply this bulletin will result in the assignment of very low conditions as these laws, if not known or followed, can halt case gain.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jp js.cden

Auditors
Class IV and above
C/Ses Class IV
  and above

URGENT – IMPORTANT

L & N LISTS – THE ITEM "ME"

Rule: The item "Me" must be accepted on any S&D list.

Rule: The item "Me" must never be represented.

The item "Me" on an L & N list *must* be accepted as the item, as it is basically the only right item there could be for an identity or valence list.

The item "Me" often appears on S & D lists, or similar L & N lists which ask for an identity or valence. If it is not accepted, or if it is represented, it will really mess up the case. (This includes the pronouns, "myself," and "I.")

The right thing to do when the pc gives this item, is to accept it as the item for the list, and do not continue that list or take any further action with that item.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:dm.clb

L4BRA

FOR ASSESSMENT OF ALL LISTING ERRORS

ASSESS THE WHOLE LIST (METHOD 5) THEN TAKE biggest reads or BDs and handle. Then clean up the list.

PC'S NAME _____ DATE _____

AUDITOR _____

0.   WAS IT THE FIRST ITEM ON THE LIST?   _____
      (Indicate and give pc his item.)

1.   DID YOU FAIL TO ANSWER THE LISTING QUESTION?   _____
      (If it reads, find out what question, clear the question noting whether it reads, if so,
      list it, find the item and give it to the pc.)

2.   WAS THE LIST UNNECESSARY?   _____
      (If it reads, indicate BPC and indicate that it was an unnecessary action.)

2A.   DID THE QUESTION HAVE NO CHARGE ON IT?   _____
      (Indicate.)

2B.   WERE YOU ASHAMED TO CAUSE AN UPSET?   _____
      (L1C after list corrected.)

2C.   WERE YOU AMAZED TO REACT THAT WAY?   _____
      (Same as 2B.)

2D.   THE QUESTION HAD ALREADY BEEN LISTED BEFORE?   _____

(Indicate, rehab.)

2E. YOU HAD NO INTEREST IN THE QUESTION? _____
(Indicate that the auditor missed that it didn't read.)

3. WAS THE ACTION DONE UNDER PROTEST? _____
(If it reads, handle by itsa earlier similar itsa.)

4. IS A LIST INCOMPLETE? _____
(If reads, find out what list and complete it, give the pc his item.)

5. HAS A LIST BEEN LISTED TOO LONG? _____
(If so, find what list and get the item from it by nulling with Suppress, the nulling question being: "On has anything been suppressed?" for each item on the overlong list. Give the pc his item.)

6. HAS THE WRONG ITEM BEEN TAKEN OFF A LIST? _____
(If this reads, put in Suppress and Invalidated on the list and null as in 5 above and find the right item and give to the pc.)

7. HAS A RIGHT ITEM BEEN DENIED YOU? _____
(If this reads, find out what it was and clean it up with Suppress and Invalidate and give it to the pc.)

8. HAS AN ITEM BEEN PUSHED OFF ON YOU YOU DIDN'T WANT? _____
(If so, find it and get in Suppress and Invalidate on it and tell pc it wasn't his item and continue the original action to find the correct item.)

9. HAD AN ITEM NOT BEEN GIVEN YOU? _____
(if reads, handle as in 7.)

10. HAVE YOU INVALIDATED A CORRECT ITEM FOUND? _____
(If so, rehab the item and find out why the pc invalidated it or if somebody else did it, clean it up and give it to pc again.)

11. HAVE YOU THOUGHT OF ITEMS THAT YOU DID NOT PUT ON THE LIST? _____
(If so, add them to the correct list. Renull the whole list and give the pc the item.)

12. HAVE YOU BEEN LISTING TO YOURSELF OUT OF SESSION? _____
(If so, find out what question and try to write a list from recall and get an item and give it to the pc.)

13. HAVE YOU BEEN GIVEN SOMEBODY ELSE'S ITEM? _____
(If so, indicate to the pc this was not his item. Don't try to find whose it was.)

14. HAS YOUR ITEM BEEN GIVEN TO SOMEONE ELSE? _____
(If so, find if possible what item it was and give it to the pc. Don't try to identify the "somebody else.")

14A. WERE EARLIER LISTING ERRORS RESTIMULATED? _____

(Indicate and correct earlier lists then check the current.)

14B. HAD THIS LIST ALREADY BEEN HANDLED?   _____
      (Indicate.)

15.   HAS A RELEASE POINT BEEN BYPASSED ON LISTING?   _____
      (If so, indicate the overrun to the pc, rehab back.)

16.   HAS A RELEASE POINT BEEN BYPASSED ON THE QUESTION   _____
      ONLY?
      (If so, indicate the overrun to the pc and rehab back.)

17.   HAVE YOU GONE EXTERIOR WHILE LISTING?   _____
      (If so, rehab. If Ext Rundown not given, note for C/S.)

18.   HAS IT BEEN AN OVERT TO PUT AN ITEM ON A LIST?   _____
      (If so, find out what item and why.)

19.   HAVE YOU WITHHELD AN ITEM FROM A LIST?   _____
      (If so, get it and add it to the list if that list available. If not put item in the report.)

20.   HAS A WITHHOLD BEEN MISSED?   _____
      (If so, get it, if discreditable ask "Who nearly found out?")

21.   HAS AN ITEM BEEN BYPASSED?   _____
      (Locate which one.)

22.   WAS A LISTING QUESTION MEANINGLESS?   _____
      (If so, find out which one and indicate to the pc.)

23.   HAS AN ITEM BEEN ABANDONED?   _____
      (If so, locate it and get it back for the pc and give it to him.)

24.   HAS AN ITEM BEEN PROTESTED?   _____
      (If so, locate it and get the Protest button in on it.)

25.   HAS AN ITEM BEEN ASSERTED?   _____
      (If so, locate it and get in the Assert button on it.)

26.   HAS AN ITEM BEEN SUGGESTED TO YOU BY ANOTHER?   _____
      (If so, get it named and the Protest and Refusal off.)

27.   HAS AN ITEM BEEN VOLUNTEERED BY YOU AND NOT ACCEPTED? _____
      (If so, get off the charge and give it to the pc, or if he then changes his mind on it, go
      on with the listing operation.)

28.   HAS THE ITEM ALREADY BEEN GIVEN?   _____
      (If so, get it back and give it again.)

29.   HAS AN ITEM BEEN FOUND PREVIOUSLY?   _____
      (If so, find what it was again and give it to the pc once more.)

30. HAS AN ITEM NOT BEEN UNDERSTOOD?   _____
     (If so, work it over with buttons until pc understands it or accepts or rejects it and go
     on with listing.)

30A. WAS THE LISTING QUESTION NOT UNDERSTOOD?   _____
     (Get defined and check for read. It may be unreading. If so, indicate that an un-
     charged question was listed because it read on a misunderstood.)

30B. WAS A WORD IN THE QUESTION NOT UNDERSTOOD?   _____
     (Same as 30A.)

31. WAS AN ITEM DIFFERENT WHEN SAID BY THE AUDITOR?   _____
     (If so, find out what the item was and give it to the pc correctly.)

31A. DID THE AUDITOR SUGGEST ITEMS TO YOU THAT WERE NOT   _____
     YOURS?
     (Indicate as illegal to do so. Correct the list removing these.)

32. WAS NULLING CARRIED ON PAST THE FOUND ITEM?   _____
     (If so, go back to it and get in Suppress and Protest.)

33. HAS AN ITEM BEEN FORCED ON YOU?   _____
     (If so, get off the Reject and Suppress and get the listing action completed to the
     right item if possible.)

34. HAS AN ITEM BEEN EVALUATED?   _____
     (If so, get off the Disagreement and Protest.)

35. HAD EARLIER LISTING BEEN RESTIMULATED?   _____
     (If so, locate when and indicate the bypassed charge. Find and correct the earlier out
     list.)

36. HAS AN EARLIER WRONG ITEM BEEN RESTIMULATED?   _____
      (If so, find when and indicate the bypassed charge. Find and correct the earlier out
     list.)

37. HAS AN EARLIER ARC BREAK BEEN RESTIMULATED?   _____
     (If so, locate and indicate the fact by itsa earlier similar itsa.)

38. DO YOU HAVE AN ARC BREAK BECAUSE OF BEING MADE TO DO   _____
     THIS?
     (If so, indicate it to the pc. Handle the ARC break. Correct the list if it's a list ARC
     break.)

39. HAS THE LIST CORRECTION BEEN OVERRUN?   _____
     (If so, rehab.)

39A. WAS THE LIST DONE WHILE YOU ALREADY HAD AN ARC BRK, PTP   _____
     OR W/H?

39B. COULDN'T YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT WAS BEING DONE?   _____

39C. COULDN'T YOU UNDERSTAND THE AUDITOR?   _____

39D. DIDN'T THE AUDITOR ACKNOWLEDGE YOU?   _____

40.   IS THERE SOME OTHER KIND OF BYPASSED CHARGE?   _____
      (If so, find what and indicate it to pc.)

41.   WAS THERE NOTHING WRONG IN THE FIRST PLACE?   _____
      (If so, indicate it to pc.)

42.   HAS THE UPSET BEEN HANDLED?   _____
      (If so, indicate it to the pc.)

43.   HAS A LIST PROCESS BEEN OVERRUN?   _____
      (If so, find which one and rehab.)

                                        L. RON HUBBARD
                                        Founder

                                        Assisted by CS-4/5

LRH:JE:ldm.rw.dz.rr.nt.dr

Remimeo
All Exec Hats
Qual Hats
Tech Hats
HCO Hats

FLOATING NEEDLES, LISTING PROCESSES

In sessions where the process being run on a pc involves a listing question (including S & D), please note that after the listing question has been thoroughly cleared with the preclear and then given to the pc that the process *is* being run.

Should it happen, then, that while the pc is actually listing off the question (and has not gone momentarily out of session), the needle floats, this is the flat point or end phenomenon of the process and the whole subject and all further steps of it are dropped at once.

Whatever charge was on the listing question has blown, either with or without the preclear being analytically aware of it.

To continue the process beyond this point is Out Tech by the process being overrun and is also a violation of our basic Fast Flow System.

Please note that whether there is a second leg to the process or not, like fitting an item found off a list into a bracket of commands, has no bearing on the fact that the process is flat.

If the needle floats while the pc is in session listing off a question, then there is no charge left on that question and there will be no item to fit into the second leg of the process.

The process has served its purpose.

With training as immaculately precise as it is and auditors' comm cycles becoming effortlessly superlative, the gradients of our technology are so fine that the results of each process on each level will be achieved faster and faster.

Sometimes the velocity of the processing is such that the end phenomenon will occur on the process without the preclear being aware of what has happened. Ending the process at this point then gives the preclear the chance to move into the velocity of the process.

Please then acknowledge the power of our technology and keep winning.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:lb-r.cden

[For further data on F/N during listing see *C/S Series 43*]

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 deter-
mined the results vital to each Level.)

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

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

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

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

LEVEL ZERO

LISTEN STYLE

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

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

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

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

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

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

LEVEL ONE

MUZZLED AUDITING

This could also be called rote style auditing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LEVEL TWO

GUIDING STYLE AUDITING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LEVEL III

ABRIDGED STYLE AUDITING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LEVEL IV

DIRECT STYLE AUDITING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SUMMARY

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

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

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

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd

Gen Non – Remimeo
HCOs
GOs
Post Public
Bulletin Board

(Cancels and replaces:
HCO PL 23. December 1965R;
Revised 31. December 1979)

ETHICS

SUPPRESSIVE ACTS

SUPPRESSION OF SCIENTOLOGY & SCIENTOLOGISTS

In 1965 and onwards I issued Policy Letters designed to help us create a calmer environment in which Scientologists could pursue their religion.

These were our Ethics Policy Letters. Scientologists have used them to improve conditions in their own lives. The proper application of ethics has brought relief from personal suffering for many. It has made it possible to attain a greater spiritual freedom and understanding where previously this had not been possible.

When a contra-survival or out-ethics situation exists unhandled, the individual. is held back from realizing all that is possible with the technology. The advances made in Scientology have now made our bridge surer and faster than ever before. It is then vital that there be an understanding of the subject of Ethics.

The chief stumbling block, huge above all others, is the upset we have with **Potential Trouble Sources** and their relationship to Suppressive Persons or Groups.

A **Potential Trouble Source** is defined as a person who, while desiring to remain active as a Scientologist, yet remains connected to a person or group suppressive to the individual or the religious beliefs and practices of Scientology.

A **Suppressive Person** or **Group** is one that actively seeks, by action or statement, to suppress or damage Scientology or a Scientologist by Suppressive Acts.

Suppressive Acts are acts calculated to impede or destroy Scientology or a Scientologist in his studies or counseling, or to affect adversely his well-being.

These definitions would apply to the study and practice of Scientology by the individual.

There are people who suppress. They are few. HCOB 27 September 1966 gives the characteristics of the anti-social personality and the social personality. An understanding and ability to recognize the anti-social can bring about major change in life and livingness.

The social personality is in the vast majority. It is not momentary misconduct which determines the anti-social nor is it mere prejudice or dislike. One cannot honestly and accurately identify the anti-social without examining the positive side of his life as well as the negative.

All men have committed wrongs or failed to act when they should have. Men are not perfect. But there are many who try to do the right thing and there is a much smaller number who specialize in wrongdoings.

All discipline must be based on truth and must exclude acting on false reports.

THE SCIENTOLOGIST AND THE SUPPRESSIVE PERSON

A Scientology parishioner caught in the situation of being active in Scientology while still connected with a Suppressive Person or Group is given a Present Time Problem of sufficient magnitude to prevent ease gain, as only a PTP can halt progress. Only ARC breaks worsen it. To the PTP is added ARC breaks with the Suppressive Person or Group. The result is no-gain or deterioration of a case by reason of the suppressive connection in the environment. Any Scientologist, in his own experience, can probably recall some such cases and their subsequent upset.

The pressure from a Suppressive Person can thus stop an individual from making any progress. In fact, the constant ARC breaks and malicious intent can be very hard on the individual who can begin to feel worse. The Suppressive Person or Group may then exploit this by making an example of the individual to others. The individual becomes a person manipulated by the Suppressive Person or Group who may well portray their actions as "for your own good" but who in fact have only their own interests in mind.

Unless the Potential Trouble Source, the Scientologist caught up in this, can handle the situation, he will suffer hardship. He may eave in or squirrel because his personal progress is halted in the face of the hostile environment.

This policy letter gives the means and provides the policy for getting the above situation handled.

A Potential Trouble Source receives pastoral counselling which has been specifically developed to help him or her handle the situation. To give the PTS individual other forms of pastoral counselling would be to deny him the full benefit of it.

SUPPRESSIVE ACTS

In the Church of Scientology Suppressive Acts include:

- public disavowal of Scientology or Scientologist in good standing with Scientology Churches

- public statements against Scientology or Scientologist but not to Committees of Evidence duly convened

- proposing, advising or voting for legislation or ordinances, rules or laws directed towards the Suppression of Scientology

- pronouncing Scientologists guilty of the practice of the religion of Scientology

- testifying hostility before state or public inquiries into Scientology to suppress it, reporting or threatening to report Scientology or Scientology or Scientologists to civil authorities in an effort to suppress Scientology or Scientologists from practicing or receiving standard Scientology

- bringing civil suit against any Scientology organization or Scientologist including the non payment of bills or failure to refund without first calling the matter to the attention of the Ethics Officer who would inform senior and legal advisors of the concerned Church of Scientology

- demanding a refund of donations from a Church or mission without adhering to the policy and procedure of the Claims Verification Board (information about which is freely available to all members of the Church) or seeking to create or cause upset for others in making the request

- attempting to settle a personal internal dispute with a Scientology Church or mission to personal advantage through the use of external agencies without seeking redress through the Chaplain's Court

- continued adherence to a person or group accurately pronounced Suppressive Person or by HCO

- organizing splinter to, confuse people about the true beliefs and practices of Scientology or to deceive them into considering that they will be able to study part or all of Scientology or receive standard pastoral counseling from the splinter group

- organizing splinter groups which take and pervert Scientology materials or practices, in whole or in part, still calling it Scientology or calling it something else

- infiltrating a Scientology group or organization or staff to stir up discontent or protest at the instigation of hostile forces

- seeking to splinter off an area of Scientology and deny it properly constituted authority for personal profit, personal power or to "save" Scientology

- engaging in malicious rumor-mongering to the authority or repute of one's fellows or executives of Scientology Churches or missions or organizations

- falsifying records that then imperil the liberty or safety of a Scientologist

- knowingly giving false testimony to imperil a Scientologist

- receiving money, favors or encouragement to suppress Scientology or Scientologists

- sexually destructive conduct to the well-being or good state of mind of a Scientologist in good standing or any individual for which a Scientology Church, mission or organization has responsibility for or towards

- blackmail of Scientologists or Scientology organizations threatened or accomplished – in which case the crime being used for blackmail purposes becomes fully outside the reach of Ethics and is absolved by the fact of blackmail unless repeated.

Suppressive Acts are clearly those covert or overt acts knowingly calculated to reduce or destroy a Scientology Church or prevent individual betterment of a Scientologist.

Scientologists are expected to abide by the laws of their Land. This rule is invariable. In any dispute or relationship with an expelled person, a Scientologist is expected to obey the law fully. Violation of the law by a Scientologist in such a case would additionally be a very serious violation of the codes and policies of the Church.

Acts of violence and destruction in violation of these laws are in particular considered to be Suppressive Acts. Aiding or cooperating in covering up any such activity should also be considered a Suppressive Act. While it would be a rare ease indeed for such acts to occur, an individual having knowledge of such would report it to the Ethics Officer who would inform senior and legal advisors of the Church. Care must be taken that such reports deal in facts only, with no assumptions, misleading or false information, all of which can be the source of needless injustice.

If a person or a group that has committed a Suppressive Act comes to his, her or their senses and wishes to set things right and make up for damage done and seek the forgiveness of his fellows, the HCO Secretary:

A   Tells the person or group to stop committing present time overts and to cease all destructive acts so that he, she or they may be able to get case gain and increase their awareness and understanding.

B.   Requires a public announcement to the effect that they realize their actions were senseless and stating where possible the influences or motivations which caused them to act in the way they did; gets it signed before witnesses and published broadly, particularly to persons directly influenced or formerly associated with the former offender or offenders. Should the individual or group be honestly aware of any conspiracy to destroy or cause harm to Scientology or Scientologist connected to his, her or their actions, the letter should indicate such with specifies. This is not an excuse to fabricate information.

B(1) Requires that all debts to Scientology Churches or missions or organizations are resolved.

C.   Requires training beginning at the lowest level without financial aid if the Ministers in charge of training will accept the person or group members for such.

D.   Makes a note of the matter with copies of the statement and files in the Ethics files of those concerned, and forwards copies to those network seniors concerned.

E.   Informs the International Justice Chief and forwards a duplicate of the original copy which shows signatures.

Identification of a Suppressive Person or Group is not done lightly because of suspicion or rumor or opinion. An understanding of HCOB 27 September 1966 THE ANTI-SOCIAL PERSONALITY; THE ANTI-SCIENTOLOGIST is requisite. It is the actions of an individual or group which ate the criteria, the positive and. the negative.

The Scientologist is at all times expected to follow the Code of a Scientologist and the Creed of the Church. This applies fully to dealings with Suppressive Persons or Groups. The fact that a person or group has been declared Suppressive does not justify mistreatment of that person or group.

There is no other policy which takes precedence in the handling of Suppressive Persons or Groups than this Policy Letter.

———————————

Until a Suppressive Person or Group is absolved, but not during the period when the person requests and has a Committee of Evidence, or an amnesty occurs, no Scientology Ethics other than this HCO Policy Letter applies to such persons.

The individual or group may not avail themselves otherwise of Scientology justice procedures. Having acted destructively towards his fellows, he is no longer entitled to the service and protection of the group, This of course has no effect upon the individual or group's recourse on normal legal channels available to any citizen although in matters of the person's membership in the Church such avenues would have no influence.

Such persons are in the same category as those whose certificates have been cancelled, and persons whose certificates, classifications and awards have been cancelled are also in this category.

A Committee of Evidence may be called by any Convening Authority who wishes more concrete evidence of efforts to suppress Scientology or Scientologists but if such a Committee's findings, passed on, establish beyond reasonable doubt Suppressive Acts, this Policy Letter applies.

Outright or covert acts knowingly designed to impede or destroy Scientology or Scientologists is what is meant by Acts Suppressive of Scientology or Scientologists.

The greatest good for the greatest number of dynamics requires that actions destructive of the advance of many, by Scientology means, overtly or covertly undertaken with the direct target of destroying Scientology as a whole, or a Scientologist in particular, be summarily handled due to the character of the reactive mind and the consequent impulses of the insane or near insane to ruin every chance of Mankind via Scientology.

POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE

A Scientologist closely associated with a person who has committed Suppressive Acts is known as a Potential Trouble Source or Trouble Source. The history of Dianetics and Scientology is strewn with. Confused by emotional ties, dogged in refusing to give up Scientology, yet invalidated by a Suppressive Person at every turn they cannot, having a PTP, make case gains. If they would the situation, they make gains and recover their potential. If they make no determined move, they eventually succumb.

Therefore, where the well-being and happiness of a Scientologist is at stake., the influences of Suppressive Persons, must be considered. The effects of a Suppressive Person upon a closely associated individual are the same regardless of the nature of the Suppressive Person's to Scientology.

The validity of this is borne out by the fact that in the past contrived actions against the Church by official agencies were instigated by individuals who were actively suppressing a Scientologist, or Scientology. The suppressed Scientologist did not act in good time to avert the trouble by handling the suppressive source.

There is no practice of "disconnection" allowed in the Church of Scientology. The first step in handling anything is gaining the ability to face it. Perhaps it will seem too much to handle but the Scientologist who continues to confront and handle the situation will gain more than. the increased understanding with the other person. He will know that he has handled, despite all invitations to do otherwise.

The materials of the PTS and SP Detection, Routing and Handling course, which are mandatory for the individual with a PTS situation, provide the technology for handling.

Communication is the universal solvent. Understanding a situation permits one to handle it.

RIGHTS OF SUPPRESSIVE PERSON OR GROUP

A truly Suppressive Person or Group has none of the rights and privileges accorded one as a member of the Church.

However a Person or group may be falsely labelled a Suppressive Person or Group. Should the person or group claim the label to be false, he, she or they may request a Committee of Evidence via their nearest HCO. The executive with the power to convene a Committee of Evidence must do so if one is requested for recourse or redress of wrongs.

The Person or representative of the group labelled Suppressive is named as an Interested Party to the Committee. They attend it where it convenes.

The Committee must pay attention to any actual evidences that the person or group that is accused of being suppressive may produce particularly to the effect of having helped Scientology or Scientologist or a Scientologist and if this is seen to outweigh the accusations, proof or lack of it, the Person is absolved.

Any knowingly false testimony, forgeries or false witnesses introduced by the person or group accused of being suppressive can result in an immediate finding against the Person or group.

Any effort to use copies of the testimony or findings of a Committee of Evidence called for this purpose outside of the Church immediately reverses any favorable finding and automatically labels the or group suppressive.

Failing to prove guilt of Suppressive Acts, the Commit tee must absolve the person or group publicly.

If the findings, authorized by the Convening Authority, prove guilt beyond doubt, the person or group is so labelled a Suppressive Person or Group. Should a person wish to reenter the Church after this, he would apply steps A-E of this policy.

No damages or costs may be borne by or ordered by a Committee of Evidence in cases involving Potential Trouble Sources or Suppressive Persons or Groups.

When the Suppressive Person or Group representative fails to appear before a Committee of Evidence on a Bill of Particulars labelling persons as Suppressive Persons or Groups at the published time of its convening, the Bill of Particulars stands as proven and the Convening Authority is bound so to declare. This is standard procedure in any Committee of Evidence.

INJUSTICE

It must be remembered at all times that Justice must include a refusal to accept any report not substantiated by actual, independent data, seeing that all such reports are investigated and that all investigations include confronting the accused with the accusation and where feasible the accuser, BEFORE any action is decided upon or taken. This is the primary breakdown of any justice system – that it acts on false reports, disciplines before substantiation and fails to con-front an accused with the report and his accuser before any discipline is assigned, or which does not weigh the value of a person in general against the alleged crime even when proven.

RESPONSIBILITY OF A POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE

An individual who is knowingly PTS and who seeks to conceal this or to avoid handling the situation is subject to disciplinary action. In severe cases this can result in a Committee of Evidence.

RESPONSIBILITY OF HCO

The Ethics Officer who seeks to avoid the handling of PTS individuals or who seeks to handle individuals in a nonstandard fashion or in violation of issues on PTS handling is subject to disciplinary action. This can result in a Comm Ev, depending upon the gravity of the situation.

RESPONSIBILITY OF A C/S OR AUDITOR

A Case Supervisor or Auditor who fails to see that standard pastoral counselling procedure as laid out in HCOBs is applied in resolving a case of PTSness is subject to disciplinary action. This can result in a Comm Ev, depending upon the gravity of the situation.

EVIDENCES OF SUPPRESSION

It is wise for any Scientologist, HCO Secretary or Committee of Evidence in matters concerning Suppressive Acts to obtain valid documents, letters, testimonies duly signed and witnessed, affidavits duly sworn to and other matters and evidences which would have weight in a court of law. Momentary spite and false reports are then guarded against.

EXPULSION

Expulsion from the Church of Scientology results where Suppressive Acts have been duly proven beyond doubt and where the individual concerned has refused to apply steps A-E as noted early in this HCO PL.

Scientology training or pastoral counseling may not be given to an expelled individual. Their only terminal in a Scientology Church or mission is the Ethics Officer.

It must be noted however that no matter how severe the case we never close the door entirely. As stated in HCO PL 16 March 1971 Issue **it important – an operating standard rule:**

"You must keep the door open only if its just a crack."

A Suppressive Person expelled from the Church is not otherwise disciplined. A Suppressive Person lives in his or her own private hell. He or she is not beyond help but it is not a small job.

There are many many more people who are not suppressive and who wish to survive and for others to survive, for all their failings. To them we owe our time.

We must make the way safe for those who enter Scientology to realize the full potential which can be theirs. To permit Suppressives to destroy people and deny them happiness, is at best gross cowardice.

Expulsion orders are not to be treated lightly. In keeping with traditional religious practice it is the last measure of the group to safeguard its own existence and inner peace against former members who not only no longer agree with our religious tenets but are also engaging in destructive activities against the Church and its members.

We have decided to take on the responsibility of lifting ourselves from the mud, to a civilization of which all can be proud. Let us not lose this way through inattention to the matters contained in this Policy Letter.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:bk

Remimeo

THE ANTI-SOCIAL PERSONALITY

THE ANTI-SCIENTOLOGIST

There are certain characteristics and mental attitudes which cause about 20% of a race to oppose violently any betterment activity or group.

Such people are known to have anti-social tendencies.

When the legal or political structure of a country becomes such as to favor such personalities in positions of trust, then all the civilizing organizations of the country become suppressed and a barbarism of criminality and economic duress ensues.

Crime and criminal acts are perpetuated by anti-social personalities. Inmates of institutions commonly trace their state back to contact with such personalities.

Thus, in the fields of government, police activities and mental health, to name a few, we see that it is important to be able to detect and isolate this personality type so as to protect society and individuals from the destructive consequences attendant upon letting such have free rein to injure others.

As they only comprise 20% of the population and as only 2½% of this 20% are truly dangerous, we see that with a very small amount of effort we could considerably better the state of society.

Well-known, even stellar, examples of such a personality are, of course, Napoleon and Hitler, Dillinger, Pretty Boy Floyd, Christie[*] and other famous criminals were well-known examples of the anti-social personality. But with such a cast of characters in history we neglect the less stellar examples and do not perceive that such personalities exist in current life, very common, often undetected.

When we trace the cause of a failing business, we will inevitably discover somewhere in its ranks the anti-social personality hard at work.

In families which are breaking up we commonly find one or the other of the persons involved to have such a personality.

Where life has become rough and is failing, a careful review of the area by a trained observer will detect one or more such personalities at work.

---

[*] Editor's note: John Dillinger, famous American bank robber, 1902-1934; Pretty Boy Floyd, famous American gangster 1904-1934; Christie: English serial killer from the middle of the 20th century.

As there are 80% of us trying to get along and only 20% trying to prevent us, our lives would be much easier to live were we well-informed as to the exact manifestations of such a personality. Thus we could detect it and save ourselves much failure and heartbreak.

It is important then to examine and list the attributes of the anti-social personality. Influencing as it does the daily lives of so many, it well behooves decent people to become better informed on this subject.

ATTRIBUTES

The anti-social personality has the following attributes:

1.   He or she speaks only in very broad generalities. "*They say*..." "Everybody thinks…" "Everyone knows…" and such expressions are in continual use, particularly when imparting rumor. When asked, "Who is everybody…" it normally turns out to be one source and from this source the anti-social person has manufactured what he or she pretends is the whole opinion of the whole society.

This is natural to them since to them all society is a large hostile generality, against the anti-social in particular.

2.   Such a person deals mainly in bad news, critical or hostile remarks, invalidation and general suppression.

"Gossip" or "harbinger of evil tidings" or "rumormonger" once described such persons.

It is notable that there is no good news or complimentary remark passed on by such a person.

3.   The anti-social personality alters, to worsen, communication when he or she relays a message or news. Good news is stopped and only bad news, often embellished, is passed along.

Such a person also pretends to pass on "bad news" which is in actual fact invented.

4.   A characteristic, and one of the sad things about an anti-social personality, is that it does not respond to treatment or reform or psychotherapy.

5.   Surrounding such a personality we find cowed or ill associates or friends who, when not driven actually insane, are yet behaving in a crippled manner in life, failing, not succeeding.

Such people make trouble for others.

When treated or educated, the near associate of the anti-social personality has no stability of gain but promptly relapses or loses his advantages of knowledge, being under the suppressive influence of the other.

Physically treated, such associates commonly do not recover in the expected time but worsen and have poor convalescences.

It is quite useless to treat or help or train such persons so long as they remain under the influence of the anti-social connection.

The largest number of insane are insane because of such anti-social connections and do not recover easily for the same reason.

Unjustly we seldom see the anti-social personality actually in an institution. Only his "friends" and family are there.

6. The anti-social personality habitually selects the wrong target.

If a tyre is flat from driving over nails, he or she curses a companion or a non-causative source of the trouble. If the radio next door is too loud, he or she kicks the cat.

If A is the obvious cause, the anti-social personality inevitably blames B, or C or D.

7. The anti-social cannot finish a cycle of action.

Such become surrounded with incomplete projects.

8. Many anti-social persons will freely confess to the most alarming crimes when forced to do so, but will have no faintest sense of responsibility for them.

Their actions have little or nothing to do with their own volition. Things "just happened".

They have no sense of correct causation and particularly cannot feel any sense of remorse or shame therefore.

9. The anti-social personality supports only destructive groups and rages against and attacks any constructive or betterment group.

10. This type of personality approves only of destructive actions and fights against constructive or helpful actions or activities.

The artist in particular is often found as a magnet for persons with anti-social personalities who see in his art something which must be destroyed and covertly, "as a friend", proceed to try.

11. Helping others is an activity which drives the anti-social personality nearly berserk. Activities, however, which destroy in the name of help are closely supported.

12. The anti-social personality has a bad sense of property and conceives that the idea that anyone owns anything is a pretense made up to fool people. Nothing is ever really owned.

THE BASIC REASON

The basic reason the anti-social personality behaves as he or she does lies in a hidden terror of others.

To such a person every other being is an enemy, an enemy to be covertly or overtly destroyed.

The fixation is that survival itself depends on "keeping others down" or "keeping people ignorant".

If anyone were to promise to make others stronger or brighter, the anti-social personality suffers the utmost agony of personal danger.

They reason that if they are in this much trouble with people around them weak or stupid, they would perish should anyone become strong or bright.

Such a person has no trust to a point of terror. This is usually masked and unrevealed.

When such a personality goes insane the world is full of Martians or the FBI and each person met is really a Martian or FBI agent.

But the bulk of such people exhibit no outward signs of insanity. They appear quite rational. They can be *very* convincing.

However, the list given above consists of things which such a personality cannot detect in himself or herself. This is so true that if you thought you found yourself in one of the above, you most certainly are not anti-social. Self-criticism is a luxury the anti-social cannot afford. They must be RIGHT because they are in continual danger in their own estimation. If you proved one WRONG, you might even send him or her into a severe illness.

Only the sane, well-balanced person tries to correct his conduct.

RELIEF

If you were to weed out of your past by proper search and discovery those anti-social persons you have known and if you then disconnected, you might experience great relief.

Similarly, if society were to recognize this personality type as a sick being as they now isolate people with smallpox, both social and economic recoveries could occur.

Things are not likely to get much better so long as 20% of the population is permitted to dominate and injure the lives and enterprise of the remaining 80%.

As majority rule is the political manner of the day, so should majority sanity express itself in our daily lives without the interference and destruction of the socially unwell.

The pity of it is, they will not permit themselves to be helped and would not respond to treatment if help were attempted.

An understanding and ability to recognize such personalities could bring a major change in society and our lives.

THE SOCIAL PERSONALITY

Man in his anxieties is prone to witch hunts.

All one has to do is designate "people wearing black caps" as the villains and one can start a slaughter of people in black caps.

This characteristic makes it very easy for the anti-social personality to bring about a chaotic or dangerous environment.

Man is not naturally brave or calm in his human state. And he is not necessarily villainous.

Even the anti-social personality, in his warped way, is quite certain that he is acting for the best and commonly sees himself as the only good person around, doing all for the good of everyone – the only flaw in his reasoning being that if one kills everyone else, none are left to be protected from the imagined evils. His *conduct* in his environment and toward his fellows is the only method of detecting either the antisocial or the social personalities. Their motives for self are similar – self-preservation and survival. They simply go about achieving these in different ways.

Thus, as Man is naturally neither calm nor brave, anyone to some degree tends to be alert to dangerous persons and hence, witch hunts can begin.

It is therefore even more important to identify the social personality than the anti-social personality. One then avoids shooting the innocent out of mere prejudice or dislike or because of some momentary misconduct.

The social personality can be defined most easily by comparison with his opposite, the anti-social personality.

This differentiation is easily done and no test should ever be constructed which isolates only the anti-social. On the same test must appear the upper as well as lower ranges of Man's actions.

A test that declares only anti-social personalities without also being able to identify the social personality would be itself a suppressive test. It would be like answering "Yes" or "No" to the question "Do you still beat your wife?" Anyone who took it could be found guilty. While this mechanism might have suited the times of the Inquisition, it would not suit modern needs.

As the society runs, prospers and lives *solely* through the efforts of social personalities, one must know them as *they*, not the anti-social, are the worthwhile people. These are the people who must have rights and freedom. Attention is given to the antisocial solely to protect and assist the social personalities in the society.

All majority rules, civilizing intentions and even the human race will fail unless one can identify and thwart the anti-social personalities and help and forward the social personalities in the society. For the very word "society" implies social conduct and without it there is no society at all, only a barbarism with all men, good or bad, at risk.

The frailty of showing how the harmful people can be known is that these then apply the characteristics to decent people to get them hunted down and eradicated.

The swan song of every great civilization is the tune played by arrows, axes or bullets used by the anti-social to slay the last decent men.

Government is only dangerous when it can be employed by and for anti-social personalities. The end result is the eradication of all social personalities and the resultant collapse of Egypt, Babylon, Rome, Russia or the West.

You will note in the characteristics of the anti-social personality that intelligence is not a clue to the anti-social. They are bright or stupid or average. Thus those who are extremely intelligent can rise to considerable, even head-of-state heights.

Importance and ability or wish to rise above others are likewise not indexes to the anti-social. When they do become important or rise they are, however, rather visible by the broad consequences of their acts. But they are as likely to be unimportant people or hold very lowly stations and wish for nothing better.

Thus it is the twelve given characteristics alone which identify the anti-social personality. And these same twelve reversed are the sole criteria of the social personality if one wishes to be truthful about them.

The identification or labeling of an anti-social personality cannot be done honestly and accurately unless one *also*, in the same examination of the person, reviews the positive side of his life.

All persons under stress can react with momentary flashes of anti-social conduct. This does not make them anti-social personalities.

The true anti-social person has a majority of anti-social characteristics.

The social personality has a majority of social characteristics.

Thus one must examine the good with the bad before one can truly label the anti-social or the social.

In reviewing such matters, very broad testimony and evidence are best. One or two isolated instances determine nothing. One should search all twelve social and all twelve anti-social characteristics and decide on the basis of actual evidence, not opinion.

The twelve primary characteristics of the social personality are as follows:

1.   The social personality is specific in relating circumstances. "Joe Jones said…" "The Star Newspaper reported…" and gives sources of data where important or possible.

He may use the generality of "they" or "people" but seldom in connection with attributing statements or opinions of an alarming nature.

2.   The social personality is eager to relay good news and reluctant to relay bad.

He may not even bother to pass along criticism when it doesn't matter.

He is more interested in making another feel liked or wanted than disliked by others and tends to err toward reassurance rather than toward criticism.

3.   A social personality passes communication without much alteration and if deleting anything tends to delete injurious matters.

He does not like to hurt people's feelings. He sometimes errs in holding back bad news or orders which seem critical or harsh.

4.   Treatment, reform and psychotherapy particularly of a mild nature work very well on the social personality.

Whereas anti-social people sometimes promise to reform, they do not. Only the social personality can change or improve easily.

It is often enough to point out unwanted conduct to a social personality to completely alter it for the better.

Criminal codes and violent punishment are not needed to regulate social personalities.

5.   The friends and associates of a social personality tend to be well, happy and of good morale.

A truly social personality quite often produces betterment in health or fortune by his mere presence on the scene.

At the very least he does not reduce the existing levels of health or morale in his associates.

When ill, the social personality heals or recovers in an expected manner, and is found open to successful treatment.

6.   The social personality tends to select correct targets for correction. He fixes the tyre that is flat rather than attack the windscreen. In the mechanical arts he can therefore repair things and make them work.

7.   Cycles of action begun are ordinarily completed by the social personality, if possible.

8.   The social personality is ashamed of his misdeeds and reluctant to confess them. He takes responsibility for his errors.

9.   The social personality supports constructive groups and tends to protest or resist destructive groups.

10.   Destructive actions are protested by the social personality. He assists constructive or helpful actions.

11.   The social personality helps others and actively resists acts which harm others.

12.   Property is property of someone to the social personality and its theft or misuse is prevented or frowned upon.

THE BASIC MOTIVATION

The social personality naturally operates on the basis of the greatest good.

He is not haunted by imagined enemies but he does recognize real enemies when they exist.

The social personality wants to survive and wants others to survive, whereas the anti-social personality really and covertly wants others to succumb.

Basically the social personality wants others to be happy and do well, whereas the anti-social personality is very clever in making others do very badly indeed.

A basic clue to the social personality is not really his successes but his motivations. The social personality when successful is often a target for the anti-social and by this reason he may fail. But his intentions included others in his success, whereas the anti-social only appreciate the doom of others.

Unless we can detect the social personality and hold him safe from undue restraint and detect also the anti-social and restrain him, our society will go on suffering from insanity, criminality and war, and Man and civilization will not endure.

Of all our technical skills, such differentiation ranks the highest since, failing, no other skill can continue, as the base on which it operates – civilization – will not be here to continue it.

Do not smash the social personality – and do not fail to render powerless the anti-social in their efforts to harm the rest of us.

Just because a man rises above his fellows or takes an important part does not make him an anti-social personality. Just because a man can control or dominate others does not make him an anti-social personality.

It is his motives in doing so and the consequences of his acts which distinguish the anti-social from the social.

Unless we realize and apply the true characteristics of the two types of personality, we will continue to live in a quandary of who our enemies are and, in doing so, victimize our friends.

All men have committed acts of violence or omission for which they could be censured. In all Mankind there is not one single perfect human being.

But there are those who try to do right and those who specialize in wrong and upon these facts and characteristics you can know them.

                                                            L. RON HUBBARD
                                                            Founder

LRH:lb-r.rd.jh

SUPPRESSIVE PERSONS,

MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF

It is interesting in the detection of Suppressive Persons that they use "policy" to prevent purpose.

In one org which went into a serious decline a Suppressive Person was in a high position.

Every time org personnel returned from Saint Hill and proposed that the org get going, they were told by this SP that their proposals were "against policy".

Not one of these people, hearing this, ever alerted to a glaring fact. The SP in this case was renowned for never being able to pass a bulletin, tape or policy letter!

So how would that person have known **what** was against policy for that person **never** was known to pass a hat check!

So that person's statement that, "it's against policy" was obviously false since the person was incapable of passing hat checks or bulletins and wouldn't ever have known what any policy was for or against anything.

Thus we see one of the characteristics of an SP is:

1. **The negation of policy without knowing it and the use of "policy" to prevent success in Scientology is the primary tool of the SP against orgs.**

_____

Dissemination is a prime target of the SP.

Magazines ordinarily have half a dozen SPs on their lines. These people write in and complain about ads. If you don't watch it these half dozen become "everybody" and the mag is beaten down into not advertising.

"Soft sell" is another recommendation of the SP.

And "build it quietly" and "get only decent people" are all part of this.

When somebody is demanding less reach, that person is an SP.

Therefore we have another characteristic:

2.   SPs recommend ineffective dissemination and find fault with any being done.

_____

A Suppressive will try to sell off the property or buildings of an org and in one case tried to give them away when temporarily in charge.

3.   A suppressive will try to get rid of an org.

_____

Good staff members are a prime target for SPs. In one org where an SP got a foothold 60% of the staff was gotten rid of and the org almost crashed.

They do it by making people too dissatisfied to produce and so make it impossible for the org to earn.

4.   An SP will seek to upset and get rid of the best staff members.

_____

Bad news, particularly if false, is the only comm line of the SP.

The executive who is getting bad news as a steady diet on his lines has SPs about.

5.   Entheta is the sole stock in trade of the SP.

_____

The triumph an SP feels in not getting rid of things the auditor has tried to ease is quite malevolent.

6.   An SP is satisfied with auditing only when he gets worse.

_____

7.   SPs are happy when their pcs get worse and sad when their pcs get better.

_____

8.   An SP in an examiner post will only declare released the bad result cases and will not pass actual releases but will ARC break them.

_____

9.   Covert invalidation is the level of an SP's social intercourse.

_____

An SP can only restimulate another, he has no power of his own.

10.   An SP deals only in restimulation, never easing or erasing.

_____

11.   The persons around an SP get so restimulated they can't detect the real SP.

_____

The whole rationale of the SP is built on the belief that if anyone got better, the SP would be for it as the others could overcome him then.

He is fighting a battle he once fought and never stopped fighting. He is in an incident. Present time people are mistaken by him for past, long gone enemies.

Therefore he never really knows what he is fighting in present time, so just fights.

12. The SP is sure everyone is against him personally and if others became more powerful they would dispose of him.

_____

The SP usually commits continuing overts. These are hidden.

I have had two or three SPs blow up and shout or snarl at me. When I investigated I found, in these cases, they were committing daily crimes of some magnitude.

13. An SP commits hidden overts continuously.

_____

14. Back of a crime you will find SP characteristics.

_____

15. Because an SP uses generalities in his speech "everybody" "they", etc., the SP is hard to detect.

_____

SPs have an experiential track that is poor. SPs know how to needle and commit overts and hold others back.

When released, the SP has so little decent background experience that he or she has a very hard time.

16. Releasing an SP does not make a worthwhile person. It only makes a person who can now learn to get along in life.

"A cleared cannibal is a cleared cannibal."

_____

SPs don't get case gains. Sometimes they pretend them. They are held back by their continuing overts. If we were found by them to be decent, their past conduct would swell up and engulf them.

They are in a continued PTP of their fight with Mankind. And they follow the rule that pcs with PTPs get no case gains.

_____

Real SPs comprise about 2½ per cent of the population. By restimulating others they make another 17½ per cent into Potential Trouble Sources. Therefore about 20% of the population is Ethics type.

We must not allow this 20% to prevent the 80% from crossing the bridge.

We are no enemy of the SP. But he can't have friends, can he?

So we handle the SP and his PTS's and carry on with our job.

                                                    L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:mh.cden

Remimeo
Franchise
Students
BPI

All Levels

THE CONTINUING OVERT ACT

Pity the poor fellow who commits daily harmful acts.

He'll never make it.

A criminal pilfering the cash box once a week has himself stopped cold as far as case gains are concerned.

In 1954 I counted some noses. I checked up on 21 cases who had never had any gains since 1950. 17 turned out to be criminals! The other 4 were beyond the reach of investigation.

That gave me my first clue.

For some years then, I watched for no-gain cases and carefully followed up those that I could. They had major or minor criminal backgrounds.

This gave the 1959 breakthrough on the meter checks (Sec Checking).

Following it further since 1959 I have finally amassed enough histories to state:

The person who is not getting case gains is committing continuing overts.

While this sounds like a very good "out" for us, we assume that the auditor at least tried *something* sensible.

Today – the running of a pc by grades is a saving grace for merely "tough cases". Directors of Processing are doing well with the modern graded process approach, level by level, and the DofP Washington has just told me they were cracking cases with the lowest grade processes DC had never been able to handle well before.

So, given processing by Grades (the best case approach we've ever had), we crack the rough ones.

But will that be *all* cases?

There's still one. The case who continually commits overts before, during and after processing.

He won't make it.

One thing helps this, however.

You have seen the Ethics Codes appear.

By putting a bit of control in the Scientology environment we have enough threat to restrain dramatization.

The phenomena is this: The reactive bank can exert stress on the pc if it is not obeyed. Discipline must exert just a shade more stress *against* dramatization than the bank does. This checks the performance of the continual overt long enough to let processing bite.

Not everyone is a continuous overt committer by a thousand to one. But this phenomenon is not confined to the no-gain case.

The *slow* gain case is also committing overts the auditor doesn't see.

Therefore a little discipline in the environment speeds the *slow* gain case, the one we're more interested in.

The no-gain case, frankly, is one I am not panting to solve. If a fellow wants to sell his next hundred trillion for the sake of the broken toy he stole, I'm afraid I can't be bothered. I have no contract with any Big Thetan to save the world complete.

It is enough for me to know:

1.   Where bottom is, and

2.   How to help speed slow gain cases.

Bottom is the chap who eats your lunch apple and says the children did it. Bottom is the fellow who sows the environment with secret suppressive acts and vicious generalities.

The slow gain case responds to a bit of "keep your nose clean, please, while I apply the thetan-booster."

The fast gain case does his job and doesn't give a hoot about threatened discipline if it's fair. And the fast gain case helps out and the fast gain case can be helped by a more orderly environment. The good worker works more happily when bad workers see the pitfalls and desist from distracting him.

So we all win.

The no-gain case? Well, he sure doesn't deserve any gain. One pc in a thousand. And he yaps and groans and says "Prove it works" and blames us and raises hell. He makes us think we fail.

Look down in our Sthil files. There are actually thousands upon thousands of Scientologists there who each one comment on how wonderful it is and how good they feel. There are a few dozen or so who howl they haven't been helped! What a ratio! Yet I believe some on staff think we have a *lot* of dissatisfied people. These no-gain characters strew so much entheta around that we think we fail. Look in the Saint Hill files sometime! Those many thousands of reports continue to pour in from around the world with hurrah! Only the few dozen groan.

But long ago I closed my book on the no-gain case. Each of those few dozen no-gains tell frightening lies to little children, pour ink on shoes, say how abused they are while tearing the guts out of those unlucky enough to be around them. They are suppressive persons, every one. I know. I've seen them all the way down to the little clinker they call their soul. And I don't like what I saw.

The people who come to you with wild discreditable rumours, who seek to tear people's attention off Scientology, who chew up orgs, are suppressive persons.

Well, give them a good rock and let them suppress it!

I can't end this HCO B without a confession. I know how to cure them rather easily.

Maybe I'll never let it be done.

For had they had their way we would have lost our chance. It's too near to think about.

After all, we have to earn our freedom. I don't care much for those who didn't help.

The rest of us had to sweat a lot harder than was necessary to make it come true.

                                                    L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml.rd

Gen Non-Remimeo
HCO Sec Hat
D of P Hat
D of T Hat

HCO JUSTICE DATA RE ACADEMY & HGC

HANDLING THE SUPPRESSIVE PERSON

THE BASIS OF INSANITY

The suppressive person (whom we've called a Merchant of Fear or Chaos Merchant and which we can now technically call the *suppressive person*) can't stand the idea of Scientology. If people became better, the suppressive person would have lost. The suppressive person answers this by attacking covertly or overtly Scientology. This thing is, he thinks, his mortal enemy since it undoes his (or her) "good work" in putting people down where they should be.

There are three "operations" such a case seeks to engage upon regarding Scientology: (a) to disperse it, (b) to try to crush it and (c) to pretend it didn't exist.

Dispersal would consist of several things such as attributing its source to others and altering its processes or structure.

If you feel a bit dispersed reading this Policy Letter, then realize it is about a being whose whole "protective colouration" is to disperse others and so remain invisible. Such people generalize all entheta and create ARC Breaks madly.

The second (b) is done by covert or overt means. Covertly a suppressive person leaves the org door unlocked, loses the E-Meters, runs up fantastic bills, and energetically and unseen seeks to pull out the plug and get Scientology poured down the drain. We, poor fools, consider all this just "human error" or "stupidity". We rarely realize that such actions, far from being accidents, are carefully thought out. The proof that this is so is simple. If we run down the source of these errors we wind up with only one or two people in the whole group. Now isn't it odd that the *majority* of errors that kept the group enturbulated were attributable to a *minority* of persons present? Even a very "reasonable" person could not make anything else out of that except that it was very odd and indicated that the *minority* mentioned were interested in smashing the group and that the behaviour was not common to the whole group – meaning it isn't "normal" behaviour.

These people aren't Communists or Fascists or any other ists. They are just very sick people. They easily become parts of suppressive groups such as Communists or Fascists because these groups, like criminals, are suppressive.

The Suppressive Person is hard to spot because of the dispersal factor mentioned above. One looks at them and has his attention dispersed by their "everybody is bad".

The Suppressive Person who is *visibly* seeking to knock out people or Scientology is easy to see. He or she is making such a fuss about it. The attacks are quite vicious and full of lies. But even here when the Suppressive Person exists on the "other side" of a potential trouble source, visibility is not good. One sees a case going *up* and *down*. On the other side of that case, out of the auditor's view, is the Suppressive Person.

The whole trick they use is to generalize entheta. "Everybody is bad." "The Russians are all bad." "Everybody hates you." "The People versus John Doe" on warrants. "The masses." "The Secret Police will get you."

Suppressive groups use the ARC Break mechanisms of generalizing entheta so it seems "everywhere".

The Suppressive Person is a specialist in making others ARC Break with generalized entheta that is mostly lies.

He or she is also a no-gain-case.

So avid are such for the smashing of others by covert or overt means that their case is bogged *and won't move under routine processing*.

The technical fact is that they have a huge problem, long gone and no longer known even to themselves which they use hidden or forthright vicious acts continually to "handle". They do *not* act to solve the environment they are in. They are solving one environment, yesterday's, in which they are stuck.

The only reason the insane were hard to understand is that they are handling situations which no longer exist. The situation probably existed at one time. They think they have to hold their own, with overts against a non-existent enemy to solve a non-existent problem.

Because their overts are continuous they have withholds.

Since such a person has withholds, he or she can't communicate freely to as-is the block on the track that keeps them in some yesterday. Hence, a "no-case-gain".

That alone is the way to locate a Suppressive Person. By viewing the case. Never judge such a person by their conduct. That is too difficult. Judge by no-case-*gains*. Don't even use tests.

One asks these questions:

1.   Will the person permit auditing at all? or

2.   Does their history of routine auditing reveal any gains?

If (1) is "No", one is safe to treat the person as suppressive. It is not always correct but it is always safe. Some errors will be made but it is better to make them than to take a chance on it. When people refuse auditing they are (a) a potential trouble source (connected to a Suppressive Person); (b) a person with a big discreditable withhold; (c) a Suppressive Person or

(d) have had the bad luck to be "audited" too often by a Suppressive Person or (e) have been audited by an untrained auditor or one "trained" by a Suppressive Person.

[The last category (e) (untrained auditor) is rather slight but (d) (audited by a Suppressive Person) can have been pretty serious, resulting in continual ARC Breaks during which auditing was pressed on without regard to the ARC Break.]

Thus there are several possibilities where somebody refuses auditing. One has to sort them out in an HGC and handle the right one. But HCO by policy simply treats the person with the same admin policy procedure as that used on a Suppressive Person and lets HGC sort it out. Get that difference – it's "with the same admin policy procedure as" not "the same as".

For treating a person "the same as" a Suppressive Person when he or she is not only adds to the confusion. One treats a real Suppressive Person pretty rough. One has to handle the bank.

As to (2) here is the real test and the only valid test: Does their history of routine auditing reveal any gains?

If the answer is **no** then *there* is your Suppressive Person, loud and very unclear!

That is the test.

There are several ways of detecting. When fair auditors or good ones have had to vary routine procedure or do unusual things on this case in an effort to make it gain, when there are lots of notes from Ds of P in the folder saying do this – do that – you know that this case was *trouble*.

This means it was one of three things: 1. a potential trouble source 2. a person with a big withhold 3. a Suppressive Person.

If despite all that trouble and care, the case did not gain – or if the case simply didn't gain despite auditing no matter how many years or intensives, then you've caught your Suppressive Person.

That's the boy. Or the girl.

This case performs continual calculating covert hostile acts damaging to others. This case puts the enturbulence and upset into the environment, breaks the chairs, messes up the rugs and spoils the traffic flow with "goofs" done intentionally.

One should lock criminals out of the environment if one wants security. But one first has to locate the criminal. Don't lock everybody out because you can't find the criminal.

The cyclic case (gains and collapses routinely) is connected to a Suppressive Person. We have policy on that.

The case that continually pleads "hold my hand I am so ARC broken" is just somebody with a big *withhold*, not an ARC Break.

The Suppressive Person just gets no-case-gain on routine student auditing.

This person is actively suppressing Scientology. If such will sit still and pretend to be audited the suppression is by hidden hostile acts which include:

1. Chopping up auditors;

2. Pretending withholds which are actually criticisms;

3. Giving out "data" about their past lives and/or whole track that really holds such subjects up to scorn and makes people who *do* remember wince;

4. Chopping up orgs;

5. Alter-ising technology to mess it up;

6. Spreading rumours about prominent persons in Scientology;

7. Attributing Scientology to other sources;

8. Criticizing auditors as a group;

9. Rolling up Dev-T, off policy, off origin, off line;

10. Giving fragmentary or generalized reports about entheta that cave people in – and isn't actual;

11. Refusing to repair ARC Breaks;

12. Engaging in discreditable sexual acts (also true of potential trouble sources);

13. Reporting a session good when the pc went bad;

14. Reporting a session bad when the pc went up in tone;

15. Snapping terminals[4] with lecturers and executives to make critical remarks or spread ARC Break type "news" to them;

16. Failing to relay comm or report;

17. Making an org go to pieces (note one uses "making" not "letting");

18. Committing small criminal acts around the org;

19. Making "mistakes" which get their seniors in trouble;

20. Refusing to abide by policy;

21. Non-compliance with instructions;

22. Alter-is of instructions or orders so that the programme fouls up;

23. Hiding data that is vital to prevent upsets;

24. Altering orders to make a senior look bad;

25. Organizing revolts or mass protest meetings;

26. Snarling about Justice.

---

[4] Comment by the Editor (Chris): A lecturer or exec are terminals (a source) someone making critical remarks or spreading ARCX type news, steals the attention of the group from the "source" to him/herself, i.e. makes himself the terminal. So it snaps the groups attention off of what was trying to be communicated and onto the other person. Or if no group is involved it causes a sudden shift of attention in the source.

And so on. One does not use the catalogue, however, one only uses this *one* fact – *no case gain by routine auditing over a longish period*.

This is the fellow that makes life miserable for the rest of us. This is the one who overworks executives. This is the auditor killer. This is the course enturbulator or pc killer.

There's the cancer. Burn it out.

_____

In short, you begin to see that it's this one who is the only one who makes harsh discipline seem necessary. The rest of the staff suffers when one or two of these is present.

One hears a whine about "process didn't work" or sees an alter-is of tech. Go look. You'll find it now and then leads to a Suppressive Person inside or outside the org.

Now that one knows who it is, one can handle it.

But more than that, I can now crack this case!

The technology is useful in all cases, of course. But only this cracks the "no-gain-case".

The person is in a mad, howling situation of some yesteryear and is "handling it" by committing overt acts today. I say condition of yesteryear but the case thinks it's *today*.

Yes, you're right. They are nuts. The spin bins are full of either them or their victims. There's no other real psycho in a spin bin!

What? That means we've cracked insanity itself? That's right. And it's given us the key to the Suppressive Person and his or her effect on the environment. *This* is the multitude of "types" of insanity of the 19th century psychiatrist. All in one. Schizophrenia, paranoia, fancy names galore. Only one other type exists – the person the Suppressive Person got "at". This is the "manic-depressive" a type who is up one day and down the next. This is the Potential Trouble Source gone mad. But these are in a minority in the spin bin, usually put there by Suppressive Persons and not crazy at all! The real mad ones are the Suppressive Persons. They are the only psychos.

Over simplification? No indeed. I can prove it! We could empty the spin bins now. If we want to. But we have better uses for technology than saving a lot of Suppressive Persons who themselves act only to scuttle the rest of us.

You see, when they get down to no-case-gain where a routine process won't bite, they can no longer as-is their daily life so it all starts to stack up into a horror. They "solve" this horror by continuous covert acts against their surroundings and associates. After a while the covert ones don't seem to hold off the fancied "horror" and they commit some senseless violence in broad daylight – or collapse – and so they can get identified as insane and are lugged off to the spin bin.

Anybody can "get mad" and bust a few chairs when a Suppressive Person goes too far. But there's traceable sense to it. Getting mad doesn't make a madman, it's damaging actions

that have no sensible detectable reasons that's the trail of madness. Any thetan can get angry. Only a madman damages without reason.

All actions have their lower scale discreditable mockery. The difference is, does one get over his anger? The no-case-gain of course can't. He or she stays misemotional and adds each new burst to the fire. It never gets less. It grows. And a long way from all Suppressive Persons are violent. They are more likely to look resentful.

A Suppressive Person can get to one solid *dispassionate* state of damaging things. Here is the accident prone, the home wrecker, the group wrecker.

Now here one must realize something. The Suppressive Person finds outlet for his or her unexpressed rage by carefully needling those they are connected with into howling anger.

You see the people around them get dragged into this long gone incident by mistaken identity. And it is a maddening situation to be continually mix-identified, accused, worked on, doubled crossed. For one is *not* the being the Suppressive Person supposes. The Suppressive Person's world is pretty hard to live around. And even ordinarily cheerful people often blow up under the strain.

So be careful who you call the Suppressive Person. The person connected with a Suppressive Person is *liable to be only visible rage in sight!*

You have some experience of this – the mousey little woman who rarely changes expression and is so righteous connected to somebody who now and then goes into a frenzy.

How to tell them apart? Easy! Just ask this question:

Which gets a case gain easily?

Well, it's even simpler than that! Put the two on an E-Meter. Don't do anything but read the dial and needle. The Suppressive one has the high stuck T.A. The other has a lower T.A. Simple?

Not all Suppressive Persons have *high* T.A. The T.A. can be anywhere especially very low (1.0). But the needle is weird. It is stuck tight or it RSes without reason (the pc wearing no rings to cause an RS).

Suppressive Persons also can have the "dead" thetan clear read!

You see people *around* a Suppressive Person Q and A and disperse. They seek to "get even" with the Suppressive Person and often exhibit the same symptoms *temporarily*.

Sometimes *two* Suppressive Persons are found together. So one can't always say which is the Suppressive Person in a pair. The usual combination is the Suppressive Person and the Potential Trouble Source.

However you don't need to guess about it or observe their conduct.

For this poor soul can no longer as-is easily. Too many overts. Too many withholds. Stuck in an incident that they call "present time". Handling a problem that does not exist. Supposing those around are the personnel in their own delirium.

They look all right. They sound reasonable. They are often clever. But they are solid poison. They can't as-is anything. Day by day their pile grows. Day by day their new overts and withholds pin them down tighter. They aren't here. But they sure can wreck the place.

There is the *true* psycho.

And he or she is dying before your very eyes. Kind of horrible.

The resolution of the case is a clever application of problems processes, never O/W. What *was* the condition? How did you handle it? is the key type of process.

I don't know what the percentage of these are in a society. I know only that they made up about 10% of any group so far observed. The data is obscured by the fact that they ARC Break others and make them misemotional – thus one of them seems to be, by contagion, half a dozen such.

Therefore simple inspection of conduct does not reveal the Suppressive Person. Only a case folder puts the seal on it. No-Case-Gain by routine processes.

However this test too may soon become untrustworthy for now we can crack them by a special approach. However we will also generally use the same approach on routine cases as it makes cases go upward fast and we may catch the Suppressive Person accidentally and cure him or her before we are aware of it.

And that would be wonderful.

But still we'll have such on our lines in Justice matters from now on. So it's good to know all about them, how they are identified, how to handle.

HCO must handle such cases as per the HCO Justice Codes on Suppressive Acts when they blow Scientology or seek to suppress Scientologists or orgs. One should study up on these.

The Academy should be careful of this and report them to HCO promptly (as they would potential trouble sources or withholds that won't be delivered). The Academy *must not* fool about with Suppressive Persons. It's a sure way to deteriorate a course and cave in students.

POLICY

When an Academy finds it has a Potential Trouble Source, a "withholdy case that ARC Breaks easily" or a Suppressive Person enrolled on a course or a blow the Academy *must* call for HCO Department of Inspection & Reports, Justice section. This can be any HCO personnel available, even the HCO Sec.

The HCO representative must wear some readily identified HCO symbol and must take a report sheet with a carbon copy on a clip board.

HCO must have present other staff adequate to handle possible physical violence.

The student, if still present, must be taken to a place where an interview will not stop or enturbulate a class, by Tech Division personnel. This can be any Tech Division office, empty auditing room or empty classroom. The point is to localize the commotion and not stir up the whole Tech Division.

If Tech Division personnel is not available HCO can recruit "other staff" anywhere by simply saying "HCO requires you" and taking them into the interview place.

HCO has a report sheet for such matters, original and one copy for Justice files.

The HCO representative calls for the student's folder and looks it over quickly for TA action. If there is none (less than 10 divs/sess) that's it. It is marked on the report sheet, "No TA action in auditing" or "Little TA". HCO is not interested in what processes were run. Or why there is no TA. If the course requires no meters the folder is inspected for alter-is (which denotes a rough pc) or no case changes.

If there are no TA notations in the folder HCO should put the person on a meter, making sure the person is not wearing a ring. One asks no questions, merely reads the TA position and notes the needle and marks these in the report sheet. The Tone Arm will be very high (5 or above) or very low (2 or less) or dead thetan (2 or 3) and the needle would be an occasional RS or stuck or sticky if the person is a Suppressive Person. This is noted in the report sheet.

If the folder or the student in question says he has had no case gain this is again confirming of a Suppressive Person.

If two of these three points (folder, meter, statement) indicate a Suppressive Person, HCO is looking for *two* possible students when so called in – the one who caused the upset and that student's coach or student's auditor. There very likely may be a Suppressive Person on the course that is not this student. Therefore one looks for that one too, the second one.

If a bit of questioning seems to reveal that the student's auditor was responsible, test that student too, and enter it on a second HCO report form. And order the other one to auditing at the student's own expense.

In short be alert. There's been an upset. There may be other persons about who caused it. Don't just concentrate on the student. There is a condition on the course that causes upsets. That is really all one knows.

When one walks in on it, find out why and what.

If the HCO tests indicate some doubt about either student being a Suppressive Person, HCO asks about a possible withhold and enters any result on the sheet and sends the students and sheet separately to the Tech Division, Dept of Estimation. The procedure is the same for a Suppressive Person but is "a withholdy pc who ARC Breaks easily" or simply "a withholdy pc" if no ARC Breaks are noted. "Auditing recommended".

But there is a third category for which HCO is very alert in this interview. And that is the **Potential Trouble Source**.

For this person may only be audited further if he or she disconnects or handles the Suppressive Person or group to which he or she is connected and can't be sent to the HGC or back to the course either until the status is cleared up.

If this seems the case, there is no point in continuing the person in the Tech Division and HCO takes over fully, applying the policy related to Potential Trouble Sources.

This type of case will probably not be dangerous but quite co-operative, and probably dazed by having to *do* something about his situation. He or she has been hammered with invalidation by a Suppressive Person and may be rather wobbly but if the Justice steps are taken exactly on policy there should be no trouble. HCO can take a Potential Trouble Source (but never a Suppressive Person) out of the Tech Division premises and back to HCO to complete such briefing. Remember, it is all one to us if the Potential Trouble Source handles it or not. Until it's handled or disconnected we don't want it around as it's just more trouble and the person will cave in if audited under those conditions (connected to a Suppressive Person or group).

A Suppressive Person found in an Academy is ordered to HGC processing always. And always at his or her own expense.

If the Suppressive Person won't buy auditing, or co-operate, HCO follows steps A to E in policy on Suppressive Persons in the Justice Codes; HCO may be assisted in this by Tech personnel.

The point is, the situation must be handled fully there and then. The student buys his auditing or gets A to E. There is *no* "We'll put you on probation in the course and if…" because I've not found it to work. Auditing or Suppressive Person A to E. Or both.

THE BLOWN STUDENT

The student however may have blown off the premises or he has gone entirely. On a minor, momentary blow, where all it took was the student's auditor and a few words to get the student back, the matter is not a real blow.

But where the student leaves the premises in a blow or doesn't turn up for class, the Tech Division must send an Instructor and the student's auditor over to HCO Department of Inspection and Reports. An HCO representative should go with them at once to pick up the student.

The student is brought back with as little public commotion as possible and the procedure of HCO checkout, etc is followed as above.

THE GONE STUDENT

Where the student can't be gotten back (or in all such cases) the real cause may be a Suppressive Person in the Course itself, not the blown student or the upset student.

If the Suppressive Person is on the course (and is not the blown student) HCO will want to know this. In all such cases the one who caused the [enturbulated[5]] environment may not be the culprit.

The HCO representative calls for the blown student's case folder and looks for TA. If there is none or for some reason the student wasn't audited, or if no meters were used on that course, HCO seeks to find out what the case's responses were to processing.

If the case seemed to change or improve yet the student is gone, HCO looks over the blown student's ex-auditor for suppressive characteristics such as satisfaction the pc blew, critical statements about tech or instructors, case rough or difficult, lies about the circumstances, etc. and if such signs are present, HCO orders the blown student's ex-auditor to the HGC at the student's own expense.

If this interview with the blown student's auditor seems to indicate a Suppressive Person beyond any doubt HCO orders the student to the HGC at the student's own expense.

The blown student's course auditor will not be found usually to be a Potential Trouble Source as these are seldom bad or rough auditors, so questions about this possibility don't really apply.

But if this student (the blown student's auditor) is Suppressive, it's HGC or A to E. If the student gives on A to E he or she may be returned to course or to the HGC as HCO deems best.

In all such cases where a Suppressive Person is found, watch out for legal repercussions by having reliable witnesses present during such negotiations or upsets and take liberal notes for possible Comm Ev. This is why there also must be an HCO representative handling it.

If there is no agreement to be audited and the student who is found to be a Suppressive Person will not respond to A to E (because student has blown and can't be found or because the student flatly refuses), the student is considered terminated.

A waiver or quit claim is given or sent the student stating:

Date:

Place:

I …………………… having refused to abide by the Codes of (name and place of org) do hereby waive any further rights I may have as a Scientologist and in return for my course fee of ……… I do hereby quit any claim I may have on (name of org) or any Scientologist personnel or any person or group or organization of Scientology.

---

[5] Editor's note

Signed

2 Witnesses

Only when this is signed the student may have his course fee returned, but no other fees as he accepted that service.

The ex-student should realize this makes him Fair Game and outside our Justice Codes. He may not have recourse of any kind beyond refund. And after signing can only return to Scientology as per policy on Fair Game.

The HGC audits such a Suppressive Person sent to it on special processes specially issued by HCO B for Suppressive Persons. It will be found that adherence to these policies will make Academies very calm.

Note: Nothing in this policy letter waives or sets aside any policy concerning the auditing of known institutional cases in an HGC. Persons with histories of institutionalized insanity may not be audited in HGC.

L. RON HUBBARD

P.S. If you've wondered if you are a Suppressive Person while reading this – you aren't! A Suppressive Person never does wonder, not for a moment! **They know they're sane!**

LRH:wmc.cden

Cancellation of Fair Game: The practice of declaring people **Fair Game** will cease. **Fair Game** may not appear on any Ethics Order. It causes bad public relations. This P/L does not cancel any policy on the treatment or handling of an SP. [From HCO P/L 21 October 1968, Volume 1, page 489.]

Remimeo
Required for
Level IV Students
To Review Auditors

LEVEL IV

SEARCH AND DISCOVERY

PREREQUISITE: A KNOWLEDGE OF ETHICS
DEFINITIONS AND PURPOSES.

The process called Search and Discovery requires as well a good knowledge of Ethics.

One must know what a **Suppressive Person** is, what a **Potential Trouble Source** is and the mechanism of how and why a case Roller Coasters and what that is. All this data exists in Ethics policy letters and should be studied well before one attempts a "Search and Discovery" or further study of this HCOB. Ethics is not merely a legal action – it handles the whole phenomena of case worsening (Roller Coaster) after processing and without this technology an auditor easily becomes baffled and tends to plunge and squirrel. The *only* reason a case Roller Coasters after good standard auditing is the PTS phenomena and a Suppressive is present.

THREE TYPES

There are Three Types of PTS.

Type One is the easy one. The SP on the case is right in present time, actively suppressing the person.

Type Two is harder for the *apparent* Suppressive Person in present time is only a restimulator for the actual suppressive.

Type Three is beyond the facilities of orgs not equipped with hospitals as these are entirely psychotic.

HANDLING TYPE ONE PTS

The Type One is normally handled by an Ethics Officer in the course of a hearing.

The person is asked if anyone is invalidating him or his gains or Scientology and if the pc answers with a name and is then told to handle or disconnect from that person the *good indicators* come in promptly and the person is *quite* satisfied.

If however there is no success in finding the SP on the case or if the person starts naming Org personnel or other unlikely persons as SP the Ethics Officer must realize that he is

handling a Type Two PTS and, because the Auditing will consume time, sends the person to Tech or Qual for a Search and Discovery.

It is easy to tell a Type One PTS from a Type Two. The Type One brightens up at once and ceases to Roller Coaster the moment the present time SP is spotted. The pc ceases to Roller Coaster. The pc does not go back on it and begin to beg off. The pc does not begin to worry about the consequences of disconnection. If the pc does any of these things, then the pc is a Type Two.

It can be seen that Ethics handles the majority of PTSs in a fast manner. There is no trouble about it. All goes smoothly.

It can also be seen that Ethics cannot afford the time to handle a Type Two PTS and there is no reason the Type Two should not pay well for the Auditing.

Therefore, when Ethics finds its Type One approach does not work quickly, Ethics must send the person to the proper division that is handling Search and Discovery.

TYPE TWO

The pc who isn't sure, won't disconnect, or still Roller Coasters, or who doesn't brighten up, can't name any SP at all, is a Type Two.

Only Search and Discovery will help.

SEARCH AND DISCOVERY

The first thing to know is that **case worsening is caused only by a PTS situation.**

There never will be any other reason.

As soon as you doubt this datum and think about "other causes" or try to explain it some other way you no longer prevent cases from worsening and no longer rescue those who have worsened.

The second thing to know is that **a suppressive is always a person, a being or a group of beings**. A suppressive is *not* a condition, a problem, a postulate. Problems and Counter-Postulates come into the matter but the SP as a being or group must always be located as a being or a group, not as merely an idea. As the technology is close to and similar to that of a service facsimile, a poorly trained auditor can get confused between them and produce a condition he says is the cause. Persons who cannot confront and who therefore see persons as ideas not people are the ones most likely to fail in doing Search and Discovery.

The third thing to know is that there can be an actual SP and another person or being similar to the actual one who is only an apparent SP.

An *actual* SP actually suppresses another.

An *apparent* SP only reminds the pc of the actual one and so is restimulated into being a PTS.

The *actual* SP can be in present time (Type One PTS) or is in the past or distant (Type Two PTS).

The Type Two always has an *apparent* SP who is not *the* SP on the case, is confusing the two and is acting PTS only because of restimulation, not because of suppression.

Search and Discovery as a process is done exactly by the general rules of listing. One lists for persons or groups who are or have suppressed the pc. The list is complete when only one item reads on nulling and this is the item.

If the item turns out to be a group, one does a second list of who or what would represent that group, gets the list long enough to leave on nulling only one item reading, and that is the SP.

An *incident is* not a person or a group.

A condition is not a person or a group. And a group is not a person, what you want is one being.

The E-Meter signs are unmistakable and the good indicators come in strongly when the actual SP is found.

This is the entire action. It is liable to the various ills and errors of writing and nulling a list, such as overlisting, underlisting, ARC Breaking the pc by by-passing the item or getting an incomplete list. These are avoided by knowing one's business as an Auditor and being able to handle an E-Meter with skill and confidence.

When one goofs on a Search and Discovery and finds the wrong actual SP the signs are the same as those where a Type Two is handled as a Type One – not sure, no good indicators, Roller Coasters again, etc.

The actual SP can be back track but it is seldom vital to go far out of PT and usual for a lifetime person to turn up.

Done correctly the pc's good indicators come in at once, the pc cognites, the meter reacts *very* well with Blowdowns and repeated long falls, and the pc ceases to Roller Coaster.

Care should be taken not to get too enthusiastic in going far back track on the pc as you run into whole track implants etc, easily handleable only at Level V. The pc can get "over whumped" if you go too far back and you'll wish you hadn't. This normally happens however, only when the pc has been ARC Broken by the Auditor, when the right item has been bypassed and the list is overlong, or when 2 or 3 items are still reading on the list (incomplete list).

Locating a Service Facsimile is quite similar to Search and Discovery but they are different processes entirely.

Only the doingness is similar. In Search and Discovery the end product is a *being*. In Service Facsimile the end product is an item or concept or idea. Don't get the two mixed.

HANDLING TYPE THREE

The Type Three PTS is mostly in institutions or would be.

In this case the Type Two's *apparent* SP is spread all over the world and is often more than all the people there are – for the person sometimes has ghosts about him or demons and they are just more apparent SPs but imaginary as beings as well.

All institutional cases are PTSs. The whole of insanity is wrapped up in this one fact.

The insane is not just a bad off being, the insane is a being who has been overwhelmed by an actual SP until too many persons are apparent SPs. This makes the person Roller Coaster continually in life. The Roller Coaster is even cyclic (repetitive as a cycle).

Handling an insane person as a Type Two might work but probably not case for case. One might get enough wins on a few to make one fail completely by so many loses on the many.

Just as you tell a Type Two to disconnect from the actual SP (wherever found on the track) you must disconnect the person from the environment.

Putting the person in a current institution puts him in a Bedlam. And when also "treated" it may finish him. *For he will Roller Coaster from any treatment given,* until made into a Type Two and given a Search and Discovery.

The task with a Type Three is *not* treatment as such. It is to provide a relatively safe environment and quiet and rest and no treatment of a mental nature at all. Giving him a quiet court with a motionless object in it might do the trick if he is permitted to sit there unmolested. Medical care of a very unbrutal nature is necessary as intravenous feeding and soporifics (sleeping and quietening drugs) may be necessary, such persons are sometimes also physically ill from an illness with a known medical cure.

Treatment with drugs, shock, operation is just more suppression. The person will not really get well, will relapse, etc.

Standard Auditing on such a person is subject to the Roller Coaster phenomena. They get worse after getting better. "Successes" are sporadic, enough to lead one on, and usually worsen again since these people are PTS.

But removed from apparent SPs, kept in a quiet surroundings, not pestered or threatened or put in fear, the person comes up to Type Two and a Search and Discovery should end the matter. But there will always be some failures as the insane sometimes withdraw into rigid unawareness as a final defense, sometimes can't be kept alive and sometimes are too hectic and distraught to ever become quiet, the extremes of too quiet and never quiet have a number of psychiatric names such as "catatonia" (withdrawn totally) and "manic" (too hectic).

Classification is interesting but non-productive since they are all PTS, all will Roller Coaster and none can be trained or processed with any idea of lasting result no matter the temporary miracle.

Remove a Type Three PTS from the environment, give him or her rest and quiet, do a Search and Discovery when rest and quiet have made the person Type Two.

(Note: These paragraphs on the Type Three make good a promise given in *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* to develop "Institutional Dianetics".)

The modern mental hospital with its brutality and suppressive treatments is not the way to give a psychotic quiet and rest. Before anything effective can be done in this field a proper institution would have to be provided, offering only rest, quiet and medical assistance for intravenous feedings and sleeping draughts where necessary but not as "treatment" and where *no* treatment is attempted until the person looks recovered and only then a Search and Discovery as above under Type Two.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ep.cden

Remimeo
DofP
Auditors
Ethics Officers

C/S Series 79

Expanded Dianetics Series 5

PTS INTERVIEWS

(Reference HCO B 17 April 72, C/S Series 76)

Interviews to discover a PTS condition are done on a meter with all reads marked.

The Interview asks (a) about persons who are hostile or antagonistic to the pc, (b) about groups that are anti-Scientology, (c) about people who have harmed the pc, (d) about things that the pc thinks are suppressive to the pc, (e) about locations that are suppressive to the pc and about past life things and beings suppressive to the pc.

In doing the Interview the Interviewer must realize that a sick person is PTS. There are no sick people who are not PTS to someone or a group or something somewhere.

A somewhat suppressive pc will find the good hats suppressive. This does not relieve his condition. He is PTS to SP people, groups, things or locations, no matter how SP he is.

He can have been audited by someone he knew in an earlier life and who goofed the session. A few auditors have since been declared. Not because they goofed but because they were SP.

However, some PTS pc will make trouble for good people because that is what PTS means (Potential Trouble Source). So do not buy all the good people he is PTS to.

Further, when you do get the person or group or thing or location the PTS person will F/N VGI and begin to get well.

The PTS condition is actually a problem and a mystery and a withdrawal so it is sometimes hard to find and has to be specially processed (3 S&Ds) to locate it. Usually it is quite visible.

Don't have a sick, rollercoaster pc appear for Interview and then say "not PTS". It's a false report. It only means the Interviewer did not find it.

The pc sometimes begins to list in such an Interview and such an Interview where a wrong item is found has to be audited to complete the list or find the right item. (See C/S Series 78, HCO B 20 Apr 72, Issue II.)

So Interview worksheets are **vital**.

The Interview should end on an F/N.

The Interview is followed by the Ethics action of HCO PL 5 April 72 or other Ethics actions such as handling or disconnection and posting as called for in policy. An Interviewer has to use good TRs and operate his meter properly and know 2-way comm and PTS tech.

Some Interviewers are extremely successful.

Such Interviews and handling count as auditing hours.

When properly done, plus good auditing on the PTS RD, well people result.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:mes.rd

Class III and above
 Auditors
Word Clearers
HCO
Tech/Qual
C/Ses
PTS/SP Detection,
 Routing and Handling
 Course
Ethics Officers
Class IV Grad Check-
 sheet

EDUCATING THE POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE,

THE FIRST STEP TOWARD HANDLING: PTS C/S-1

Ref:	BPL 5 Apr 72RC I	PTS TYPE A HANDLING
	BTB 11 Nov 77	HANDLING PTS SITUATIONS
	HCOB 24 Apr 72 I	PTS INTERVIEWS
	HCOB 10 Aug 73	PTS HANDLING
	HCOB 27 Sep 66	THE ANTI-SOCIAL PERSONALITY THE ANTI-SCIENTOLOGIST
	HCOB 28 Nov 70	PSYCHOSIS
	HCOB 24 Nov 65	SEARCH AND DISCOVERY
	HCOB 12 Mar 68	MISTAKES, ANATOMY OF
	HCOB 9 Nov 67	REVISION OF REMEDY A. REMEDY B AND S AND Ds
	HCOB 5 Feb 66 III	S AND D WARNING
	HCOB 9 Dec 71RC	PTS RUNDOWN, AUDITED
	HCOB 20 Jan 72R	PTS RUNDOWN ADDITION
	HCOB 3 Jun 72RA	PTS RUNDOWN, FINAL STEP
	HCOB 29 Dec 78	THE SUPPRESSED PERSON RUNDOWN
	HCOB 30 Dec 78	SUPPRESSED PERSON RUNDOWN – PROBLEMS PROCESSES
	HCOB 31 Dec 78 II	OUTLINE OF PTS HANDLING

When you find you have a potential trouble source on your hands the very first thing you must do is educate him on the fundamentals of PTS/SP tech.

Do not begin any other PTS handling on any PTS person until he has completed the basic education steps of the PTS C/S-1 given in this HCOB.

In the absence of education into the basics of PTS tech you will have PTS students and pcs asserting they're not PTS, you will have upsets. protest, recurrences of "once handled" PTSness. PTSes will not cognite, will not take action to handle the antagonistic terminal, will

not recover. Failure to educate simply doesn't work. So a very thorough job must be done at this point to guarantee the success of any PTS handlings which follow.

Now people and circumstances and PTS sits vary, and you may wish to carry the education steps of the PTS person beyond what is given here before you begin any other handling on him. I will leave that to your educated judgment. However, the steps of the PTS C/S-1 given in this HCOB must be done on all PTS students and pcs *before any sort of PTS Interview or 10 August handling or any PTS auditing is undertaken.*

The person should, of course, study the complete PTS/SP Detection, Routing and Handling Course so that he understands the full mechanics that had been upsetting his life, but the PTS C/S-1 will give sufficient data and understanding so that he or she can begin handling the PTS scene.

PTS C/S-1

The following PTS C/S-1 is not a long action and can and should be accomplished speedily. Its purpose is to give to any PTS student or pc the necessary data and R-Factor on the basics of PTS/SP tech so that he understands and is able and willing to successfully handle his PTS situation. It can be done by an auditor, in session, or in the course room under the supervision of the Word Clearer and Course Supervisor.

Note: Some pcs and students who have been trained or who have in the past received PTS handling may protest that they know the terms and issues. If this happens acknowledge with excellent TRs and without invalidation or evaluation and tell them that this action is intended to make PTS handling effective for all and is a required step of the handling. If the auditor or Word Clearer uses excellent TRs and a good R-Factor, no ARC breaks will occur and the person will have tremendous wins.

The auditor or Word Clearer should be fully familiar with this issue as well as all issues in the PTS/SP Course pack. He will need to take a very thorough look at what has to be covered with the pc in this C/S-1 and know his materials very well and have them ready for reference and clearing any misunderstoods or questions the pc may have.

The following will be needed:

- Technical Dictionary
- Admin Dictionary
- A good English Dictionary
- A good dictionary in the pc or student's native language, and for a foreign language case a dual dictionary (English-to-foreign language and foreign language itself).
- PTS and SP Definitions Sheet – Attachment No. I of this issue
- Demo kit

A.   Have the pc define each term, using the reference. (Note: you don't ask: "Do you know what this word means?" You ask: "What is the definition of ?"

When the pc has told you the definition, have him give you a sentence or two using the term correctly. Where it applies, have him give you examples, using his experiences or those of others. Have him demo with a demo kit. Cover by exact definition all terms used and take each term defined to an F/N.

B.   Check for any questions (or misunderstoods) as you go along and ensure any such get handled so the pc or student winds up with a clear understanding of the word.

Don't settle for glibness that does not show understanding, but on the other hand, don't overrun or put duress on the pc or student, either.

Ensure each word cleared is taken to F/N.

PTS C/S-1 PROCEDURE

1.   Give the R-Factor that you are going to clear the basic words and concepts concerning PTSness.

2.   Clear the word **Affinity**. Have the pc or student demo its meaning.

3.   Clear the word **Reality**. Have the pc or student give you sentences and examples showing his understanding.

4.   Clear the word **Communication**. Have the pc or student demo its meaning.

5.   Clear **ARC Break**. Have the pc or student demo what an ARC break is.

6.   Clear **Problem**. Have the pc or student demo a problem.

7.   Clear **Withhold**. Have the pc or student give you an example of a withhold.

8.   Clear **Missed Withhold**. Have the pc or student demo a missed withhold.

9.   Clear **Postulate**. Ask the pc or student if he's ever postulated anything. Have him tell you about it.

10.   Clear **Counter** (the prefix).

11.   Have the pc or student demo several examples of a postulate and a counter-postulate.

12.   Clear **hostile. Antagonism**.

13.   Clear **Suppress**. Have the pc Or student demo several different examples of how someone or something could be suppressed.

14.   Clear **Suppression**. Have the pc or student give you examples of suppression from movies he's seen or books he's read or suppression he's seen or experienced.

15.   Clear **Suppressive Person**. Have the pc or student demo the definitions.

16.   Clear **Suppressive Groups**.

17.   Clear **Roller-Coaster**. Have the pc or student demo roller-coaster. Ask him if he's ever been around anyone who roller-coastered. Let him tell you about it briefly if he wishes.

18.   Clear **Potential Trouble Source** (PTS). Have the pc or student demo this well.
         (If this step is being done by a Word Clearer in the course room, end off at this point
         and send the pc or student to the Examiner. Then, get him started on the Study Sec-
         tion. If being done in session, the auditor may continue with the Study Section.)

STUDY SECTION

19.   The following issues are to be read by the PTS student or pc, word cleared Method 4
         and starrated. This may be done in a course room, under the super-vision of the Course
         Supervisor or in session with an auditor.

                 HCOB 27 Sep 66   THE ANTI-SOCIAL PERSONALITY THE ANTI-SCIENTOLOGIST
                 HCOB 28 Nov 70   PSYCHOSIS
                 HCOB 24 Nov 65   SEARCH AND DISCOVERY
                 HCOB 12 Mar 68   MISTAKES, ANATOMY OF
                 BPL 5 Apr 72RC I   PTS TYPE A HANDLING
                 BTB 11 Nov 77   HANDLING PTS SITUATIONS
                 HCOB 24 Apr 72 I   PTS INTERVIEWS
                 HCOB 10 Aug 73   PTS HANDLING

20.   End off and send the pc or student to the Examiner. Route the pc's folder with all
         worksheets to the C/S who will examine them for thoroughness and completeness and
         then order the person's next step.

                                  _____

         Educating a PTS person is the key to putting him at cause over the PTS sit. Do this
PTS C/S-1 thoroughly and well. It is not to be considered a substitute for the full PTS/SP De-
tection, Routing and Handling Course, but will set up the PTS student or pc for a highly suc-
cessful PTS handling. These you get him signed up for the course.

         PTS tech is highly effective and powerful. Get the most out of it by applying it prop-
erly, with **education** as the first step.

                                                         L. RON HUBBARD
                                                         Founder

LRH:jk

PTS C/S-1 DEFINITIONS SHEET

AFFINITY

Degree of liking or affection or lack of it. Affinity is a tolerance of distance. A great affinity would be a tolerance of or liking of close proximity. A lack of affinity would be an intolerance of or dislike of close proximity. Affinity is one of the components of understanding; the other components being reality and communication. (Dianetics Today, Glossary)

REALITY

The degree of agreement reached by two ends of a communication line. In essence, it is the degree of duplication achieved between cause and effect. That which is real is real simply because it is agreed upon, and for no other reason. (Tech Dict)

COMMUNICATION

"The interchange of ideas or objects between two people or terminals. More precisely the definition of communication is the consideration and action of impelling an impulse or particle from source point across a distance to receipt point, with the intention of bringing into being at the receipt point a duplication and understanding of that which emanated from the source point." "The formula of communication is: Cause, Distance, Effect, with Intention, Attention and Duplication with Understanding." "Communication by definition does not need to be two-way. Communication is one of the component parts of understanding." (Tech Dict; HCOB 5 Apr 73 Reiss. 19 Sep 74 AXIOM 28 AMENDED; Dianetics Today, Glossary)

ARC BREAK

A sudden drop or cutting of one's affinity, reality, or communication with someone or something. Upsets with people or things come about because of a lessening or sundering of affinity, reality, or communication or understanding. It's called an ARC break instead of an upset, because, if one discovers which of the three points of understanding have been cut, one can bring about a rapid recovery in the person's state of mind. It is pronounced by its letters A-R-C break. (Tech Dict)

PROBLEM

Anything which has opposing sides of equal force; especially postulate-counter-postulate, intention-counter-intention or idea-counter-idea; and intention-counter-intention that worries the preclear (Dianetics Today Glossary)

OVERT

1. ... An aggressive or destructive act by the individual against one or more of the eight dynamics (self, family, group, mankind, animals or plants, mest, life or the infinite). (Dianetics Today, Glossary)

2. That thing which you do which you aren't willing to have happen to you. (Tech Dict)

WITHHOLD

An undisclosed harmful (contra-survival) act. (Dianetics Today, Glossary)

MISSED WITHHOLD

An undisclosed contra-survival act which has been restimulated by another but not disclosed. This is a withhold which another person nearly found out about, leaving the person with the withhold in a state of wondering whether his hidden deed is known or not. (Dianetics Today, Glossary)

POSTULATE

1. To conclude, decide or resolve a problem or to set a pattern for the future or to nullify a pattern of the past. (Tech Dict)

2. That self-determined thought which starts, stops or changes past, present or future efforts. (Tech Dict)

3. In Scientology the word postulate means to cause a thinkingness or consideration. It is a specially applied word and is defined as causative thinkingness. (Tech Dict)

COUNTER

1. Opposition, as in direction or purpose; for example countermarch, counteract. (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language)

HOSTILE

1. Of or pertaining to an enemy. (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language)

2. Feeling or showing enmity; antagonistic. (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language)

ANTAGONISM

1. Mutual resistance; opposition; hostility. (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language.)

2. The condition of being an opposing principle, force or factor. (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language)

SUPPRESS

1. To squash, to sit on, to make smaller, to refuse to let reach, to make uncertain about his reaching, to render or lessen in any way possible by any means possible. to the harm of the individual and for the fancied protection of a suppressor. (Tech Dict)

SUPPRESSION

1. Suppression is "a harmful intention or action against which one cannot fight back." Thus when one can do anything about it, it is less suppressive. (Tech Dict)

SUPPRESSIVE PERSON

1. A person with certain behavior characteristics and who suppresses other people in his vicinity and those other people when he suppresses them become PTS or potential trouble sources. (Tech Dict)

2. A person who has had a counter-postulate to the pc you are handling. (Tech Dict)

3. Is one that actively seeks to suppress or damage Scientology or a Scientologist by suppressive acts. (Tech Dict)

SUPPRESSIVE GROUPS

1. Are defined as those which seek to destroy Scientology or which specialize in injuring or killing persons or damaging their cases or which advocate suppression of mankind. (Tech Dict)

ROLLER-COASTER

1. A case that betters and worsens. A roller-coaster is always connected to a suppressive person and will not get steady gains until the suppressive is found on the case or the basic suppressive person earlier. Because the case doesn't get well he or she is a potential trouble source to us, to others and to himself. (Tech Dict)

2. Gets better, gets worse, gets better, gets worse. (Tech Dict)

POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE

1. Somebody who is connected with an SP who is invalidating him, his beingness, his processing, his life. (Tech Dict)

2. It means someone connected to a person or a group opposed to Scientology. It is a technical thing. It results in illness and roller-coaster and is the cause of illness and roller-coaster. (Tech Dict)

3. The PTS guy is fairly obvious. He's here, he's way up today and he's way down tomorrow and he gets a beautiful session and then he gets terribly ill. That's the history of his life. (Modern Management Technology Defined)

4. The mechanism of PTS is environmental menace that keeps something continually keyed-in. This can be a constant recurring somatic or continual, recurring pressure or a mass. The menace in the environment is not imaginary in such extreme cases. The action can be taken to key it out. But if the environmental menace is actual and persists it will just key-in again. This gives recurring pres-sure unrelieved by usual processing. (Modern Management Technology Defined)

SEARCH AND DISCOVERY

1. Search and discovery of suppression is called an "S and D." It locates the suppressive on the case. (HCOB 9 Nov 67, REVISION OF REMEDY A, REMEDY B AND S AND Ds)

"Remember that the real suppressive person (SP) was the one that wove a dangerous environment around the pc. To find that person is to open up the pc's present time perception or space. It's like pulling a wrapping of wool off the pc.

"The SP persuaded or caused the pc to believe the environment was dangerous and that it was always dangerous and so made the pc pull in and occupy less space and reach less.

"When the SP is really located and indicated the pc feels this impulse not to reach diminish and so his space opens up.

"The difference between a safe environment and a dangerous environment is only that a person is willing to reach and expand in a safe environment and reaches less and contracts in a dangerous environment.

"An SP wants the other person to reach less. Sometimes this is done by forcing the person to reach into danger and get hurt so that the person will thereafter reach less.

"The SP wants smaller, less powerful beings. The SP thinks that if another became powerful that one would attack the SP.

"The SP is totally insecure and is battling constantly in covert ways to make others less powerful and less able." (HCOB 5 Feb 66 S AND D WARNING)

Remimeo
All Supervisors
Student's Hat
HPCSC
Mini Crse Super Crse
Word Clearing Crse
Est Off Crse
Dept 13 Personnel

Word Clearing Series 32RA

URGENT – IMPORTANT – URGENT

*Vital for all Supervisors,
Est-Os, and Cramming Officers.*

WORD CLEARING METHOD 4

Tech and admin cramming officers, word clearers and course supervisors use method 4 word clearing when fishing for a misunderstood word. E.g. cramming officers use it to fish for misunderstood words concerning what the person is being crammed on. Word clearers use it on interns when the intern needs a retrain or retread or even if the intern is sent to cramming. Course supervisors use it in the classroom **continuously on non-F/N students** or queries.

The whole idea is the person requiring the method 4 word clearing has a cramming order or is not an F/Ning student because of confusion as a result of a misunderstood word, as per Word Clearing Series 16R or omitted materials.

Method 4 fishes for the misunderstood word, finds it, clears it to F/N, looks for another in the area until there are no more with an F/N VGIs, then moves to another area, handles that – eventually all the misunderstoods that resulted in the cramming order or non-F/N student are handled.

It requires no C/S OK for it to be done. Method 1 is not a prerequisite to method 4.

E-Meter Drill No. 21 is the E-Meter Drill to be drilled on method 4. It's the method of fishing for a cognition.

Requires proper application of TRs and metering. All supervisors, Est-Os, and Dept 13 personnel to check out on, drill, and *apply* this tech **as it is vital study tech**.

METHOD 4 WORD CLEARING

1. Give person the cans, state, "I am not auditing you."

2. Ask while watching the meter: "Is there any part of what you're studying you did not fully get?" Trace the read. Use "fishing for a cog" drill (per HCO B 25 June 70, Issue III) if needed. If no read the question may be varied, e.g.

    "Is there any part of the materials you're studying you disagree with?" or "Is there any part of what you're studying you feel you could not apply?" or "In (material being checked) is there anything you didn't understand?"

    Let the student tell you *briefly*. Do **not** tell him the data.

    Verify that his study pack is complete as the data might have been omitted. Also he might never have read the pack at all.

    If the data was missing do not go on to step 3. See that he gets the complete pack and reads it. Then repeat method 4.

    If the person just has not read the materials do not go on to 3 but get him to read the materials. Then repeat method 4.

3. Get what it is then ask: "What *word* was misunderstood just before that?" Meter reads, word clearer finds the word, never accepting a confusion but finds *the* word giving the read (SF, F, LF, BD), gets it looked up in a dictionary and used in sentences until it can be seen from the sentences that the student now understands the word and the word F/Ns. All the tools of study tech and word clearing are at the word clearer's disposal to take the word to F/N. The word clearer does not stop at one misunderstood but makes sure all are cleared.

4. Repeat 2 & 3 until the materials are fully cleared up and any and all misunderstoods or confusions handled.

5. If the action bogs when used in the classroom the student must be sent to Qual for handling and supervisor to cramming on TRs and metering and drilling on this procedure.

    The correct action is a **W/C Correction List done on the student and handled.**

    Of course if the above question F/Ns on asking, there would be no misunderstoods on the material being checked, but the person is in cramming, not an F/Ning student or whatever, so there obviously are misunderstood words to be found and handled.

    Look at HCO PL 16 Feb 72, *The Purpose of the Dept of Personnel Enhancement*. It says this Dept "reaches and looks for business all over the org and brings it in". So someone with stats down – student or post stats, confusion about what to do, overloaded, can't seem to handle it, how do you do this, etc. etc. are *all* indicators of misunderstood words as the person is saying confusion, confusion. Well, underneath the confusion is a misunderstood word just as Word Clearing 16R says.

Method 4 word clearing is what is used in doing and achieving the purpose of the Dept of Personnel Enhancement, HCO PL 16 Feb 72.

One of the ways the word clearers in this Dept do the job is using method 4 word clearing.

Method 4 is used by course supervisors to handle all student queries about contents of course materials.

The reason students ask questions about "What is meant" is because of omitted pack materials from their checksheet, failure to read what they have **or because of a misunderstood word just before they got confused**.

The super has to know only where the materials are **and be smart enough to do Method 4 instead of giving the student alter-ised answers that stop Scientology working.**

Word clearing, especially method 4, is how to get in HIGH CRIME HCO PL 7 FEB 1965, REISSUED 15 JUNE 70, "KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING".

Successful Course Supervision and successful Cramming require this action be fully known and u – s – e – d.

<div align="center">

KEEP SCIENTOLOGY

WORKING

</div>

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:clb.nt.rd

Word Clearing Series 42R

Tape Course Series 10

METHOD 4 NOTES

Too generalized a question in using method 4 defeats its use and can restimulate a person badly.

Example: "Is there anything in college you didn't understand?" That of course is just plain ridiculous as a question. "Have you ever heard anything you didn't understand?" would be similarly silly.

BREAK DOWN THE MATERIALS

When doing method 4 you have to break down the materials (put them into small separate units) in order to ask questions.

Example: We have papers 1 & 2, both on the same subject. The wrong question for method 4 would be "Is there anything in papers 1 & 2 you didn't understand?" and not even give him the papers to see! The right way to do it would be to take paper 1 and break it down into its obvious sections, give the person paper 1 and let him look at it. Point to its 1st section and say, "Is there anything you didn't understand in this section?" while watching the meter. Then point to next section, do the same. Finish paper 1. Then go to paper 2 and do it the same.

A person has to know what he's being asked about and has to be thinking of it when asked the question.

TAPES

Just as it would be ridiculous to ask, "Have you ever misunderstood anything you ever read?", it would be silly to ask, "Did you ever have a misunderstood on tape?"

The right way is to take the tape and put it on a machine and play a bit of it. And ask, "Is there anything in the first section of this tape you didn't understand?" while watching the

meter. Then high speed the tape forward to another area and do the same. Thus the tape is covered.

This can also be done from any tape notes, section by section.

BOOKS

Books are done chapter by chapter.

QUICKIE M4

Method 4 is defeated utterly by:

1. Bad metering,

2. Too general a question,

3. Not having the material to hand,

4. Not getting the person's attention on parts of the material,

5. Not taking each word found to F/N.

Quickie M4 misses. It sets the person up for a loss in his studying. And we want him to actually succeed in his study, don't we?

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.jh

PTS HANDLING

(PTS = Potential Trouble Source)

There are two stable data which anyone has to have, understand and **know are true** in order to obtain results in handling the person connected to suppressives.

These data are:

1. That all illness in greater or lesser degree and all foul-ups stem directly and only from a PTS condition.

2. That getting rid of the condition requires three basic actions: A. Discover. B. Handle or disconnect.

Persons called upon to handle PTS people can do so very easily, far more easily than they believe. Their basic stumbling block is thinking that there are exceptions or that there is other tech or that the two above data have modifiers or are not sweeping. The moment a person who is trying to handle PTSs gets persuaded there are other conditions or reasons or tech, he is at once lost and will lose the game and not obtain results. And this is very too bad because it is not difficult and the results are there to be obtained.

To turn someone who may be PTS over to an auditor just to have him mechanically audited may not be enough. In the first place this person may not have a clue what is meant by PTS and may be missing all manner of technical data on life and may be so overwhelmed by a suppressive person or group that he is quite incoherent. Thus just mechanically doing a process may miss the whole show as it misses the person's understanding of why it is being done.

A PTS person is rarely psychotic. But all psychotics are PTS if only to themselves. A PTS person may be in a state of deficiency or pathology which prevents a ready recovery, but at the same time he will not fully recover unless the PTS condition is also handled. For he became prone to deficiency or pathological illness because he was PTS. And unless the condition is relieved, no matter what medication or nutrition he may be given, he might not recover and certainly will not recover permanently. This seems to indicate that there are "other illnesses or reasons for illness besides being PTS". To be sure there are deficiencies and illnesses just as there are accidents and injuries. But strangely enough the person himself precipitates them because being PTS predisposes him to them. In a more garbled way, the medicos and nutritionists are always talking about "stress" causing illness. Lacking full tech they yet have an inkling that this is so because they see it is somehow true. They cannot handle it.

Yet they recognize it, and they state that it is a senior situation to various illnesses and accidents. Well, we have the tech of this in more ways than one.

What is this thing called "stress"? It is more than the medico defines it – he usually says it comes from operational or physical shock and in this he has too limited a view.

A person under stress is actually under a suppression on one or more dynamics.

If that suppression is located and the person handles or disconnects, the condition diminishes. If he also has all the engrams and ARC Breaks, problems, overts and withholds audited out triple flow and if **all** such areas of suppression are thus handled, the person would recover from anything caused by "stress".

Usually the person has insufficient understanding of life or any dynamic to grasp his own situation. He is confused. He believes all his illnesses are true because they occur in such heavy books!

At some time he was predisposed to illness or accidents. When a serious suppression then occurred he suffered a precipitation or occurrence of the accident or illness, and then with repeated similar suppressions on the same chain, the illness or tendency to accidents became prolonged or chronic.

To say then that a person is PTS to his current environment would be very limited as a diagnosis. If he continues to do or be something to which the suppressive person or group objected he may become or continue to be ill or have accidents.

Actually the problem of PTS is not very complicated. Once you have grasped the two data first given, the rest of it becomes simply an analysis of how they apply to this particular person. A PTS person can be markedly helped in three ways: (a) gaining an understanding of the tech of the condition (b) discovering to what or to whom he is PTS (c) handling or disconnecting.

Someone with the wish or duty to find and handle PTSs has an additional prior step: He must know how to recognize a PTS and how to handle them when recognized. Thus it is rather a waste of time to engage in this hunt unless one has been checked out on all the material on suppressives and PTSs and grasps it without misunderstoods. In other words the first step of the person is to get a grasp of the subject and its tech. This is not difficult to do; it may be a bit more difficult to learn to run an E-Meter and considerably more difficult to learn how to list for items, but there again this is possible and is much easier than trying to grope around guessing.

With this step done, a person has no real trouble recognizing PTS people and can have success in handling them which is very gratifying and rewarding. Let us consider the easiest level of approach:

I)   Give the person the simpler HCO Bs on the subject and let him study them so that he knows the elements like "PTS" and "Suppressive". He may just cognite right there and be much better. It has happened.

II) Have him discuss the illness or accident or condition, without much prodding or probing, that he thinks now may be the result of suppression. He will usually tell you it is

right here and now or was a short time ago and will be all set to explain it (without any relief) as stemming from his current environment or a recent one. If you let it go at that he would simply be a bit unhappy and not get well as he is discussing usually a late lock that has a lot of earlier material below it.

III) Ask when he recalls first having that illness or having such accidents. He will at once begin to roll this back and realize that it has happened before. You don't have to be auditing him as he is all too willing to talk about this in a most informal manner. He will get back to some early this-lifetime point usually.

VI) Now ask him who it was. He will usually tell you promptly. And, as you are not really auditing him and he isn't going backtrack and you are not trying to do more than key him out, you don't probe any further.

V) You will usually find that he has named a person to whom he is still connected! So you ask him whether he wants to handle or disconnect. Now as the sparks will really fly in his life if he dramatically disconnects and if he can't see how he can, you persuade him to begin to handle on a gradient scale. This may consist of imposing some slight discipline on him such as requiring him to actually answer his mail or write the person a pleasant good roads good weather note or to realistically look at how he estranged them. In short what is required in the handling is a low gradient. All you are trying to do is **move the PTS person from effect over to slight gentle cause**.

VI) Check with the person again, if he is handling, and coach him along, always at a gentle good roads and good weather level and no H E and R (Human Emotion and Reaction) if you please.

That is a simple handling. You can get complexities such as a person being PTS to an unknown person in his immediate vicinity that he may have to find before he can handle or disconnect. You can find people who can't remember more than a few years back. You can find anything you can find in a case. But simple handling ends when it looks pretty complex. And that's when you call in the auditor.

But this simple handling will get you quite a few stars in your crown. You will be amazed to find that while some of them don't instantly recover, medication, vitamins, minerals will now work when before they wouldn't. You may also get some instant recovers but realize that if they don't you have not failed.

The auditor can do "3 S&Ds" after this with much more effect as he isn't working with a completely uninformed person.

"3 S&Ds" only fail because of wrong items or because the auditor did not then put in triple rudiments on the items and then audit them out as engrams triple flow.

A being is rather complex. He may have a lot of sources of suppression. And it may take a lot of very light auditing to get him up to where he can do work on suppressives since these were, after all, the source of his overwhelm. And what he did to **them** might be more important than what they did to **him** but unless you unburden **him** he may not get around to realizing that.

You can run into a person who can only be handled by Expanded Dianetics.

But you have made an entrance and you have stirred things up and gotten him more aware and just that way you will find he is more at cause.

His illness or proneness to accidents may not be slight. You may succeed only to the point where he now has a chance, by nutrition, vitamins, minerals, medication, treatment, and above all, auditing, of getting well. Unless you jogged this condition, he had no chance at all: for becoming PTS is the first thing that happened to him on the subject of illness or accidents.

Further, if the person has had a lot of auditing and yet isn't progressing too well, your simple handling may all of a sudden cause him to line up his case.

So do not underestimate what you or an auditor can do for a PTS. And don't sell PTS tech short or neglect it. And don't continue to transfer or push off or even worse tolerate PTS conditions in people.

You **can** do something about it.

And so can they.

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

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

</div>

LRH:nt.rd

Remimeo
SSO
DPE
Ethics Officers
PTS/SP Checksheet

PTS DATA

Based on a recent pilot it has become quite obvious that a full and complete PTS handling would consist of:

A.   PTSness handled terminatedly by interview or auditing by a person trained on BPL 31 May 71RF.

B.   Complete study and pass on the PTS/SP Checksheet, BPL 31 May 71RF Re-Revised 4 Mar 77.

The correctly located suppressive, who is then handled based on a thorough understanding of the mechanics of PTS/SP phenomena form the simplicity that is PTS tech. The tech of locating the suppressive source is also fully covered in the PTS/SP Checksheet and is a vital prerequisite for PTS handlers.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

As assisted by CS-5

Revision assisted by
Anna Nordlof
Int Cross Check Br Dir Int HQ

LRH:IE:AN:nt.lf

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 27 OCTOBER 1964
(Re-issued on 23 June 1967)

(Replaces HCO Pol Ltr 5 Nov 1964)

Remimeo
Franchise
All Students
All staff
Registrars' Hats
Tech Hats
Qual Hats
HCO Hats

POLICIES ON PHYSICAL HEALING, INSANITY

AND POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES

It has been the long standing policy of Central Organizations to handle physical illness and insanity in the following manner.

HEALING

Any process labelled "healing", old or new refers to healing by mental and spiritual means and should therefore be looked upon as the relief of difficulties arising from mental and spiritual causes.

The proper procedure in being requested to heal some complained of physical disability is as follows:

1. Require a physical examination from whatever practitioners of the physical healing arts may be competent and available;

2. Clearly establish that the disability does not stem from immediately physical causes;

3. If the disability is pronounced to be curable within the skill of the physical practitioner and is in actual fact a disease or illness which surrenders to contemporary physical treatment, to require the person to be so treated before Scientology processing may be undertaken;

4. If, however, the physical practitioner's recommendation includes surgery or treatment of an unproven nature or the illness or disease cannot be accurately diagnosed as a specific physical illness or disease with a known cure, the person may be accepted for processing on the reasonable assumption that no purely physical illness is proven to exist, and that it is probably mental or spiritual in origin.

POLICIES REGARDING THE INSANE

With insane persons or persons with a proven record of insanity, do the following:

1. Establish to the best of your ability within reasonable administrative limits and known tests that any HGC pc accepted for processing does not have a history of deserved institutionalization in an insane asylum or similar place;

2. Process only those persons who have no such history;

3. Do not recommend any other treatment by practitioners in the field of insanity where there exists any evidence that such practitioners injure, disable or maltreat patients by violently reacting drugs, by painful shocks, surgery or other barbaric and outdated means of "mental treatment";

4. If no recommendation is possible under (3) above, recommend only rest and a change of environment, but not in a professional capacity.

POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES

Policies similar to those regarding physical illness and insanity exist for types of persons who have caused us considerable trouble.

These persons can be grouped under "Potential Trouble Sources". They include:

(a) Persons intimately connected with persons (such as marital or familial ties) of known antagonism to mental or spiritual treatment or Scientology. In practice such persons, even when they approach Scientology in a friendly fashion, have such pressure continually brought to bear upon them by persons with undue influence over them that they make very poor gains in processing and their interest is solely devoted to proving the antagonistic element wrong.

They, by experience, produce a great deal of trouble in the long run as their own condition does not improve adequately under such stresses to effectively combat the antagonism. Their present time problem cannot be reached as it is continuous, and so long as it remains so, they should not be accepted for auditing by any organization or auditor.

(b) Criminals with proven criminal records often continue to commit so many undetected harmful acts between sessions that they do not make adequate case gains and therefore should not be accepted for processing by organizations or auditors.

(c) Persons who have ever threatened to sue or embarrass or attack or who have publicly attacked Scientology or been a party to an attack and all their immediate families should never be accepted for processing by a Central Organization or an auditor. They have a history of only serving other ends than case gain and commonly again turn on the organization or auditor. They have already barred themselves out by their own overts against Scientology and are thereafter too difficult to help, since they cannot openly accept help from those they have tried to injure.

(d) Responsible-for-condition cases have been traced back to other causes for their condi-
     tion too often to be acceptable. By Responsible-for-condition cases is meant the per-
     son who insists a book or some auditor is "wholly responsible for the terrible condition
     I am in". Such cases demand unusual favours, free auditing, tremendous effort on the
     part of auditors. Review of these cases shows that they were in the same or worse con-
     dition long before auditing, that they are using a planned campaign to obtain auditing
     for nothing, that they are not as bad off as they claim, and that their antagonism ex-
     tends to anyone who seeks to help them, even their own families. Establish the rights
     of the matter and decide accordingly.

(e) Persons who are not being audited on their own determinism are a liability as they are
     forced into being processed by some other person and have no personal desire to be-
     come better. Quite on the contrary they usually want only to prove the person who
     wants them audited wrong and so do not get better. Until a personally determined goal
     to be processed occurs, the person will not benefit.

(f) Persons who "want to be processed to see if Scientology works" as their only reason
     for being audited have never been known to make gains as they do not participate.
     News reporters fall into this category. They should not be audited.

(g) Persons who claim that "if you help such and such a case" (at great and your expense)
     because somebody is rich or influential or the neighbours would be electrified should
     be ignored. Processing is designed for bettering individuals, not progressing by stunts
     or giving cases undue importance. Process only at convenience and usual arrange-
     ments. Make no extraordinary effort at the expense of other persons who do want
     processing for normal reasons. Not one of these arrangements has ever come off suc-
     cessfully as it has the unworthy goal of notoriety, not betterment.

(h) Persons who "have an open mind" but no personal hopes or desires for auditing or
     knowingness should be ignored, as they really don't have an open mind at all, but a
     lack of ability to decide about things and are seldom found to be very responsible and
     waste anyone's efforts "to convince them".

(i) Persons who do not believe anything or anyone can get better. They have a purpose
     for being audited entirely contrary to the auditor's and so in this conflict, do not bene-
     fit. When such persons are trained they use their training to degrade others. Thus they
     should not be accepted for training or auditing.

(j) Persons attempting to sit in judgement on Scientology in hearings or attempting to in-
     vestigate Scientology should be given no undue importance. One should not seek to
     instruct or assist them in any way. This includes judges, boards, newspaper reporters,
     magazine writers, etc. All efforts to be helpful or instructive have done nothing bene-
     ficial as their first idea is a firm "I don't know" and this usually ends with an equally
     firm "I don't know". If a person can't see for himself or judge from the obvious, then
     he does not have sufficient powers of observation even to sort out actual evidence. In
     legal matters, only take the obvious effective steps – carry on no crusades in court. In
     the matter of reporters, etc. it is not worth while to give them any time contrary to
     popular belief. They are given their story before they leave their editorial rooms and

you only strengthen what they have to say by saying anything. They are no public communication line that sways much. Policy is very definite. Ignore.

To summarize Potential Trouble Sources, the policy in general is to cut communication as the longer it is extended the more trouble they are. I know of no case where the types of persons listed above were handled by auditing or instruction. I know of many cases where they were handled by firm legal stands, by ignoring them until they changed their minds, or just turning one's back.

In applying such a policy of cut-communication one must also use judgement as there are exceptions in all things and to fail to handle a person's momentary upset in life or with us can be quite fatal. So these policies refer to non-Scientology persons in the main or persons who appear on the outer fringes and push toward us. When such a person bears any of the above designations we and the many are better off to ignore them.

Scientology works. You don't have to prove it to everyone. People don't deserve to have Scientology as a divine right, you know. They have to earn it. This has been true in every philosophy that sought to better man.

THE STRESS OF POLICY

All the above "Potential Trouble Sources" are also forbidden training and when a person being trained or audited is detected to belong under the above headings (a) to (j) he or she should be advised to terminate and accept refund which must be paid at once and the full explanation should be given them at that time. Thus the few may not, in their own turmoil, impede service to and the advance of the many. And the less enturbulence you put on your lines, the better, and the more people you will eventually help.

Scientology is an applied philosophy designed and developed to make the able more able. In this sphere it is tremendously successful.

Efforts to involve philosophy with medical imperialism, psychiatric sadism, the bigoted churchman, bring about a slowing of our progress.

These people are sick spiritually because of their own continuous harmful actions against patients and the society and are beyond our normal means to help.

These policies will continue in existence until such time as those interested care to invest the time and treasure necessary to build the institutions and re-educate the professions which now practice medical and physical mental healing, and this is definitely not within our time, but would belong to some remote future when more men are sane.

However, such a programme would depend upon the continued existence of the medical imperialist and the psychiatrist and as their more reprehensible activities are rather new and very radical they may be abandoned by public and government long before Scientology could help them. This is probably the more likely occurrence as even in Russia, the Communist has now forsworn all violent treatments of the insane according to their delegates to the

London Medical Conference of this year, and Russian practitioners look with contempt and scorn upon the Western psychiatrist. The medical doctor of England, taken over by Socialism, has lost his ambition for medical imperialism and has no contest with Scientology. In the United States the American Medical Association has become locked in mortal combat with the government and probably will be socialized entirely in a few years due to fee abuses and lack of gains. The medical doctor remains strong only in more backward small nations such as Australia where world trends are late in arriving.

Even the Church in Rome is considering a surrender of principles and amalgamation with other faiths in an effort to save a dwindling religious membership.

Thus there may be no medical practitioner as we know him left in a few decades. Membership in the psychiatric profession is declining.

In the place of these institutions, if we ever get around to them, we may find ourselves dealing with completely different practices in the fields of physical healing and the treatment of the insane. All we ask of them is that they are competent in their treatments and less greedy for monopoly than their predecessors. And if this is so, then our policies will then remain fully in force, but in a spirit of co-operation, not with the desire to protect ourselves and the public from them and the products of their bungling.

Ours are the powerful communication lines. They are powerful because they are theta lines. Entheta (enturbulated theta) obtains all its apparent power by being parasitic on theta lines. Only when you add the power of our lines to the weakness of entheta lines can they have strength.

Example: It was the FCDC communication to its own field about that government raid that (a) cost the most in cash and (b) did the most damage. You can actually ignore an entheta line in almost all cases without the faintest consequence. It only has power when we let it have power by answering it.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jw.cden

LEVEL IV

SEARCH AND DISCOVERY DATA

HOW A SUPPRESSIVE BECOMES ONE

Search and Discovery is being made and auditors are finding on one person and another "Myself". Well, just amongst us girls, of course, you are going to find it. One of the best reasons you are going to find it is that it is part of the R6 bank. The other reason you are going to find it is that after a person is totally overwhelmed by a Suppressive he assumes the valence of the Suppressive. And a person you would find that on has actually been pretty suppressive.

What you're doing is, you are pushing S & D to a point where you are clearing suppression. It wasn't intended to go that far.

If you were to ask the listing question however, "Name 'Myself'" or "Give 'Myself' a name", you would then get the Suppressive.

But this is getting very adventurous, because it is part of the R6 bank. It is getting very adventurous to do anything about it. We seem to be happy about having "Myself". I would just let them go right on being happy about it. With skill you probably could bring out the identity of this person whose valence had come over them. It would all depend on the auditor who is doing it. If I were doing it, I'd go ahead and break it down. But not a Class III auditor who is not sure what he is going up against, who is repeating the word several times, repeating the question, trying to check it to make sure the listing question is clean. Don't you see, you are never going to get that listing question clean. That I assure you. That question can't be listed out.

That is the mechanism of suppression overwhelming a person. Oddly enough you will only find it on persons who are suppressive and of course you've walked into the real mechanism of how does a Suppressive become a Suppressive? He becomes a Suppressive by taking over the valence of a Suppressive.

Then when you list it out you get "Myself" and this is compounded by the fact that it's part of the R6 bank so you don't dare do much with it but it will let a bunch of steam off the case.

With some very, very, very, very upstage auditing, very careful indeed, give them the auditing question once, then say, "Go on and answer the question" but never repeat it, never

check the thing to find out if it's a clean list – you probably would get at least one recent SP out of that combination. How we do that at that stage when I've not worked with it technically I would not be able to tell you, but I just know that it would be very risky. It makes me feel like maybe I shouldn't do anything about it at all because it's too risky, but I can see somebody getting messed up.

THE MAIN TROUBLE IN S & D

Your main trouble in S & D is much worse than that – it is simply an inability to assess[*]. And auditors since time immemorial have had trouble assessing. They have two troubles in assessing. They underlist and they overlist. It's almost an accident that an auditor ever lists the right lists the right way. I'm not saying that sarcastically but it has been my experience in teaching auditors to assess that they have two faults, they underlist and they overlist.

If they do either one of these things, they are going to ARC Break the pc and then the list isn't going to be nullable because the pc is not responding to the auditor's voice as well, and it quite often was the first one on the list which is where they never looked. More fundamental than that is simply the problem of reading an E-Meter. Those technical facts are in the road of S & D.

ASSESSING AN S & D

Actually an auditor who can assess can pass off an S & D so fast it would be like dealing cards done by a Monte Carlo Vingt-et-Un player; he could just roll them off left, right and centre. There's no real trouble in it. It's a very fast action. It all depends on how much you want to keep the pc under tension in the action, because an assessment isn't auditing to begin with.

You would start Session with, "Sit down, I'm going to assess you now. Do you have some answers to this question. Brr. Brr. Brr." And the pc says, "I want to tell you about…" "All right, good, I'm glad you're going to tell me about that but right now I want some answers to this question." See? Then "brrrrr" on down and then you'll notice your needle relax. Then you say, "All right, now I'm going through this list." Ratatat, etc. "That's it, all right. Thanks very much." Pc cognites 10 minutes. Pc cognites and the Meter blows up and good indicators come in, and you've done an S & D. There is nothing more complicated than that.

You've got auditors who were trying to do an S & D in a session. You got them that are afraid the pc has already given it on the list. You got them that haven't learned how the Meter reacts when you've got a complete list. (A Meter just falls flat when you've got a complete list. The needle goes clean.) And you've got them that aren't sure that they've got any SP, and they just didn't see that the Meter did a surge on one of them. Then you get somebody who has overlisted and he's just ploughed the guy in, so he can't assess it back easily.

---

[*] Editor's note: At that time, "assessment" and "nulling" were not as clearly distinguished as later. See e.g. Technical Dictionary, "Assessment", Def. 4.

Then you get the fellow who had four of them fall. Certainly if you've got four falling there's two things that can be wrong at this point which makes it very difficult to run back. In one you have passed it. It's above the four which are falling. You've missed it, and the pc is simply discharging on it. And actually you can ask the pc which one was it and he'll say, "Well, it was Joe, of course." That's above the four. Practically every one after the right one will read, because it's actually blowing down all the time. He's no longer paying any attention to the auditor.

Then the other thing is you just haven't completed the list.

You have to make an opinion as to whether or not you've overlisted or underlisted. You can also pick up a dirty needle and an ARC Broken pc or protesty pc if you've gone by the right one.

Here are the evils of listing, and here are the evils of assessment showing up on S & D. They are simply auditor goofs – it's just lack of experience on the part of the auditor and lack of understanding of what he's supposed to be doing. But an auditor who can really assess can knock these things off. I'd spot what auditors can assess reliably, and I'd give them specialized jobs of that character that require listing. This is a very, very highly skilled action. You save a lot of time by pulling such an auditor back into specialty.

REVIEW ACTION

In Review you have to do it sometimes when it's been done. So you have the additional answer of "How do you patch up an assessment that's already been goofed?" And "Where is the list that was lost?" You've got the problem of the list that was completed out of session. "And I got home and was lying in bed…" and so forth. So in Review you always assume the pc continued the list after the session. If the pc is there as a flat ball bearing, you just automatically assume the pc thought of it afterwards or something. It isn't that the Tech auditor always got it.

I'll give you a tip in Qual. If you assume automatically that standard technology has not been applied, as your first gambit, in anybody that you're putting back together again, you'll about 99% be right. Somehow or other it slipped by in Tech. It slipped by. Somebody thought he did it. Somebody thought it was on the report. And therefore it looked like it didn't work or something. Something was there. And in all of my D of Ping I have not found it possible to detect all departures from tech by auditors. I've never been able to bat 1000 on that. Naturally, it's nearly impossible.

Technically, what you have to do doesn't mean that you have to invent technology because there are very standard answers to all these things.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml.rd

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 enslavers 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 loses 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 loses 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

RIGHTNESS AND WRONGNESS

A lecture given on 27 August 1963

Thank you.

All right. What is this?

Audience: August 27.

Twenty-seven August AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

All right. If I can get the text written on it, these two new students will be getting Scientology – a Scientology One process known as "Acquaintance with Saint Hill." We're making strides here at an incredible rate of speed on a lot of things, and I've been working hard on getting processes arranged as to their exact uses and getting exactly what you can do with a case and how to put a pc's tone arm exactly under the auditor's control so the auditor doesn't have to worry about it and so forth.

There have been quite a few breakthroughs of great importance here recently. And all this stuff is going down in bulletin form, and I thought this morning – I was sitting there, I was thinking to myself, "Well, this morning, here I should be putting it all down in a bulletin; I'll probably go out there and put it in – down in a lecture," don't you see? And then having put it down in a lecture, then I won't bother to put it down in a bulletin, you see? Then you'll all forget about it because it was just in a lecture, don't you see? Horrible. So it left me in between, you see? So I didn't know whether to give you a lecture on the subject of what I was currently doing, you see, and what you needed to know, or throw away the lecture and put it down in a bulletin, and it left me in a terrible confusion. So I guess the best way to resolve the confusion is just tell you what I know about it – and also write it down in the bulletin. But you probably won't see the bulletin for a long time, so you better get it here.

Very complicated. Are you sufficiently confused about it? If I keep on this way, you see, you won't in a moment know whether you're reading a bulletin or listening to a lecture. [laughter] And this is Russian technology, Russian technology: how to convince somebody that black is white and that he's somewhere else when he isn't.

Lubyanka Prison, I think, they practice this sort of thing. A guy is walking down to an interrogation, a woman dentist will step out from a secret door in the hall and start examining his teeth. See, totally non sequitur. The guy is trying to understand this, you see? And while he's busy trying to understand this, something else unpredictable happens to him, see? Guys come in looking tough with big rubber hoses, and so forth, and offer him a cigarette and talk

about his wife, you know? It's all *th-th-th-th-th-th,* see? When he gets through, he doesn't know what he is or where he is, so he joins the communists.

The use to which mental technology is put in this universe, remember, is put that way and is put to the use it is put to in this universe because people don't know what they're doing, because there is no mental technology.

Now, if you stop and think about it for a moment, the purposes of mental technology must consist of survival, with its consequent domination – necessity to – and must, therefore, thereafter, consist of being right and wrong. It may be somewhat mysterious to you how these three things fit together in a channel, but they do. This fellow is trying to be right, trying to be right, trying to be right. Why is he trying to be right? He's trying to be right about the most aberrated things you ever heard of. He's always trying to be right.

If you as an auditor look at this bloke who is suffering from alcoholism or dope addiction or something like this, there's one thing that you can always be right about, see? It might be that it was made available to him while he was in high school and he was being blackmailed into it and he was this and that. And it might be this and it might be that and it might be something else, and it might be because his medulla oblongata has slipped – a lot of might-be's, might-be's, might-be's – but in actual fact all he's trying to do is be right. And if you want to be right about him, then you should realize that the reason he is drinking or hitting dope or something like that, or doing anything else he's doing, or cooking bad dinners or anything else – whatever else this person is doing which is apparently weird or contrasurvival – is in actual fact his effort to be right. And you can always be right about somebody's aberrations when you recognize they're trying to be right. That is the lowest ebb of aberration. Sounds completely weird.

Well, that's because a thetan can't do anything else but survive, and in order to survive you have to be right more than you're wrong, so you get obsessed in being right. This is elementary, my dear Watson. Do you follow that?

If you go out here and make a practice of being wrong, wrong, wrong, wrong, wrong, you're not going to survive. See, if you're always going to be wrong – you go out here and you get on a motorcycle, and you turn the petrol on and you turn the spark on full, advance it all the way, and – particularly one of these big boys – and kick the kick starter, and so forth, you sail somewhat gracefully over between the handlebars because the machine kicks back. Well, if you consistently do this, why, you're apt to be nonsurvival in the extreme. You follow this? So, actually, right and wrong are the tools of survival and nonsurvival.

In order to survive, you have to be right. In order to get somebody else to succumb, they have to be wrong. You follow this?

You see, actually, no great military commander ever wins a battle on anything else but the wrongnesses of the enemy. And he compounds these wrongnesses up to a total attack which really makes them wrong. So even they realize they are wrong, and of course at that moment they no longer survive. And the point you degenerate into succumb from survive is the point where you recognize you are wrong. That is the beginning of succumb – the recognition that you are wrong.

Naturally then, if that is true – and that is true; that's not sensible, it's true – naturally this follows, then, that if a person is surviving at all, if they are "thetaning" at all, no matter inside of what mass, there must be some residual rightness, even if it's only an insistence upon rightness. So rightness goes hand in glove, immediately, with survival.

So this works itself back and forth into an aberrated A=A=A. If the individual is surviving, he must be right. It can even go to – if an individual is undertaking an action, it must be a right action, if he is surviving. Do you see how A=A=A this becomes. In fact, it becomes complete idiocy from the lucidity of its beginning, because in actual fact there was no reason for a thetan to worry about survival in the first place.

See, he has to enter this lie into the scene before he gets off into this other series of lies. He starts worrying about his own survival. Now, we can well ask, "How does he start worrying about his own survival?" Well, he worries about the survival of something else and then identifies himself with it. You see? He says, "This thing has got to survive, and I am it, so therefore..." and here he comes, his next lie – and he needn't make this fantastic lie at all, but they manage it – and that is "I am now worried about my survival." And actually, it isn't until he takes that step that he goes halfway round the bend. See, he's practically finished now.

There is no reason at all, just because you have built a bunch of sand castles and are protecting these sand castles from destruction by the tide or naughty boys – there's no reason at all that you can't go on protecting these sand castles ad infinitum and safeguarding their survival. You don't have to take the idiot step of becoming a sand castle. See? It isn't until the individual takes that idiot step of becoming a sand castle that he himself becomes worried about his own survival. But at the moment he becomes worried about his own survival, he then enters into the necessity to dominate in order to continue to survive. Best way to protect your sand castles, of course, is to dominate anybody who would threaten to destroy your sand castles. That's elementary, isn't it? You have to be tougher than the other tough boys on the beach, in other words. You have to dominate their behavior to the degree of restraining them from destroying the sand castles. This makes domination a necessity, if you've already entered the game of survival. See, you don't even have to have become a sand castle to start dominating.

Now, what happens now? What happens now? The game of domination consists of being right and making the other fellow wrong. And that is all the game consists of. There isn't any other – I mean, out of this vast universe, you finally shake out this one little, tiny, idiotic simplicity, you know, and it all makes everything look silly, you know, when you come to think about it.

Russia and the United States – the great game. Well, that's silly! The game is silly. Russia has to dominate the United States in order to survive; therefore, capitalism has to be wrong; therefore, communism has to be right. The United States has to dominate Russia in order to survive, so communism has to be wrong and capitalism has to be right. What's wrong with this? Well, what's wrong with this is there isn't any capitalism to amount to anything. Ha! And there's practically no communism. That's getting idiotic about that stage of the game, you see? Anybody can see that one.

But let's go back to why does Russia have to dominate the United States and why does the United States have to dominate Russia. Well, that's because Russia is liable to destroy everything in the United States, and the United States is liable to destroy everything in Russia. Now, let's look at this a little more closely.

Why are they liable to destroy everything in the United States and Russia? Why is this liable to happen? I don't think you have any more answer than anybody else does. Exactly why? Well, that's because Russia is threatening to destroy everything in the United States, and the United States is threatening to destroy everything in Russia. And that's why the United States have to be very careful not to be destroyed by Russia, and Russia has to be very careful not to be destroyed by the United States. You see, this is very elementary.

You work this thing out. You don't need these Ruskian idiocies pronounced at great length to explain the international situation, to see, actually, what is taking place. Yes, but Russia is devoting so much of her production capacity to weapons and rocketry and other things in order to dominate the United States, that communism is failing. And the United States is devoting so much of its production capacity – it actually amounts now to three quarters of the total production capacity of the United States and three quarters of the total engineers, scientists and technicians of the United States are involved in this effort – that it is destroying capitalism. Because, you see, it "has to" in order to keep the effort going, in order not to be destroyed. Well, this is a typical game.

And you start examining this game on the basis of survive, dominate and right and wrong, and where's the right and wrong come in – you start to examine it, or examine any game on the basis of just these things: survival, domination and rightness and wrongness. Examine the game and immediately the rightness and wrongness that you see residual in it appears to be pretty mixed up.

Well, the United States would be very wrong to destroy its economic stability and prosperity in order to destroy communistic economic dominance or prosperity, see? And reversely, communism would be very wrong to destroy any benefit residual in any communistic system, if there is any, in order to knock out the capitalistic lines, you see? She'd be wrong to do that, but she is doing it and she is doing it on the supposition that she is right. And the United States is doing all this on the supposition that it is right. So you'll see that A=A enters into the situation where rightness becomes wrongness. And people will defend the most fantastic wrongnesses on the basis that they are being right.

As you audit people, if you specialize in this particular line – as you audit them you will sometimes be appalled by the justification of the person's own actions. You're utterly appalled. Gauze is armor plate compared to the argument that they will put up, don't you see? I mean, they put up this thin facade. "Well, you see, the reason I left my wife – reason I left my wife is because she seldom, uh – very, very seldom, uh – was ever home, you see, to put out my bedroom slippers. And therefore, I had to leave her."

"Well, why wasn't she home?"

"Well, she was working and supporting me."

And you say, "End of scene. *Rm-rm-rm*." [laughs]

And yet he will go right on leaving, you see, and staying "left," and perpetuate this action and defend it down to his last breath.

I can see it now, the hammer and sickle flying over the White House, you know, and all of the arguments and press releases that are coming out from the White House saying, "Down with Russia," you see? "Down with Russia. We are absolutely right to continue to support capitalism."

Then you'll say finally, "Well, what is capitalism?"

"Well, capitalism is all the workers are told exactly where to work, and exactly how much they're going to get, and all the property belongs to the government, and a capitalist gives you a clenched-fist salute. That's what... And we are being right. This is a right action. And it's right, what we are doing."

Well, maybe the actions were sensible. If you look down along the line, you see, you'll see some sensible actions being – taking place, and this is what throws you. Because you can see some sensible actions going forward through all this, and you may understand some of this, but what you don't understand is how right this is, or why they don't recognize that the consequences of it are just wrongness, and that they are actually being very wrong while they are saying they are being very right.

You go over to Russia and say, "How come you got income tax these days, bud? How come your workers all get different rates of pay, and status symbols seem to be entering in here, and what's all this about some unions being organized, and well, what's all this going on here? This doesn't look like communism to me."

"Oh, yes, yes, yeah. Oh, this – this is communism. This is communism. You see, a good communist – a good communist loans money at interest. That's the definition of a good communist. And we're perfectly right in everything we are doing. And that is really correct communism."

And you look at this and it just becomes complete idiocy to you. You don't see whether you are coming or going, you see? What is all this about?

Well, you see this sort of thing taking place on the international front. It's very, very easy to recognize at that level of action. Very easy to recognize. But it's not quite so easy to recognize when you see this skid-row bum. He's just all soiled from having spent the night in the gutter, you see? And you smell the canned heat on his breath, you know? And there he is, you see? He's about ready to hit the chutes. Now somebody tells you, "Why is he doing it?"

"He is doing it because it is a right action."

You say, "Oh, no!"

"Yes," you say, "he's being right. He is asserting the rightness of being a skid-row bum and canned heat and all the rest of that. And he's asserting that as a rightness. And that is why he is doing it."

Well, you see, you've undercut the simplicity and you've left a large zone of unreality, because the society itself has worked out all kinds of rightnesses and wrongnesses on its own bat as to why he's a canned-heat eater, see? They worked out this fantastic... "Well," they say,

"after all, he probably had few opportunities in his youth." The guys who want more appropriation for the university say he never had a chance to get a university education, you see? The milk producers who want to sell more milk said, "Didn't have enough milk and there wasn't enough strontium 90 in it."

Everybody has got explanations for this, so you come down to the final, last-ditch explanation, which is the right one, and nobody recognizes the rightness of the explanation. He is asserting the rightness of eating canned heat. Why? Because everybody has always tried to make him wrong. His automatic response is to be right, so he has no choice but to eat canned heat. Get the idea?

Now, if he at any given instant says, "I am wrong to eat canned heat," he'll collapse. He's finished. He may go into a coma. He may even die. I mean, it's on that elementary basis. It's a fantastically elementary situation.

What is it all about? Well, behavior doesn't necessarily have everything to do with the whole track, you understand? Behavior is behavior, and then people have tried to aberrate it one way or the other and have tried to twist it around one way or the other and mess it up and make people do some other way, but the science of life still remains the science of life.

The factors of life still remain the factors of life. And if you were to delete all of the GPMs and incidents and everything else, you would not have removed the basic laws on which Scientology is built. That's interesting, isn't it? Come to think about it, you get so involved in erasing things. These simply enforce and exaggerate and destroy freedom of choice. They destroy freedom of choice over the exercise of the ability to be happy or powerful or normal or active, or something of the sort. They destroy power. They destroy freedom of choice. They destroy the ability to be self-determined or to be pan-determined about things. They make a person one-sided about everything under the sun, you see?

And they simply use basic and residual law – unwittingly, by the way – to exaggerate certain things which then lead a person to enslave himself. And the basic mechanism of enslavement is survival – the insistence upon surviving, followed by the necessity to dominate, followed by, then, the necessity to be right or wrong. The necessity to be right or wrong then becomes as irrational as the original postulate to survive. And these postulates go downhill, and you will find in them the most incredible situations you will find. You will blink – I told you about this, you look for it. And one of these days you are really going to blink at what somebody is doing in order to be right. They just become totally concentrated on the last way they can be right. This is how they can be right! And everybody's working all around them, on top of them, pounding them, publicizing them, kicking their head in on the subject, and the more that people kick, why, there it is.

Then the person will go more degraded. You'll see sometimes a person who is only nominally degraded – they're a politician or something like that, see? And you'll see this person go downhill and become a covert criminal and slip a little bit further and a little bit further. And you'll see him out lecturing for the Salvation Army, protesting against the very thing which they recently held to be right. This individual has sort of died a death now. He is talking about going to heaven. He's talking about being dead. That is mainly what he's talking about.

You very often go into – you go into a church of one of these older faiths, and you'll find the minister up there haranguing and screaming, you know, about "the evils of the demon rum," or something like that, to the congregation. "Stay ye away from that pub, bud," you know? Yelling, you know? And he goes back to his study, you see, and he takes this little nip of medicine to fortify himself, you see, after the exertions of his lecture.

Now, these birds who are working this hard were working inevitably and invariable in the field and area of death, because they are right down to the point where you get an aberrated rightness and wrongness; cessation of survival is so threatened that it becomes imminent. It actually gets dramatized before it happens.

And you'll see somebody turning against religion because of the amount of hypocrisy in it. You know, the guy is saying, "Well..." Well, the Roman Catholic church probably lost its grip on the world which it's trying to reassert now by killing off the Buddhist. I beg your pardon, the better interpretation is that it's only those in charge in Vietnam who are members of the Catholic church. That actually isn't everybody. There are some Presbyterians there, too, in the American troops, and so forth.

I have opened up a chapter here which is leaving you blinking just a little bit.

I'm sure somebody is going to make the assumption sooner or later, though, that if the only government in the world being maintained in force actively by US arms is a Catholic government, that that government's turning against another religion has something to do with something here that we haven't quite put the finger on. And we add to the fact that that same government is attacking the only other organization on the face of Earth who doesn't believe in death forever, we begin to ask interesting questions. You probably hadn't linked the attacks on the Buddhist up with US arms supporting the government of Vietnam, nor the attacks of the FDA against the FCDC in Washington, DC.

Yeah, everybody else is all right. Criminals, they're fine, and so forth. Everybody's all right. But it's just these two organizations on the face of Earth plus one other, the Theosophists, who talk about reincarnation and who talk about coming back to life again and who talk about these other things. And it's an oddity that just in the last two or three years all three of these organizations have been furiously attacked by the US government.

Sort of an interesting puzzle, isn't it? Well, don't worry about it. We'll get there before they do. This is just an interjected thing.

Now, they're evidently asserting a rightness about death. I know it's mean of me, it's cabalist, it's rabble-rousing for me to infer that the majesty of government is actually being used to further some foul, religious end in some way and to cause everybody to be dead. But I'm very interested in the fact that the Church of England, of all organizations, right down here in the form of a vicar (who, I think, has had to move since)... this bird – I'm looking at a face or two here who were present in this – was being very censorious about our giving death lessons to young children. Story went around the world. What do you think this guy does every time he stands up there in the pulpit? It gives one to wonder, you know? He's talking about going to heaven and all this sort of thing. He's giving death lessons to little kids.

Diana came home from school one day crying. She was going to a local school up here. She wanted to know if all this stuff about poor Christ was true. And I gave her the hot dope, and [laughter] – well, as a matter of fact, I did. I was very reasonable about the whole thing. I said, "Native populaces have their religious beliefs, and wherever you are, you must remain tolerant of the current beliefs," and so forth, and she took this in.

But it's interesting that this bird down here is asserting how wrong it is, don't you see, to give children death lessons while he himself is giving them death lessons. Only our death lessons are straight dope – this is what happens with regard to death – but his are a darn lie. Somehow or another, this makes him right. How does this make him right? Well, you can just go round in circles trying to figure out what's the rightness and wrongness of this, you see? Why should a powerful state attack a truthful philosophy, you see? Why, you know, why some of the calmest and most decent people in Asia – the Buddhists – why are these people being attacked and shot down and their pagodas burned and that sort of thing Why? What...? And you can go round and round and you can get real confused and you can get real upset.

Well, there's always one stable datum. There's always one stable datum: Somehow, whatever they're doing – no matter how mad the action may appear – is undertaken by them to be right. Now, you would actually have to get them on a meter or get them to explain and put in a long, long itsa line on this subject and get off the automaticities until they finally told you the rationale. And the reason it isn't a rationale is because A=A=A along the whole line. You just would not be able to believe how or why this guy had to, you know – canned heat.

You ask him a question, "Now, how does it make you right to eat canned heat?" You say, "Well, he sure can't answer that, you know, because – ha-ha! It's ruining him. Everybody has been down on him. The 'I Will Arise' and everybody else is jumping him about this, and he's been talked to by all the ministers and everybody. He's read about how the evils that it'll do and so forth. So, heh-heh, he can't defend this one." So, of course, one would never normally ask that question; say, "How does it make you right to eat canned heat?" See? Well, brother, only an auditor would be able to adventure this far, because you're going to get a screaming automaticity.

Well, it makes him right. "Eat canned heat? Well, that's..." Makes him right because *"Rah-da-da-da-da-da-da-da-da-da* and *ta-da-da-da-da-da,"* and that makes him right. And "*Ta-da-da-da-da,*" and that makes him right. And "...eat canned heat, and therefore this makes that right," and it's "That right and that right, and so forth, and so on and so on and so on and so on and..." I mean, you finally get through, this thing has practically wound itself around the dial.

And you say, "All right, now. Now, how does it make someone else wrong?"

"Oh, ha-ha-ha-ha-ha! So-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so, and so-and-so and so-and-so and my father, and so forth and so on. And I parked my bicycle on the church steps there one day, and that old minister came out and – and he actually had the police take away my bicycle, and so forth, and he always was lecturing on the lectures of drink, you see? The evils of drink and so forth and so on – ha-ha! There you are." The guy says, "Wait a minute. That isn't sensible."

And do you know, whether he has understood it very well or not, he will now have a very hard time eating canned heat. See, here's sanitariums, the Keeler Institute – Keeley, I think it is. (One has lie detectors and the other has alcoholism. I always got them mixed.) He's been there. He's been treated. He's been biochemically injected, you know? He's been psychoanalyzed. He's been everything you could think of, see? They've given him stuff that when he eats canned heat it makes him sick. He just goes right on eating canned heat. There wasn't any stopping it because of this block – this block he had. And that intention is the strongest intention in the universe. There is no stronger intention than that at a mental level.

Above that, of course, you have the effort to dominate, and above that level you have the effort to survive. These things are very strong, but I'm talking about a mental activity: a mental activity, a thinking activity, an intentional activity – strongest intention. Survival – that just happens, you see? Domination – that just happens. Those are not intended things. You get down along the line of *intended* and it's right and wrong. And that's where that lives.

This becomes very remarkable. We've got this teenage girl. We've got this teenage girl, and she's running around and having an awful time. And she's been arrested and lectured to and shown motion pictures and been horrified and hit over the head and defamed and threatened with kicking out of her home – that if she doesn't behave on the second dynamic, you see? And she goes right on misbehaving and that sort of thing and so on and so on and so on. Now, this is an actual case history.

I had one in my office one day. Changed her whole life – almost accidental. One of the research cases that furnishes data that leads to data of this particular kind. She was just trying to make her parents wrong. She realized it. That was the change of her behavior pattern, right there. We didn't even touch in that particular case on her trying to be right. She was just trying to make her parents wrong. Well, obviously, how could you make them wrong. Well, you could make them wrong by trying to make them change their mind on what they insisted upon the most. And the diagnosis of how do you make a person wrong is, what does that person most insist upon? Therefore, if that person most insists upon this particular factor, then that is the one you must make them wrong on.

So the criminal tries to make the forces of law and order wrong, you see? The diagnosis taken from the viewpoint of the being involved is simply, what are these persons insisting is wrong? What do these people insist is wrong? And then make them wrong on it. It's a perfect Q and A, see? What they say is wrong: make them wrong. You can't get a closer identification than that, you see? Mother is saying, "Be a good girl, daughter. Be a good girl, daughter. Be a good girl, daughter. Be a good girl, daughter." Daughter, getting more and more antagonistic against the old lady – she knows now exactly how to handle Mama. You make Mama wrong. How do you make Mama wrong? All you got to be is not a good daughter. Elementary, my dear Watson, see? It isn't what aberration the individual is dramatizing. It's what aberration does the individual dredge up in order to make somebody wrong. That's behavior. It isn't the accidental thing that you think it is.

So we've got a schoolteacher. And he says, "Children, you mustn't chew gum. Children, you mustn't chew gum. Children, you mustn't chew gum." Well, the characters that like him the least are going to chew gum. Don't you see? That's how to make him wrong. You

can't destroy him overtly with 16-inch guns, but you can cave him in trying to make him wrong covertly. And he'll sit around and worry about those children chewing gum. It does. It serves to cave him in, too, a little bit, you know – a little bit, a little bit, a little bit. He may even go away sometime and stop teaching school and leave the children alone, you see? This is fantastic.

So a government which is trying to conduct decent law and order has worked against it, continuously, this factor: that bringing about decent law and order is wrong. Now, a government with that force pushed against it continuously, endlessly, on and on and on, will eventually come to the realization of exactly what keeping law and order is: It's being as criminal as possible. See, it's been made wrong to the point where it now identifies the right label with the wrong action. It knows how to be wrong: to be a decent government.

See, on this broader perimeter you watch this thing as it works its way out. If you can see that, it gives you a rather vast understanding of aberration. Now, whether or not you can reach this aberration is not the subject. This is simply, can you understand it?

Not whether or not you can reach it and do something about it with an E-Meter; because this particular rationale, although it is very true, happens to have been booby-trapped by some very evil-intentioned characters on the whole track, who implanted goals which contain – and items and implants and GPMs – which contain in them right and wrong.

And you start running an individual very long on rightness or wrongness, he is liable to collide with one of these implants and it goes into restimulation, and the cure is therefore barred. And you're unable to cure him of this particular thing, because you can't audit him on the process necessary to resolve that particular facet of aberration. This is a barrier, in other words, that's been installed. It is totally accidental that right and wrong are there, and he is not acting the way he is acting because he has that GPM.

Now, get that through your head, see? He's not. That just intensifies this action, but it doesn't bring about that action. That action would, in any event, exist whether or not there had ever been an implanter or not. But unfortunately there have been some of these implants, so you can't ordinarily say with complete security – oh, yes, you can without any security, and often get away with it – ask this little girl, "Now, how does being sexually promiscuous make you right, and who does it make wrong, and how does it make them wrong?" see, and get those two things worked out, and all of a sudden she's completely reformed. She isn't doing this at all. Oddly enough, she's no longer able – this isn't necessarily making her well – she's just no longer able to get the power into it that she had in it; she's no longer this interested in it; she's no longer this fixated on it. Because in any itsa line you will tend to trigger out enough to deintensify the force and power and concentration of the aberration.

It's very interesting that aberration is very hard to maintain. Let's say this fellow is – he's an accident prone. He takes an automobile out and runs it into a brick wall; and he takes an automobile out and he runs it off the edge of an embankment; and he takes an automobile out and he runs into another automobile; and he takes an automobile out and he leaves it parked on the train track, and so forth. And you let him come anywhere near this automobile – well, all of us have accidents to some degree, but he is carrying it to excess.

And sooner or later somebody is going to notice the number of accidents this character has. And if you as an auditor noticed this and you were just doing this job just for this thing in view – is just knock out the number of accidents this character was having with an automobile – you could first find out what he is having. In other words, he might be having wrecks or he might be having accidents, don't you see? You have to find out "what is he having?" That is necessary, because you sometimes are very sure you know what the fellow is having, but that isn't what he is having, see? He might be having physical injury, see, not accidents at all. He might merely be having physical injury. So you have to isolate that factor, and that would be the stage of analysis.

This doesn't take very long, by the way. This is nothing very laborious. This is more or less off the cuff. Sometimes it's enough to listen to him on the subject of these things, and he labels it several times for you, so you just use it, you see? That's the ordinary off the cuff assessment. Nevertheless, you have to dignify it with an assessment. It's also the clarification of the auditing command. You say, "All right. Now, how would an automobile accident make you right?" or "How has it made you right?" or any such thing as this. And you expect he's going to have to sit there and fumble with this for quite a while. Oh, no, brother! That is – if you've spotted it – that is sitting right on top. That's the easiest itsa line you ever had anything to do with: *"Brrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr, and rrrrr-rrrr. And also rrrr-rrrr-rrrr-rrrr-rrrrr."*

All right. Now, you've got to keep this thing balanced because you might run into a GPM, so don't leave him on one side of it, see? You see, the GPM would say just right and wrong. You've personalized it, so it's "How would it make *you* right?" and "How would it make *them* (or another) wrong." do you understand? *Them* wrong, *you* right. That is the way you bias this thing. You understand, the GPM is totally – it doesn't care. There's just a right and a wrong, so that you could also play this thing the other way to, as far as the GPM is concerned but not as far as the aberration is concerned. Life is what has thrown this thing awry.

All right. So, we say to this fellow, then, when he runs down and starts to catch his breath on the subject, and the automaticities are out of the way – you have to sort of sit back and wait for the automaticities to roll on this kind of a process – you say to the individual, "How would it make another or others wrong" or "Who would it make wrong and how?" I don't care how you put it, you see? But it's "who wrong" out that way, you see, and "you right." That's the way the question has to be designed. And if the question is completely designed in this fashion, you will get another rolling avalanche that will finally wind up with some earlier life – that is, this-life, usually – key-in, cognition, of some kind or another. He'll find the first person he's trying to leave – make wrong on it. Very often this happens.

You don't have to direct it very much. He'll do most of his direction on it. Then you turn around and you ask him again, "Well, how would it make you right and how would it make you wrong." Well, it tends to make a repetitive-type process out of it.

I'm not actually giving you a repetitive process. For instance, I'm looking at a student here that'll be going over to a Central Organization soon. There's two or three bad boys around that organization that have been raising hell with themselves and everybody else. It'd take, in actual fact, a good itsa line and two questions to resolve the whole ruddy mess. "How does borrowing money make you right?" And a half an hour later, "How does borrowing

money make others wrong." Now, it might not even be real to him, and he might have an awful time doing it, but that's the end of that behavior.

Now, this is processing actually below the level of recognition or cognition. You can dig this one awful deep with a pickax. You can also do some weird things to a case in changing its behavior, going along this line. But too much of a good thing is too much of a good thing, and it's a hunt-and-punch process. In actual fact, contained in this is the answer to neurosis.

Neurosis could be defined as an antisocial action or an antisurvival action which is compulsively undertaken by the individual. We just wrapped up the work of Sigmund Freud. It's as elementary as that. You understand we didn't – if you don't intend to make the person happy, and don't intend to make the person cheerful, don't intend anything except just to keep the person – fit the person better into the social framework, and if that's all that mental therapy is for, why, you got it wrapped up. I think it's faster than implanting.

Now, in the first place, the only condition for this sort of thing is we have to be more capable of communicating, perhaps. We have to be able to communicate to the person in that we would have to listen to the person. We'd have to listen to the person. We'd have to ask the person a question. But we'd also have to get our hands on the person in order to do that. The cowboy in the black hat has to get his hands on the person to implant him, too. And they also have to do some communication, too, don't they? And then they create a hell of an ARC break, don't they? I think they get twice as much aberrated behavior afterwards. I don't think it's a solution. I don't think the development of mental technology for the purpose of aberrating people down to a level of powerlessness where they won't bother us – I don't think that's a successful approach.

Well, let's just be practical. This has nothing to do with decency or overt-motivators or anything else. Let's just be cold-bloodedly practical, as cold-bloodedly practical as these characters fancy themselves to be. I don't think that it's valuable. I don't think it's valuable technology. It's valuable to know about it, of course, from your point of view. But as far as knowing how to implant people and calling that a mental technology, or knowing how to give somebody a transorbital leukotomy and calling that mental healing, knowing how to shoot somebody with some weird powder or something of the sort that makes them bounce about in the middle of the floor for an hour or two, it looks to me like all of those lines of action are unsuccessful. I don't think they're successful. They always have a hole in them, and the hole in them is that survival can futurely be threatened.

Suppose anybody ever undid it. I wish I had a nickel for every implant station that's ever been destroyed. I've known thetans to make a career out of it. In fact, I've known thetans to tilt a planet ten or fifteen degrees, with the equivalent avalanches and glacial epochs and so forth, or pull the air cover of a civilization just because it went on implanting. In fact, there's a lot of things happen because of this. Why? Because somebody was implanting. I don't think it's a sensible solution at all. In fact, I don't think it's a solution. I just think it's a dramatization of rightness and wrongness. I don't think there's any more intention behind it than that.

Look at the amount of time and effort and energy expended. Why, in any given day the appropriation of the US armed forces is probably less than the Marcabian appropriation

for the maintenance of implant stations. I think it's expensive. I just think they do it because they are trying to be right. I don't see any other reason for it at all. They're trying to be right and make others wrong. That's all.

Now, you can add political significance just as you can on Rusk's pronunciamentos: "NATO must be in accord with the Franco-Berlin Wall unity because the ruddy rods are all on the left side of the rifles," you see? "And therefore, all us Turks must pull together with all us Hungarians because the great entente of northern Rhodesia must be maintained," you see?

Well, it's not quite as insane as that, but in actual fact if you take it apart and examine it very carefully, the aggregate sum total of it is insane. It is not sensible. What's the end product of it? The end product of it is no solution and a worsening condition.

Now, whenever you see this rightness-and-wrongness situation where somebody is acting simply to be right and making others wrong simply to make others wrong – you know, there's no more action to it than that, no more reason to it than that – whenever you see that, you'll see a worsening condition. Wherever that zone and area is, you'll see things worsening.

The young girl trying to make her mother wrong with sexual misbehavior: that young girl is getting worse herself and is making her family worse, don't you see? In other words, it isn't that a status quo is being maintained. You're getting a dwindling spiral out of this sort of a thing, see? It's the last dregs of domination, this whole action, you see? No matter how covert it is, it's still an effort to dominate. It's like the guy lying on the ground with four knives in him, he's still being right and the enemy is still wrong. It's still his final effort, you see, to dominate the enemy. And many of these methods of dominating the enemy exist. And it's just an aberrated war which is in progress.

Now, we look over this implant situation as an implantation proposition, and we cannot really assign to it any improvement of circumstances. If any improvement of circumstances existed, it existed for such a short term as to render it relatively useless. A short term on the whole track might even go to a hundred thousand years. That's a short term. That's no duration for an empire. They might say, "Well, we've got it all licked here. We've got it all solved," but they haven't. They've just got a lid on, and you'll notice the situation deteriorates. The situation gets worse, gets worse, gets worse.

So that any activity that enters in upon this type of a rightness-wrongness solution – "We are doing what we are doing simply to be right and simply to make somebody else wrong" – any time any solution is entered which has that sole rationale, you can then expect a continuous worsening, not only of the person who is engaging in enforcing that solution, but also the people in that person's vicinity. So the whole thing becomes a dwindling spiral. This thing is going to develop a leak sooner or later. It's going to blow out at the edges, don't you see? Any such situation is going to go *blingo!* someplace or another, because it isn't a solution, it's a dramatization.

Now, you may not suspect it, but you are looking at the final ranks not only of neurosis but psychosis. That is the madman. That is the madman. He sees spiders on the wall. Medical treatment consists of telling him there are no spiders on the wall. This looks to me like one madman handling another madman, both with the same solution. The madman is saying, "I am being right and you are being wrong," and the person (quote) "handling his case"

(unquote) is saying, "I am being right and you are being wrong." Because of this basic agreement, you find many of these medicos winding up themselves in the padded cells.

First place, they don't understand what they are doing. And they don't understand that their solution is just as crazy as the patient's assertions.

Guy is having trouble thinking: cut his brain up. Can't think. Well, ding, ding, ding, here comes the wagon, man! This is nonsense, don't you see? I mean, there isn't anything to be gained in this. I don't see anything happening on the subject of medical mental healing but more insane people. The insane population of the world is going up, up, up, up, and the medical doctors say they've got to have more people to take care of these insane and there have got to be more buildings to take care of them. Statistics are increasing. Statistics are going up. There are more and more people going insane. And therefore, we got to have more doctors to make more people insane.

You begin to look at this after a while. You say, what the devil is wrong with a legislator who won't look over the fact the statistics are rising on insanity, therefore, the money we have been appropriating it for is being wasted? Obviously, there is no proper solution to this, we obviously have the wrong people on the job. But they never do this because they're engaged themselves in a rightness-wrongness type of piece of nonsense, and most of government is how to be wrong convincingly. So the end product of the thing is no solution, don't you see?

You want to know why they did this to you, or why you ever did something to somebody else. Well, in the final analysis, the overt-motivator sequence hinges, basically, simply upon this aberration concerning survival – the effort to dominate – which falls into a contest of "I'm right and you're wrong." Now, both sides are saying, "I'm right and you're wrong," and therefore, you get a double-clashing sort of a proposition. You have A saying, "I'm right and you're wrong"; you have B saying, "I'm right and you're wrong." You get a natural commingling of their ideas. After a while they don't know what the hell they're talking about. They don't know what's right. They don't even know what they started out to say was right, you see?

Now, a mental technology, so called, which engages itself upon the worsening of people, or making people wrong and making themselves right as an exclusive activity, is not in essence a very broad or a very intelligent technology. This is hardly worthy of the name "technology," yet it does have technology, don't you see? It certainly is not a mental science which embraces very much understanding. There's very little understanding involved in this thing. Something like the psychologist or Pavlov: if you put a young man on the table and make a dog bark, the young man slavers. (I'm being sarcastic.) Well, I don't know. I'm tempted to say on the subject, you see, "Well, I don't know. I look around and I'm not having any trouble with slavering dogs. I mean, why are we working on this problem?" It's as idiotic a statement, you see, as their own conclusions.

Stimulus-response mechanisms and so forth. Why be interested in a stimulus-response mechanism? Aw, that tells us right there that somebody must be, interested in being right and making the other fellow wrong. Don't you see? The stimulus-response mechanism – that's as far as they ever advanced. Stimulus-response mechanism. Well, stimulus-response be

damned. The consequences of the stimulus-response is what is – the Scientologist is interested in. And that goes at once into the overt-motivator sequence.

You move right on upstairs from stimulus-response, you see, into a proper piece of technology. They seem to have avoided that whole piece of technology. Why? Because they're only interested in being right and making somebody else wrong, don't you see?

Now, a mental science cannot be worthy of the name "mental science" if it keeps dramatizing an unknown one of its parts. See? That outlaws anything which continues to dramatize one of its parts, you see. It outlaws it from the proper name of a complete understanding. You said a science; a science would be a complete understanding of something. Well, if something is dramatizing one of its parts, it certainly does not have a complete understanding of life.

Now, the sciences of life are difficult just to this degree: You are living. See, you have a day-by-day interrelationship with the laws of life. And to rise superior to this, in any way whatsoever, is so phenomenal as not to have happened ever before. It's one of these tricks. It's by your own bootstraps, don't you see? And for a while, if you know all the aberrative angles, you find yourself batting about in the bottle like a bluefly, see? Every direction you fly, you run into something else. If you started analyzing your own behavior in a single day according to the basics that you know, and if you had all of them available in Scientology, you see – if you analyzed your behavior throughout any twenty-four-hour period, you'd find out, a short period of that time, somewhere along the line, you were dramatizing something. In fact, you wouldn't have to do very much analysis.

In fact, right now, all these people out in front of me are dramatizing breathing. Automaticity: they think to stay alive they have to breathe. You tell some doll that someplace and his jaw would drop, you know? You say, "Well, you can't live on Exnoo because there's no air." There'd be a lot of beings that would look at you awfully blankly.

"What you want air for? What's the air supposed to do?"

"Well, you know, air, you know, air – you got to have air, you got to have oxygen."

"What are you going to do on Exnoo that you need oxygen for?" They'd try to figure it out how you're going to put it in bottles or sell it or you... Maybe you got a new fuel for rocket ships has to do with oxygen; couldn't make... They'd finally understand what you were talking about. They'd finally understand that you were peculiar. [laughs] You get the idea?

The total cessation of the dramatization of the game called life, you see, renders one, at first glance, in a very confused situation, since he's trying not to dramatize its various parts, you see, and yet he inevitably must dramatize certain of its parts. And then he finally comes to the conclusion, "In order not to dramatize life, you climb away to a large cave on the side of a very bare mountain and hope people will put crusts of bread outside, while you sit and meditate and don't have anything whatsoever to do with life."

Now, by not having anything to do with life you have now rendered yourself free of dramatizing life. And oddly enough, there's enough workability to that. You get away from all restimulative factors and your restimulation dies down, you see? Get less restimulated, you feel quite calm. So you say, "Well, this is the way to do it. You don't be any part of life."

No. The real challenge of a science of life is to know it and be able to live – be able to live that life, you see? That's the real challenge, and oddly enough, if you know all the answers you can always do that. It isn't necessary – because you know a half a dozen lies, you see, that you think are answers, it isn't necessary to go crawling off to some cave all by your lonesome, you see? You can stand out in the middle of life and live life, don't you see?

The final challenge of a science of life is does it produce life? Not does it produce death.

When you analyze this thing all the way on down, it'll leave you kind of buggy at first. You get all sorts of weird ideas. "Well, maybe I ought to stop auditing. Maybe I ought to leave auditing. And maybe I ought to get back to my knitting or whatever else I was doing," don't you see? "And I ought to something or other."

And then you suddenly realize that what you're trying to do is drop part of what you were doing, you see, in order to get away from what you were dramatizing in order not to dramatize. You can get into an awful confused state, man. You can sit around for days trying to sort something out along those lines. Well, that's all right.

It's enough to realize, however, that you are in a situation where it can be sorted out. And that's a remarkable situation to be in. Very remarkable situation to be in.

Myself, I've had to groove off the importances of existence – what are the important things? – because time, making a problem, you see, has made it necessary to concentrate on certain importances of existence and wrap these various things up. Well, that's a very proper solution to the thing, but it certainly isn't inactive. It's flat out, man, flat out activity going along at a very high rate. I notice that there's more and more of a tendency – more and more of a tendency as one goes along the line – to recognize more and experience more life. He doesn't have to work so hard to experience life. That's one of the things.

Person who can't experience very much has to work very hard to experience something and get all involved trying to experience existence. Existence is all around them. Walk down the street and they're experiencing existence. But to convince themselves that they are surviving, they think they have to stand under a truck. And that is another way of going about it. They have to suffer impacts. They have to be in there living. What is living to them? Well, living, to them, you see – find to some degree, is being right. They have to be convinced that they are being right or convinced that they are surviving or convinced they are dominating something, you see?

And you take some king of olden times: why, there he sat upon his huge throne, and so forth, and all of his courtiers are saying *bog-bog* and *bow-bow* and walking backwards three quarters of the entrance hall, don't you see, and bumping into the guards and messing it up. All of which is simply designed to convince this fellow and convince others that he is dominating, you see?

Well, I'd say he couldn't have had much of an impression on people if he had to work at it that hard. That's simply the mechanisms of domination. You find anybody who has to work at it that hard, see, he's practically dead, man. He'd be gasping most of the time.

You find some teenager, for instance, out here going to dances and listening to music and diving and experiencing all sorts of weird new thrills and sensations and so forth; they're trying to convince themselves they're alive, don't you see? They're half-dead about nine-tenths of the time. But they're having a hard time of it.

But a science of life should bring about living.

Now, there is a level at which rightness and wrongness ceases to be analytical or comprehensible. And when we speak of aberration, it's when it drops below that point. It isn't that trying to be right is wrong: It's obsessively being right about something that's obviously wrong that goes loopy. See, that's when that mechanism goes astray, and the level of neurosis is only reached when the individual is no longer able to select his own courses of behavior, when he is obsessively following courses of behavior in order to be right.

Now, everybody has a few of these. You can all try them on for size. This fellow is – eats salads. He hates salads, but he eats salads, and you just get on this. "Is there anything you're doing that you really don't like to do?"

And this fellow says, "Oh, I just don't like to eat salads."

You say, "Well, how does eating salads make you right, and how does it make somebody else wrong?"

Now, you're going to get into an interesting situation where you're going to find out he has been already overwhelmed on the subject of salads. This thing is going to cross back the other way. It's a question of how was Mother right in making everybody wrong on the subject of salads, don't you see? And that is not a good processing question. That's somebody else's aberration, so we're not particularly interested in that.

So we just bring him up to that point and this thing will snap. You've got a lot of these things, but by and large they have no value. They have no value.

It isn't until a person reaches inability, weakness, stupidity and other suchlike things as a way to be right that the dwindling spiral is entered.

Now, he's being right by being unable. When you see that one loom over the horizon in any zone of behavior, you have approaching neuroses if it's not there already. And when a civilization goes all out for this, watch it, because it's going to be dead tomorrow. The dust is going to be moaning through its temples and the tumbleweed rolling down its freeways, because that civilization has already entered in upon the necessity to be unable in order to be right.

The way to make somebody else wrong, then, is to be nuts – incapable.

Now, a dramatization, any dramatization (entering in upon this whole field of mental science), which brings about a further disability is wrong for that civilization, no matter how right that civilization thinks it is. And anything which enters a civilization into more life, more livingness, more ARC and so forth is, of course, by basic definition, right for that civilization.

So, you see, it's also capable – this also renders itself susceptible to understanding what one should do, as well as knocking out neuroses. Now, anything that is mad in an indi-

vidual, at some higher level, was okay. All madness is simply an exaggeration of some ability or capability; it's some perversion or exaggeration of this.

Let us take in the lower rungs of it – well, let's take sexual misbehavior of some kind or another. This, of course, is a lower-harmonic enforcement of the ability to create, see, way upscale. By the time you get this thing all mixed up and clouded up, and this way and that way, you get it down here, you got some sexual disability of some kind or another, and that is how the person is still being right about this upper thing, you see? So these things really enter along this line. Way up here it was right – really right – you see? And then it came down a little bit, and it was a method of survival, and then it was a method of dominating, and then it was a method of being right in order to make others wrong. And then in that contest one got enough overts – the communication line did a switcheroo, don't you see – so what was right about it is now wrong about it, but what is wrong about it is now right about it. And we've got this thing all the way down to the bottom of the scale. It's very recognizable where it came from, but it's gone through all of this switcheroo, and down at the line it's practically unrecognizable from its immediate state as far as a person's behavior is concerned.

This fellow is an artist. He could paint. Let us say he could paint a side of a house, you see, you know, with a beautiful scene, you know. *Prrrrrooooom* – nothing to it, you know. And you find this fellow down there nursing a girl's shoe, you see, to his chest, you know? And he hides this all the time. It's a girl's shoe, and he sniffs it occasionally, you know, and it gives him kicks, you see? I mean, it's more or less the same channel, but there the upper-scale ability has become the lower-scale mockery.

And you get these lower-scale mockeries all the time get the upper-scale abilities in trouble. And once in a while you go around feeling ashamed of yourself for having suddenly thought you could do something about the United States or something like that because some nut in the booby hatch is talking all the time about doing something for the United States, don't you see?

Well, the difference is, is you probably could and he couldn't – a slight difference of ability.

Now, when you look over this whole panorama of behavior and what a person is trying to do, you enter in upon an ability to understand much of the nonsense which at the present moment you may only be protesting against. You just look around on it. But this task is rendered very difficult by the fact that the explanations so obscure the kernel of insanity of the rightness-wrongness that it's very hard to get at what they are really doing.

I don't know what the United States is doing today; maybe it's having a revolution. But it's being right about something. It's being right about something, and it's making people wrong about something. We're not sure what it is, but on a careful analysis or on an auditing level, we could discover those two points. The moment we discovered them, they'd all go unsnarl.

So a science of life actually is a science of examination of behavior, and behavior is based upon lots of ramifications, tremendous explanations in all directions, but narrowed right on down to the middle, looked at in its bare bones, it comes down to survival, dominate, rightness and wrongness. That becomes the main line of behavior. I hope sometime when

you're looking at somebody who is sitting there picking bugs off himself, one after the other, cockroach here and a cootie there, let us hope you don't jump back to keep them from getting on you. And let's hope also you don't try to convince him that there are no bugs there, because you are now playing the one game which makes him make you wrong, and at that moment, you will cut your communication line – just like that.

So now he has only one purpose in view, and that is to make you wrong and make himself right. And you can cave him in, you can deteriorate him, you can put him further downscale, but you can't bring him back up the line again. It's impossible. Because you've taken the one step to cut the communication line which could have made it all right. You see that?

So a dramatization of rightness and wrongness is not the answer to a dramatization of rightness and wrongness. And probably out of all the factors of a science of life, that one you would have to know, otherwise you would simply get trapped into the dwindling spiral of everything you tried to do anything about anyplace. It is the essential piece of understanding which is necessary to keep you free of going the chute. Okay?

Thank you.

HOW TO FIND A

SERVICE FACSIMILE

A lecture given on 4 September 1963

Thank you.

I'm very, very glad to announce that there are some of you who are not in trouble. Thought we'd start the lecture on a happy note.

What's the date?

Audience: Four September.

Four Sept. AD 13. Don't know what the month is named after, but probably something very barbaric.

Well, the shadow of your big toe has approached within several yards of a service facsimile. You remind me of a scout looking over a citadel which is bristling with guns and quite hostile, observing it from as far deep in the neighboring woods as you possibly can get. And I think maybe you've caught the tip of one turret or have seen a sign which says "Citadel." And I'm going to ask you now to be brave and even get out to the edge of the woods and take a look at this thing, because it's well worth looking at.

And perhaps the fault that you have not seen it is resident with me. It appears to be quite lucid to me; it doesn't seem to be offering very much complication and so on.

But I know what this breed of cat is. I myself have taken a look at it and have audited it and have seen the results of it, and over a period of years have had an unhappy history of colliding with it. You know, you're going down M1 there and you're wide open, you know, and everything is fine and I'll be a son of a gun if somebody hasn't piled barrels across the road, don't you see? And well, that's the end of that one, you see?

Pcs, pcs have always been full of surprises, and it's been of great interest to me to find out how they create these surprises. [laughs] And so I'm very, very happy with what we've got here in the service facsimile, because it is how they create these surprises and what happens. Apparently there's a great deal to know about this thing. And I have not, to any great degree, relayed this information even in the bulletin of R3SC. Apparently this takes a lot of grasp, basically because it's terribly simple. And it's not that anybody is protecting their service facsimile – you can almost wipe that out.

You head a person's attention toward the service facsimile, and they go right on in, man. They go down the toboggan and over the falls – crash! They are no more able to keep

out of the service facsimile than anything. And you needn't erect, now, a structure of philosophy to explain bad assessment by saying the pc will defend himself against his service fac being found. The pc will not. The pc gets to the middle of this whirlpool and just whirls. That's it, man. All you've got to do is swing him somewhere in the vicinity of the lake in which the whirlpool exists, and he dives right in and swims like mad and goes right to the whirlpool and says that's it – unless he's prevented from doing so.

My first plea, then, is don't prevent the pc from finding his service facsimile. That seems to be a rather obvious point to make, and I'm sorry that it sounds sardonic or sarcastic, but I'm afraid has to be made.

Because you could say, "Well, of course, if the pc counts on this for survival, he's not going to let it be found," you see? And you could go off on that line and make a lot of hard work for yourself, and actually it's not of that nature at all.

Now, there are so many ways of isolating a service facsimile that to cover the area of assessment at this particular stage of the game is merely to put in your hands a lot of rote this and that which will more assist you to miss the service facsimile than to find it. There is no substitute whatsoever for knowing what one is; there is no substitute at all.

Now, the service facsimile, first and foremost, is a tremendous solution which the pc believes, if disturbed, will end his survival. It is always an aberrated solution; it always exists in present time and is part of the environment of the pc. And it is something that everyone, unintentionally or otherwise, is telling the pc is wrong and causing him to assert that it is right.

Now, you get to understand a service facsimile a little bit better when you recognize that last point. That last point is very, very important. Otherwise, you're going to be running some of the silliest things and calling them service facsimiles, and you're not going to make the boat at all.

The environment, the mores, one or another dynamics, is insistently and constantly at work trying to tell the individual that the service facsimile is wrong, and the individual is constantly saying that it is right. And when you have that situation you have an unauditable pc, because he is getting audited only to prove that this is right and actually will constantly bring it up in auditing.

It is about as hard to find as a burning tar barrel in the middle of an empty field on a dark night, see?

The pc is always bringing this to the auditor's attention. This is so much the case that once you have found it you will consider that you have been very obtuse indeed. But sometimes it's being brought to the auditor's attention in different wordings, in different conduct, in different approaches that one doesn't find it easy to label. And it is probably labeling it that is harder than finding it.

Now, let us first look at the exact thing we are trying to do with a service facsimile – the exact thing we are trying to do with it; there is one thing we are trying to do with it – and then this will move out of your perimeter, as an auditor, any necessity of trying to use this principle to make an OT, because that is not what we're using it for.

I'll give you an idea now of this. Reg and I just had a discussion a moment ago, and he was saying, "Well, a human body would be a service facsimile." He's absolutely right. He's absolutely right. But this, of course, is being applied to going OT – not for the purpose we are applying it.

See, the remark is absolutely correct. It turns on mass. See? It is being asserted constantly, and so forth. Obviously it's a perfectly good service facsimile, you see? Well, all that's wrong with it is that it isn't the service facsimile we are trying to target. See? The wrong target. Because if you used that, you would be going to OT, don't you see? And we are not using the service facsimile for that. We're simply using it to get a person auditable, this lifetime, and get out of the road those constantly restimulated solutions that make it hard to audit this person. And that's its purpose. Its purpose is simply to clear this lifetime.

Now, I can give you some beauties on the application of the service facsimile on the whole track. What do you suppose you have a bank for? It obviously must be some sort of a service facsimile. Obviously; it turns on mass, doesn't it? It follows all of the rules.

Obviously, "How would having a bank make you right and others wrong," well, obviously – ha! – obviously would kill the pc. Why? Well, you'd just restimulate the whole early track and you'd throw him into countless GPMs and you'd overrestimulate him like mad. But obviously, according to the theory, it's a perfectly valid service facsimile. A reactive mind is a perfectly valid service facsimile, but not for the purposes that we are going to use this for.

It's well to remember the basic principles of the service facsimile when you are running somebody to OT, because sooner or later you're going to find this guy, and he just can't seem to get up to a point where he can tilt a planet. You're having trouble with this pc. He sits down there on one mountaintop, and you sit there on the other mountaintop and you're trying to audit him, see? And the E-Meter you use are the little glows that appear in the various parts of his vicinity. See, you say something; you see something glow, you say, "That read." [laughter] Probably your auditing commands are all in telepathy or something like this, but we don't care much about that. That's a good thing to remember. This guy just – he keeps complaining, complaining – ARC breaking. Weather gets terrible on the planet, you know – keeps ARC breaking. Thunderstorms and other things occur. And he's got this PTP, you see? He just can't tilt a planet. Weak. And I bid you remember this point, you see, that undoubtedly you are now bucking a service facsimile, see, which would probably, after you've talked for a while, add up to something like "being incapable."

And you ask him, "All right. How would being incapable make you right and how would it make others wrong?" and so forth. And you run it on up with just the same steps of R3SC. You undoubtedly got this boy flying again, you see, into some new zone or area.

So you're never really rid of the principles of the service facsimile. He's got some tremendous solution, and that solution is "being incapable." How does he survive? By being incapable. At what level? At some very upstage level of some kind or another, you see? All right. So that's perfectly valid.

So it'd be valid almost at any point of a case, but that isn't what we are using it for and that is not the design and style of R3SC. It's the same breed of cat – the same breed of cat. But

we are attacking here a solution which, just like any other solution, is a barrier to the discharge of the confusion.

What's made this possible is a new evaluation and a new road found through the bank on guess what? You've had a new communication level in auditing, and so forth, and that clarified a lot of things. But, of course, the service facsimile is born out of a reevaluation and a readjustment of the confusion and the stable datum – that basic; confusion and the stable datum.

The confusion can only stay in place as long as it has a stable datum to hang it up. Now, that is so light and so easily changed by a thetan or a being that this does not much get in anybody's road. It's only when it becomes an aberrated solution, the loss of which threatens survival, that the individual fails to be able to discharge the mass associated with it.

So if you could see confusion as a stable datum (you know those principles; they're old HCA principles), you should realize that you can actually pluck, out of the center of the confusion, the stable datum, and at that point get a discharge of the energy held in place. It's a new discovery, you see? What holds the confusion in place? A stable datum. That's a new thought, do you see, because you handle life all the time on the reverse line. You've got too much confusion, put a stable datum in and the confusion lines up on the stable datum. That's how you've been using it before.

All right, let's take a reverse look: How is the confusion held in place? The confusion is held in place by a stable datum. So the removal of the stable datum then discharges the confusion. And a confusion is a very good description of "what is charge?" Charge is an electrical confusion.

Now, as long as a stable datum is held in place by the person, the confusion will not discharge. Do you see this? So here's a new piece of advanced technology – rather remarkable piece of technology – that we have had around for a very long time and it's simply a reverse look at the thing, and we know now how to hold a confusion in place.

Now, fortunately for us – fortunately for us – confusions are tolerable and not always aberrative. In fact, the biggest part of the confusions of life are not at all aberrative; they could go on for a long time without hurting any thetan or incapacitating him for a moment.

You're playing a card game; you're playing a card game and you're having an awful time playing this card game. You just never seem to really get anyplace playing this card game. And you discover a little booklet and it says "How You Play Canasta," see? And you read over this booklet and it gives you some hot dope on the thing, and after that you can play canasta. This is just about as aberrative as eating blueberry pie. You understand?

Nevertheless, the confusions of canasta are held in abeyance by these little rules you have learned about canasta.

Now, of course the confusions concerning canasta, as I say, have no aberrative value whatsoever. Zero. Life, you see, as I've told you several times in recent lectures, is not in itself an aberrative activity. Aberration has to be rather extraordinary. It has to be worked at; it has to be kept in restimulation all the time.

Now, this rather innocent action of the switchboard girl solving the confusion of her job on the principle "If I have twelve calls simultaneously appearing on the board, I handle one and then handle two and then handle three," don't you see? In other words, she's got a confusion of calls, all you have to do is teach her to handle one call. Each confusion she has from that point thereon is handled by that. Well, it actually is not at all aberrative to her. Nothing going to drive her mad because she has twelve calls simultaneously, don't you see? That's nonsense.

So now, we pull off the case – we say, "All right, what system or solution have you had to answering calls when they were too many or a confusion of calls?"

And she says, "Well, I answer one at a time," and so forth. We get the motion of the tone arm here could not be detected with a micromilli-vernier UNIVAC. See, it actually doesn't back up any charge. You get the idea?

No, there's got to be force and violence mixed up with these things. There's got to be something fabulous. Now, she could add this up and you could add this up as part of the confusion of trying to survive by having a job – and this could be part of it. And you might touch on it and it might appear to move some mass, but actually she's got something else she is worried about. Her survival is threatened by the fact that she could not handle her job and she's liable to be dismissed, don't you see? Ah, but look, solving how she handles a switchboard does not solve what she is worried about. She is worried about the fact that if she does not handle her job she will not have a job and her survival will thereby be threatened.

Ah, there's a much bigger tower on which this little piece of confusion was leaning, don't you see? All right, so we address this. How does she hold her job? By being a competent switchboard operator. Well, I'm afraid that this is not very aberrative either.

Why is she worried about holding her job? You say, "What solutions do you have for holding your job?" And you get a little TA action, see? Get a little bit of TA action.

She says, "So-and-so, and be nice to the boss" and so forth, and so forth, and you get a little TA action, see. Because this threatens her survival, don't you see, very much – much more intimately.

But the case is still relatively unauditable. There must be something on this case if we're auditing this case and we're having trouble with the case; there must be something else that we are bucking into here. What are we running into? Something else. Something else.

And we look around and we find out, "Well now, what makes you upset, particularly, about losing a job?" or something like that. "What would be upsetting about this?"

And you hear, marvel of marvel and wonder of wonders, you hear – you expect to hear, you know, "My aged mother would then starve to death," you see, or something like that. And she says, "Well, actually, it's my dog."

You can't add this up. Actually, she can't either. Actually, it's unaddable. And you say, "Well, what about the dog? What's this got to do with the job?"

"Well, you see, uh, they'd put the dog to sleep if I couldn't feed the dog, you see?"

Now, you might be getting here close someplace and that even looks a little bit sensible, don't you see? That doesn't look quite completely dippy. But you've got the idea of a human being working like mad and terribly worried about their job and so forth, and we've traced it back to a dog. Now, ordinarily human beings do not work to support dogs. But this one is; this one is. And my golly, we work this around for a little while and we suddenly find out that she has lots of trouble all the time and lots of upsets about keeping the dog in an apartment. And we may have a service facsimile that is simply described as "keeping a dog."

See, that's probably too mild a look at it, and I haven't given it to you as rough as you would actually find it or as incredible, because I want you to understand it, not sit there with your jaw dropped, see? But keeping a dog – keeping a dog, or keeping a dog in an apartment, some such action as this, or keeping a dog – and "How would keeping a dog make you right?" And "How would keeping a dog make others wrong?"

And we find out that this girl has one computation in existence which makes her right and makes others wrong, and it has to do with keeping a barking dog in an apartment where it'll annoy people. And that makes her right and makes others wrong, and she feels if she were deprived of that solution her survival would be shattered. And this is what's causing her to worry about her job. Don't you see?

So she always carefully gets these little, sharp-bark terriers, you see, that scraffle and raffle when they walk around on the floors, you see, and that yip and yap endlessly, particularly in the middle of the night. Sooner or later as you're running this thing, she'll all of a sudden cognite, "You know, I always seem to get very noisy dogs. Wonder why that is?" Well, of course, naturally. It bothers people more.

And you run this thing down and you will get some kind of an incident, early-life incident and that sort of thing, where somebody insisted that a dog be put to sleep or something like this because it was getting old and scrawny. And she had to drive it down to the pound, and everybody was busy making her wrong and, he [she] was trying to make everybody else wrong, don't you see? And this thing is all wound up in a ball. And wonder of wonders, we get this thing audited out – it's all about dogs, you see? And suddenly, because keeping a job and handling a switchboard was attached to an aberrated service facsimile, you see, to this degree, then, her worries and anxieties all have a big lie in them, you see? And they're all twisted around wrong way to, and all of a sudden she can operate a switchboard much better – doesn't even have to have a stable datum to operate one, she just operates a switchboard, don't you see? And she can keep a job, she doesn't worry about the job, and so forth. She's relaxed on this line. You get this action?

Now, I've given you a very, very simple, understandable solution here – very simple, very understandable. And they're not quite that simple when found in real life; they are more aberrated. I gave you a more intelligible one because I wanted you to understand there was some connection. Now, as you walk across this in real life they jump, usually, a wider gap than from job to keeping a dog, see? Probably be more involved than this.

They arc across a larger spark gap. You may find out that it is "breaking dishes." So you may have some more steps in it, you see? Breaking dishes. And this doesn't make any sense at all about keeping dogs or holding jobs, but nothing makes any sense anyway. She's

breaking dishes to be right, you see, and breaking dishes to make others wrong, and this is the service facsimile on which everything else is piling up. And oddly enough, if she's not permitted to break dishes, she knows she cannot survive.

She may not know what the barometer reads; she may not know how wide the street is; she may not know a lot of other things in life. But this she does know: that if she ceases to keep the dog or break the dishes or something like that, why, that's the end of her – total tertiary line of defense.

Now, you may not discover this at once on a case. You may not discover this promptly, immediately and at once on a case. You may audit off one, two or three apparent service facsimiles that all answer up to the complete description of a service facsimile, but are actually only leaning on the central service facsimile that is restimulated in present time, don't you see? But as you take these things off, why, the central one comes to view.

Now, you see now why, when you say or imply to me, "Now Ron, you should give me some kind of a rote procedure by which to isolate this every time," you're asking me, of course, to apply a logical system to an illogical action. I probably could do it and we probably will do it and all of that sort of thing, but I actually would much rather you understood what you were doing. See, I'd much rather. Because, frankly, you can hunt and punch around on a case. You can take an old case, assessment sheets and folders and 2-12 and something, you know, on the case, or the case reports or auditors' reports or case histories or something; and you could get a whole list of things – anything that's been found on the case. And you can have a discussion over these various things and points, and you can assess them in various ways and get one or another of them to read. And you'll find out the pc's interest will hang up someplace on this list. They'll be very interested in it. Far from leaving it, they dive right in on it, see? And here's the pc's interest; it'll hang up with a somatic, so forth.

And now, in fooling around with this, it is sometimes necessary to reword it. You don't have to worry about rewording the command. You'll get results on cases by running different commands, but you'll only be running oddball, flank material on the service facsimile itself, don't you see?

Now, the command's – is always, how would it – whichever you have found – makes the pc right and makes others wrong. It's always that command, see? It's not "How would opposing it," "stepping on it," "throwing it away" or something like that, or "fighting it make you right?" see? Because you haven't got the idea of what the service facsimile is, see?

Because the condition, the final identification is that the service facsimile solution is the pc. That solution is the pc, so it is something he has. It's "How would it make him right and make others wrong?" Now, you can vary it: "How *has* it made you right?" and "How *has* it made others wrong?" You could even say "What would be made wrong by it?"

Now we're going afield, but the pc sometimes springs over, and when they're operating in an aberrated area of this particular character, their ability to follow an auditing command deteriorates markedly and they slop. That's all right.

The way you handle that, and so forth: He's all of a sudden – pc is answering what and not answering how, see? You say, "All right. Well, just give me the rest of the whats and we'll

get back to the how," you know? I mean, they're not very tough. You know, don't make them wrong and stop them and all this sort of thing. Let them go because you may be standing in the road of an avalanche at an automaticity, see? They'll slop on that auditing command, do you understand?

But the auditing command is not ever "How has it made you wrong?" Never. Never. Never. Oddly enough, it'll run, but it'll run the pc down scale. "How would doing things to it make you right?" see? Oh, oh, oh, no, no, no. You'll get some tone arm action. See, this is what'll fool you. You'll get a little tone arm action. It'll look okay.

Well, let me take the case in point. We assess "Father, " and some genius has just read the rest of the 2-12 bulletin and found out that it was always "oppose" – you were supposed to oppose what you found on that. So he ran 2-12 plus R3SC, which is pretty good. I suppose you can run several other processes in conjunction with it, too. You could probably have the pc feeling the walls at the same time you ran the process. I mean, you could do a lot of things. [laughs]

But anyhow – I'm sorry, but that actually happened. And the command was "How would opposing Father" – this is not quite the right one, but don't want to cast too many bricks – "How would opposing Father make you right?"

Brother, that is not a service facsimile: opposing Father is not a service facsimile – that's an action. See, that's just an action. Now, if you assessed it out, you've got to try it. You got to try it on for size and you got to find out if there's anything to this, because it would be if you assessed Father... it just simply – I mean, it's too idiotically simple: Father must be a solution. See, it must be a huge solution. So we say, "How would Father make you right?" And "How would," you know, "Father make others wrong?" you see?

Now, you can drag this over into the cow pasture and say, well, hating Father is probably the service facsimile and so forth, but actually you're just looking at a secondary or tertiary condition of a service facsimile. You're not looking at a service facsimile, because this is no action. See? This'd be something which was the result of a service facsimile.

And the first rule is – what I first gave you in this lecture – if the pc doesn't immediately jump into the lake and swim right straight to the whirlpool, but tells you "Oh, well... Father – make me right, hm-mm, doesn't make any sense," I call to your attention the pc is still standing on the bank – not service facsimile. Got the idea? Pc has not swum madly in and got all embroiled in this thing. Because that's the first thing they want to do, hit the service facsimile – drown. Why? Because to drown is to survive. Obviously – that's the characteristic of a service facsimile.

The pc says, "Um, I don't think um, I don't know. It's – I'll have to – right –I don't know whether that's right or not. I'll just – make me right? And – don't – I don't know if that would make me right or not. Let's see, would it make me right? Would it make anybody else wrong. I don't know. I can answer the question. There doesn't seem to be very much wrong."

Wake up there in the auditing chair and take a look at what's going on.

Pc is standing on the bank, feet not wet, whirlpool not approached – equals service facsimile not been found.

So go on and do something else clever. Say, "Well, that's fine. I'm glad we covered that," cheerily, cheerily, cheerily, cheerily, cheerily, and you gather up your papers and get the hell out of there, see?

Pc won't be able to keep out of it; that I guarantee you, man. Won't be able to stay out of it.

You say... the service facsimile is "burning cats." See, something weird like this comes up, see? Or "being a cat," you know? Something like that. "Being catlike." "How would being catlike make you right?"

"Oh, well, that's so-and-so and so-and-so, and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so, and then, of course, so-and-so and so-and-so, you understand. There's quite a – quite a – that's quite a thing when you start really thinking about it like that. You see, catlike is so-and-so and so-and-so and so on, you understand? And so on, and a lot of times been catlike because, you see, it – it uh, it's catlike, you know, and – and so forth, and uh, that's the way it is and so on." And when you can't get in an auditing question to get the session properly started, know that you have hit one. [laughter]

Now, the reason it turns on automaticities is, of course, that it is automatic, unanalyzed solutions, and they simply just pour off in a Niagara. When you got a real one and you're running one, always note in your auditor's report "automaticity." It merely means, more answers than the pc can articulate are arriving from the bank – conveyor belt stacking up. Just note down when you find one of those automaticities. It's a guarantee you've hit on a service facsimile.

Now, this gives us the way it has to be run. Because it is susceptible to avalanches, you can't then run it with the old TR 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, see? You've got to throw the question into the arena and let the lions fight over it for a while, you understand? And just don't stop it with a new question; don't stop it with acknowledgments; let it sort of run out. After a while, the pc has given you fifteen, twenty answers and so forth, and seems to look rather blank – doesn't seem to have one now, and that sort of thing. Well, you can either give him another question or you can change the thing over to the other side, and it does the same thing then. So it's actually not one auditing question for one auditing answer. You're not running it that way. You're running it one auditing question for one waterfall.

But sometimes the pc swaps ends in the middle of it. Well, this is no time to stop him either. He's busy making others wrong with this "being catlike," you see, and others wrong, others wrong, others wrong, others wrong, "and it'd make me right to so-and-so and so-and-so." And he's just reached the end of the flow and he's turned around and he's on the back flow. You can also overrun these things and put the pc into a stuck-flow sort of a drifting anaten. You're insisting that more answers must exist, you see? Well, he's already at the end of his rope, and you're making him run too long on that side. So it's run very permissively.

What you're trying to do is get rid of this avalanche and automaticity and get some tone arm action. That's your main purpose. So how you do that as an auditor is give only enough questions to get the pc going and only enough acknowledgments to acknowledge the fact that you had a lot of answers. And turn it around whenever it comes toward the end of the rope; and turn it around the other way. It's very simple stuff.

Now, trying to keep the pc answering the auditing question is sometimes difficult, as I just told you, because the pc will skid around on this and disassociate because he's in a disassociated area. And don't you ever tell me that you're very shocked because this pc has given you a whole bunch of answers that weren't answers to the auditing question. Now, that's expected. That's expected, see? Because what?

This solution – now, let's talk back on the theory of the thing. This solution, you see, is holding back a tremendous amount of aberration, none of which makes sense, so it doesn't as-is. So there sits this solution, see, "keeping a dog," you see?

All right. All this stuff is back of it and nothing is going to flow, because as long as this person is able to keep a dog, life is handled: Jobs are taken care of, everything is protected; all is right in the world – except, of course, for the painful stomach, a hatred of dogs and some little marginal fringe worries, you know, of one kind or another. And being broke all the time and not being able to have a job or hold a job.

It's like trying to solve a problem with a whopping lie, don't you see? And boy, would you have to get busy to keep this problem solved with this whopping lie. So it has to be continuously asserted – continuously asserted. And that solution, then, is just a solution. That's all it is. And the pc doesn't even have to work on it consciously because the pc has got it all triggered to be worked on all the time anyhow. It's the immediate answer to anything.

So life just continues to stack up on this solution, and it accumulates mass on this solution, and the solution accumulates mass.

Now, because the solution... Now, let me give you the condition of what kind of a solution it's got to be: It's got to be a below 2 on the Tone Scale solution – always below 2, nothing above 2, see? It's a below 2 solution, because it, perforce, is a substitute for an itsa line. It's a substitute for an itsa line. The pc started out by feeling he or she could not itsa the object that he or she was trying to make wrong and so dreamed up this solution – dreamed up this solution as a final solution. And that, then, is a substitute for an itsa line, believe it or not.

Well, there's a girl sitting there and Mother has not spoken to her since noon because the fender of the car has been dented. And she has this solution, "Well, families are no good," you see? Makes it unnecessary to observe Mother; makes it unnecessary to observe the environment; makes it unnecessary to participate; makes it... No necessity at all to do anything about it because it's all done – it's all contained there in the solution. And then because, you see, there is no is-ness occurring on the environment, you get an accumulation of mass. See, mass only accumulates in the absence of itsa. So there goes the old shell game. So it's actually a substitute itsa line.

Now, because of this, of course, it then is referred to every time one refers to anything. And when it is a below 2 on the Tone Scale solution, it of course is propounding this – it's propounding this very clearly, as aberrated as this sounds: To survive it is necessary to succumb. And that solution always propounds that, one way or the other, in some oblique, aberrated way.

Survival is made up of a numerous number of succumbs. How to survive: "Not to have any fun" – that's a good way, see? "To cry all the time." "To appear to be destitute." Obvi-

ously, see, I mean, to... These are all manifestations of non-survival, don't you see? Survive, in order to, it's necessary to manifest non-survival in order to survive. It's always this kind of an oddball solution, see? You'll get something like "not eat," see? That's quite common, by the way, service facsimile: refusing to eat, not eating – common service facsimile. Little children will play this an awful lot of the time, and when it gets out of that realm and range and moves into adult life, why, you have diets. They usually don't amount to a service facsimile, but when they do, you've really got a mess on your hands. It's really a nice, big mess. And this must be terribly common because one of the major problems they have in insane asylums is making people eat. Not eating is one of the final protests – hunger strikes. Throw guys in jail, one of the first things they think of is go on a hunger strike. If they want to make a big protest, they go on a hunger strike. So there's a very common service facsimile.

Some version of no sex – no second dynamic. I don't care how you have it or how you phrase it. It's got to be some "no second dynamic" one way or the other, see? It's an incapacity on it; it's an aberrated practice of it. It can go worse than that. How to survive, you see, is to murder children. How does that add up? Well, it adds up to the guy all right, you see? And on the first dynamic, how to survive? Well, commit suicide, you see? In innumerable ways, you can commit suicide on many gradients, you see? "Be ugly," you see? "Be overweight." "Be too thin." Be this, be that, be disabled, be something, be something – doesn't much matter what it is, you see? You might collide with that on the first dynamic.

On the third dynamic, "to be antisocial." See, these are all sure methods of non-survival, don't you see? And yet they are added up as a survival computation. "Shoot policemen." Third-dynamic solution: how to survive: shoot policemen. Simple, effective. And you say, "Yeah. But that couldn't be a service facsimile in this lifetime, because this pc has never shot a policeman in this lifetime." *Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha!* Don't make me laugh. This pc has always shot a policeman; every time they see a policeman they shoot a policeman.

"Robbing houses." You say, "Well, robbing houses – this individual – this couldn't be a service facsimile, because this person has never robbed a house." Oh, well now, don't be too sure. Never passes one but he doesn't rob it – thinks about it and so forth.

Well, how does he use this service facsimile? Oh, he uses it via the newspapers. He always clips out robberies and shows people about robberies and that sort of thing. Figures out robberies; reads nothing but detective stories, see, and – robbery – robbing houses; good service facsimile.

So, you see, it doesn't even fit in with the guy's environment. Therefore, it sometimes is rather hard to trace.

You get somebody who is in a death cell, you see, having already shot up innumerable policemen and so forth. Well, you know what his service facsimile is – you think. You say it's obviously "shooting policemen." No, I point something out to you: He shot policemen. Probably wasn't his service facsimile at all. His service facsimile is probably "never loading guns" or – you know? Service facsimile is "being kind to everyone."

See, the exact circumstance of the person doesn't always guarantee you that you have your hands on the service facsimile. That's what I'm trying to point out here. Because this thing goes underground. It's not very visible, and they very often... The most effective service

facsimiles are those which are totally hidden until you've come anywhere in their vicinity and then they're laid in your lap, see?

You don't find service facsimiles above 2 on the Tone Scale. Now, it'd be completely silly, then, to add up the ARC of the lower Tone Scale, like "not communicated" or something like this, and say "Well, his service facsimile is 'not communicated'." "How would not communicated make you right?" or "not having communicated make you right?" or "not communicating make you right?" and so forth.

Well, this is, I'm afraid, a little bit too general, see? You don't use these buttons by their isolated selves because they are insufficiently directional.

The pc answers them too broadly.

And all you do in such a case is restimulate the service facsimile without labeling it. Well, let me give you – just dream one up here; don't say it's terribly workable: "Who or what would make themselves right by not communicating" Something like this. Or "Tell me a means of not communicating," and make a list and assess the list. Don't you see? Some odd action of this particular character. Such a button, then, is useful for the location of a service facsimile, but is not in itself a service facsimile.

You eventually get, on this list, "hiding pencils." And you say, "Well, this can't be very damaging, but we will run it anyway." Well, it's not maybe very damaging; but you find out that the reason the pc has always looked so bulky is because they're always carrying fifteen or twenty gross of pencils; can't get into their room at night because of the crates of pencils, you know? Everybody in their vicinity misses pencils all the time. Never spotted him. This is loopy conduct of one kind or another. But sometimes it can look so ordinary to you – because this is this planet – that you sometimes don't put your finger on an obvious service facsimile.

Let's say it isn't "being sick" but it's "having chills." "How would that make you right and make somebody else wrong?" or something like that, you see? Or "having a cold," or something like this. That still could separate out into a service facsimile, don't you see? But it might not be on and it might be on: it doesn't matter.

You, you see, I've given you a bunch of stuff that you may think, by this time, the service facsimile, again, is very hard to locate. No, it isn't. I'm just giving you the idea that you've got to look for it. You've got to prowl around. After this character has given you something that might be it, make a "represent" on it. Be quite frank with the pc. Don't pussyfoot on this thing. There's been too much pussyfooting about already.

Say, "We's looking fo' you' service facsimile. What is it, boy?" You know, subtle!

"What do you think your service facsimile is?" Do a list. Pull the missed withholds and null that list – good reliable method. Pc – withhold it perhaps, and then just the fact that you put it down on pulling the missed withhold – and all of a sudden he dives into the water, swims right over to the middle of the lake, dives right into the middle of the whirlpool and says "There we are. *Uhhhhhh!* What am I doing here?" Interest! Attraction! So forth.

Because, of course, it's not a volitional solution. That is to say, he doesn't think up this solution all the time. It's a subawareness solution which goes into automatic action. It's that buried. He's right on the verge of it all the time, he's in direct connection with it all the time, so you just lay down the faintest link to it and he can't help but travel that link, don't you see?

That's one of the reasons, you say, that neurosis and psychosis are very, very difficult to maintain. All you practically have to do is spot them and they start blowing up. It's very hard to dramatize the exact reason for them.

Why anybody would go through heroic actions to explode a psychosis or neurosis, or electric shock people or go into brain treatment, just because the person is jumping about the floor and screaming or refusing to eat or doing something like this, and so on – that's not a good enough reason. That doesn't mean that the psychosis or neurosis is violent, you see? That only means that it produces violent reactions. See, it doesn't mean that it is violent at all. Maybe this girl, insane, is jumping about the floor because she doesn't like cockroaches. And that's the logical explanation of the thing, and people fail to note that this is true because there are no cockroaches there. But she's seeing cockroaches, you see?

So you might have something on this order (this becomes very elementary): You say, "What really might be worrying you all the time?" You make a little list. And she jumps about the floor and hangs from the chandelier and rolls up in a ball and so forth, but she'll talk to you and she gives you, finally, a list. And you assess this list out according to interest: Which one is she really most interested in? And you'll find out that it's cockroaches. She's very interested in these cockroaches that are all over the floor. And you'd say, "Well, how would seeing cockroaches make you right?" And that's probably the end of her insanity. Why, she probably couldn't maintain it from that point on. She wouldn't be well; she wouldn't be calmed down or anything like that. But she's now going to have a hard time maintaining it because she's got a connection to it. And the thing will discharge. See, it's hard to do now. Now you got to get volitional about jumping around in the middle of the floor; now you got to mock up the cockroaches to put them on the floor, don't you see? And she just can't make it. And that charge, just that much charge, and it's gone.

That, by the way, was practically the totality – the accidental fact there, is probably the totality of the Freudian recoveries – is contained right in that. It's just that they would evaluate in some fashion or another, like you do with an ARC break, you see? And they'd happen every now and then to strike something that was a service fac, and the individual would think about it, and it would be impossible then to dramatize it. But not knowing the mechanics of it, it nevertheless would slightly discharge, don't you see? And it's all those false assignments that made their people sick, see? It was the assignments that weren't service facs, and that sort of thing.

So you can learn from that just in passing. And don't give a guy a bunch of phony service facs, see? Let him decide what it is, you see? Don't ever foist one off on anybody. You'll find that's always a good part of the rules. If he says it isn't it, it isn't it, man. That's it. That's the rules. Customer is always right. Because frankly, if you've got it, he can't stay out of it, see? That – if you keep that little fact up your sleeve, why, you can afford to reject any quan-

tity of them. You say, "All right, 'beating dogs' and so forth. You don't think that is it. I had it on the list here. It read a little bit."

"No, I don't think that is. Beating dogs, beating dogs, beating dog, beating dogs, beating dogs, and so on – beating dogs…"

"Would it make you right in any way?"

"Nah. Would beating dogs make me right? Hm. Heh. No. No. No. Wouldn't do much. Well, actually, could add it up – it could make me right to object to bad behavior on the conduct of dogs and make dogs wrong to indulge in bad behavior." End of computation, see?

You'll find every once in a while a pc will give you something like that. And then they'll say, "Oh yes. Let's see. How would it make me wrong? Now, let's see. How would bad auditing make me right or... bad auditing wouldn't make me right – it'd make me wrong." Of course, that's the end of that. You pursue that no further, see?

But, "How would getting stuck in an engram make you right and make others wrong?"

"Wouldn't do it."

"Well, how would auditing make you right and make others wrong. You see? How would auditing make you right?"

"Well, it'd make me right if I got better and it'd make the auditor wrong if I didn't." End of computation.

Of course, that's no service fac. Perfectly logical answer. There are no further answers behind it. No vast blast of the TA as it falls down; there's nothing going on here particularly. So you don't want to hang people with these things, because it's too easy to find the right ones. And they abound, man.

This is one of the most interesting little treasure hunts you ever engaged upon, see? And you might as well get used to what it is and figure out what it is and put your own itsa line in on it, and so forth, because you'll sure know what it is, then, see? You say, "Here it is, man. This guy has got this thing which is some kind of a horrendous solution of some kind or another, and it's got all this charge backed up. And whenever I audit him with a Prepcheck, why, very little TA action or mass turns on with a Prepcheck – must be a service fac. This case not very easy to audit; has a fragile tone arm; tone arm gets stuck hard" – another condition, you see? – "must be a service fac, and so on. Can't get this thing. Why?" Well, look – it – obviously, if all the discharge you're going to get is a confusion running off in the form of charge – if the charge won't run off, there must be a solution there which prevents the charge from running off. And that's all there is to it. He's got it solved. He doesn't have to look around. Back's bad and his head's bad and his ribs are bad and he can't sleep at night and he's got ulcers and so forth; but he doesn't have to inspect this. See?

Say, "Well..." You start running this down, you'll find out, well – do this little list or something like that, or however you're going to run it into, or do past data, moving in toward this thing – you find out he sleeps on the floor. Doesn't sleep in bed. Has a bed but he sleeps on the floor.

Well, I'd try that on for size and just say, "Well, is there any possibility you do that because it would make you right?"

Now, you're going to get one of two reactions: *"Ppfffff.* Well, it would make the landlady wrong, because she doesn't change the sheets very often, and so I sleep on the floor, see?" Or, the other reaction, which is the one you're looking for, see, is "Well, sleeping on the floor make you right?" "Oh, yes, yes. As a matter of fact, it would, so on. And a long time ago when I was in – when I was in – in boarding school, you know, we used to have these bed – big high beds and so forth, and could pull you out on the floor and ma... But that isn't the real reason why this thing was. You see, I kept sleeping on the floor. Actually, you get more fresh air, and so forth, and…"

Well now, look, don't be a complete knucklehead as an auditor and try to go through some more action, see? You're just using auditing actions to cut the itsa line. You got one running, man. Just sit back and let it run. Do the easy thing, see? All you got to do is sit back and let it run.

The only trouble you'll get into is sometimes the pc starts running backtrack on it in a hurry, and then you should start getting nervous. So if you can get in an auditing question on the thing, why, slide "in this lifetime" or something like that on the front of the auditing question, providing you have asked an auditing question. If you haven't, why, try to get it in at the next question – if you get a chance to ask the next question. Got the idea? You might not get a chance to ask the question at all. It may run all the way out and he's now ready for the other side, see?

Now, the main thing that you gain from all this and the main thing you gather from all this is tone arm action. You've got the mass flowing that kept the pc from getting tone arm action. And that's your interest in it. You're not interested in his social conduct. You're interested in his auditing conduct. Where old medical psychiatry went adrift, we needn't go adrift. They become so fixated on the subject of "rrrright conduct," without even being able to define what it is (except maybe a slaver when the bell rings), that these birds are always adjudicating everything on the subject of conduct. Insanity is a brand of conduct. Neurosis is a brand of conduct – conduct, conduct.

Well, the unfortunate part of it is – the unfortunate part of it is – that it doesn't catalog, it doesn't classify. You cant do that, see? Because it just renders everybody open to the charge of being neurotic or psychotic, just everybody wide open – which is one of the more interesting factors, and then they can use this politically, don't you see? And then anybody they don't want around, they merely say some of his conduct is aberrated and they can throw him in the local spinbin and chop his brains up for hamburger. I don't know what they eat.

The point I'm making here is that's highly dangerous – highly dangerous – saying a person is insane or sane when your sole basis of adjudication, you see, is conduct.

So this doesn't always meet the eye. Some of the most roaring inanities on this planet are classified as sane behavior.

Now, in actual fact, you're measuring up not a person who is in agreement with this planet but you're measuring up a person who has lived a very long time. So whatever is the service fac is the service fac, don't you see?

It's not because he does something peculiar, or not because he does something this, or – we have a list of things. I can tell you what it's more likely to be than something else. But action that is peculiar is only peculiar, not compared to the mores of the society in which you find yourself but just compared to the datum of survival. See, just compare it directly to the datum of survival. And it's always a contrasurvival action which is posing as a survival action.

Revolt. I don't even know why you'd revolt against an Earth government; they're all convicts, see? You're living in an area where there are no wardens, see? Actually kind of silly to do anything particular in this particular direction because they're nuttier than anybody else, don't you see? They probably need their hands held twice as hard as anybody in the spinbin, you know? They don't know what they're doing.

So what is considered normal on this planet might at any one point be completely batty. So the service facsimile comes down to the comparison with the datum of actual survival and the fact that the pc is interested in it and that it releases tone arm action because it must be a fixed solution.

So actually, what you're studying are fixed solutions uninspected by the person, which are contrasurvival. Now, when you hit all of those, man, you've hit the jackpot.

In any case which has a fragile tone arm which is liable to stick at the drop of an E-Meter cord, see – bang! like that – you're looking at a service facsimile. You must be. There must be a fixed solution. Why? Because there's no charge runs by it. So if no charge runs by it, it must be a fixed solution, and it gets in the road of auditing, so it must be contrasurvival. Actually, it could be a fixed survival solution which really was a survival solution, and you'd find it wouldn't even vaguely influence auditing.

See, you'd go out and audit the guy and you get tone arm action, and he'd go on flying and he's got these fixed solutions all over the place. He's practically nothing but a bundle of fixed solutions. You're trying to find the black spot in the middle of the ball of yarn, see? The black spot in the middle of a mountain of white spots. The mountain comes down if you find that spot. Fortunately for you, there are several gray spots in its immediate vicinity, any one of which can be hit and do the case some good. So it's a constant prowl on this route. You handle one. All right. Fine. Is this case going to remain stable? Well, that's very doubtful so let's find two. Let's find three. Let's make sure we got it, see?

Now, your tone arm is flying around and your needle, by this time – the thing can't stick. You find you find one, the case will tentatively resume its stuck-needle condition, momentarily resume it. Interesting. Can't hold it, but it's a drop, you know?

You haven't got all of these now; you haven't got all of them you want, and it'll still be a little this way. And the next one you find – *pshew-sss-sss-ssss-ssssew.* It's coming down. Needle is getting so it can't stand upright, because there's nothing to hold it. Just the weight of the needle causes it to bang against the sides, you see? You actually have trouble reading your

tone arm, as you're winning on these, when you are really hitting center. You're having trouble with that tone arm because you can't find out where to center it.

Your needle is not as nice as it was before. It's too floppy. You're having a trouble centering it. And you just about get it centered and it moves, see? And you just about get it centered, it flops over the other way. Your tone arm reading gets very, very inaccurate as this really starts to bite. You can't quite keep it properly centered. It's moving too fast, too. Pc just thinks a thought, see, and it goes clank! It's gone. But, gee, how much charge went off there? Well, we don't know. It's because you're bleeding, you see, a central reservoir of charge and it's flowing in a Niagara.

Now, the other thing it does for you and the reason why this is very beneficial to the case – completely aside from unblocking this – is a service facsimile is always protruded into present time, always protruded into present time. So any constant PTP that your pc has had will of course produce the service facsimile. And that is very good news for you. You can produce the service facsimile out of any PTP that has been constant and continual with the pc.

"What did you come into Scientology to resolve?" And he'll give you a long series of this and that.

Now, it's very, very dangerous to list too many problems on a pc. You list too many problems on a pc and you're going to wind him up in a bang! That's dangerous. Call that to your attention. Listing problems – not so good, see, not so good. Bad show. Doing an incomplete list of problems will ARC break the pc. A complete list of problems is very often too long and is a bit dangerous to the pc's needle and case condition.

So how do you find out the problems? Well, you have to take a step backwards before you take a step forwards. See, locating the problem that you're trying to solve – you can't let that run forever because that's the exact opposite of an itsa line. It's a whatsit line. See, a problem line is a whatsit line. And you can freeze your tone arm gorgeously with a whatsit line. So a whatsit list will freeze your tone arm, and so forth. So it had better be on the basis of a friendly discussion which you can leave in an awful hurry. And you recognize that you're taking a step backwards with this case, making him whatsit, which is basically what's bum with these assessments, and so forth.

"What problem – what was your chronic present time problems when you got into Scientology, and so forth? What were these things? What were these things you were trying to solve at that particular time?"

Now, if you hang up this case too badly, you can take that little list and ask for a solution for each one of the problems he's given you – if you've made a list – ask for some solutions for those problems, and you will take the tension off the tone arm. So there is a cure for this situation, but it's rather a lengthy and involved cure. But you may have, sitting right there... the solution, you see, is not a problem; the solution is not a problem, but a few of these problems can be looked at as pointers to a possible solution.

He's having trouble in a certain area. Now, your problem, once you've got any idea of his problems, is to put your finger on some solution with regard to that problem. And that solution will be the fixed solution – which gives you the service facsimile.

Now, notice that R1C and R2C are designed to strip away solutions, decisions and stable data off the case – so-called stable data. Therefore, they are very, very easy to run and they produce tone arm action and are the least likely to hang up the tone arm. You start asking for whatsits, however, in R1C: "Well, you say you have had a – you – you've had the idea that all snakes were – lived in the tops of houses, and so forth. Now, what problems would that solve?"

Man, cut your throat! You've asked the reverse side of R1C and the tone arm is going to go up and stick. But notice that your R1C and R2C, these itsa-line questions and run, are designed to strip away charge from the service facsimile area.

Therefore, it is a very good thing to find out if the pc has been run on R1C and R2C. Of course, they won't have discharged the service facsimile but they may have some data there that they uncovered in looking at all this, which you might then sort out and get an idea, don't you see? So you say, "While you were being run in the co-audit down there, what did you run into that you found very interesting while you were running your case? What did you really run into?"

"Well, I ran into this and that and the other thing and the other thing and the other thing," and you make your little bit of a list of these types of solutions and zones and areas and you've got yourself an assessment, See? Then run this thing down, and – with a little further discussion with the pc – and you're liable to hit right on it just like that.

Funny part of it is that R3R is almost a dead-center pitch on a service facsimile, providing it winds up in a statable solution.

Now, "failing not to communicate with eating figs in Smyrna," I don't think you would find a good service facsimile. I call that to your attention. If it doesn't make sense to you, it's not likely to make sense to the pc. So don't go astray on this, because, after all, the preliminary step of R3R was designed to do an entirely different thing and it may be only a fragment of that and it won't be the tone level you found, see? It won't be that. It'll be some fragment of it or a rewording of it.

Now, I funnily enough have found one on an incomplete R3R assessment that two stayed in on. The list had to be extended, don't you see? And one of those was the service facsimile. I find that quite interesting. In other words, if we had completed the list to the final run, we wouldn't have found the service facsimile, see, because it would have been buried back on the line a little bit, don't you see?

Well, this tells you that it doesn't really have to be a terribly good assessment – any kind of an assessment. You've run something like "failed to shoot" – "What have you failed to shoot?" or something like this, or "failed to have been with?" or something – And you get a list, get a list of this; go on down the line; assess the thing out. Well, even if your "failed to shoot" is kind of a lousy level, as long as it's in not because it's been protested or was a mistake on your part, see? Pc has protested it, so it's in, you know? That's the corny way those assessments go astray.

Pc didn't understand it, didn't know what it was. So it keeps reading, you know? If you don't clear anything with the pc while you're assessing the pc, you can expect that problem to come up on auditors that are green in your supervising sometimes.

That can be sort of corny and it'll still produce something. And you're doing yourself a list over alongside of this thing, and you didn't even really get a chance to complete your list very well, and so on, but it went out, and you finally had a level stay in. It's much more likely to be that level if the pc is interested in it. You get the idea. It's the item – pardon me – it's much more likely to be the item, you see, than it is the level, because the level is too broad. And just running it loosens up the bank enough so that you can then do one with greater accuracy, because everything on that – as long as you just got something to stay in for fifteen strikes or something like that – you know, one of these arduous lists where everything is alive on the whole list. Everything is alive on the whole list and you've got ten strikes after each one, but one has fifteen strikes in before they *all* went out. You know, one of those corny ones, and so forth. You can actually pick up one of those and the thing that has fifteen strikes, "Was that in because you didn't understand what it was?" "No. I understand what it is all right."

"All right. That's it. Now we're going to list this one."

See, it's that crude. You'll still get somewhere in the vicinity of a service fac, because it operates just like a magnet. And that you're ticking away at it draws the pc's attention toward it, and as he lists, he's even liable to list it non sequitur on the list. It doesn't even answer the question, but there it is, see? You want to watch this, see, because his attention is being pulled to this thing inevitably. You're asking him for right answers, and he gives you the rightest answer he knows: "Jump off the top of the Empire State Building." That's the solution. That solves everything. That solves all problems, so you're asking him "What don't you have affinity for in this lifetime?" and he finally puts down "jumping off the top of the Empire State Building," see? Hasn't anything to do with what he doesn't have affinity for, but it'll go on the list. You get what I'm talking about, now?

You see, your assessment is greatly assisted, greatly assisted by the fact that as long as you're not ARC breaking the pc and keeping him on levels that he is protesting and is unhappy about, and as long as you don't disregard the pc's interest while assessing, the mind gets pulled right over to the service facsimile, bang! They'll put it down non sequitur. They'll put it down a dispersed, a disassociated item, and all kinds of wild things happen while you're doing an assessment. You want to watch this sort of thing. That thing stays on the list, and you notice it doesn't even have anything to do with the list sometimes.

Well, actually, the degree it's disassociated from the subject of the list is the most likely clue that it's a service fac. But it just reads on the meter as long as anything else. It'll stay in. You'll assess it out, long as the pc understands what it is and isn't there because it's a protest, see? Solution is not very difficult to find. If it's the solution to life, the guy is going to give it to you. He's going to handle your session with it. See? And you'll sometimes think you've been an awful knucklehead. You've had a pc sitting across from you for a long time that's been handling all sessions with this. Something like that. So it eventually dawns on you that that's what that is, you see? Doesn't make sense, but it's sure been present.

And I'd keep looking for and running service facsimiles on a pc until it looked to me like we had notoriously and considerably altered this pc's methods of going at life and until I had a wonderfully free needle and a nice, gorgeously clear TA, and I'd just keep it up.

Now, what's the basic benefit? I was going to give you one other benefit to the thing. It, of course, is the source of your present time environment. So the pc who is always coming to session with a PTP that has to be audited before you can get on with the session, of course is having his service facsimile kicked, out of session. So it's a diagnosis of the existence of a service facsimile. That's continuous. Anybody has a PTP once in a while. That's always got big PTP, big, big, you know, big, big. You know, *"Il-dal-dal, oh-dada-dal*. And we can't be audited today because of so-and-so, and we got to handle this other situation and so on."

You're just looking at a service facsimile. What mass is it that is such a magnet for trouble on this case? There must be something restimulating here in the environment all the time. There must be some restimulable item right here all the time. And man, if you can get rid of that, the overrestimulation factor of a case vanishes. See? The overrestimulation vanishes. So you have knocked out at one fell swoop – because restimulation by reason of present time is always about 50 percent of the restimulation present on any case at any given moment, that has service facs, you see? It's about 50 percent of the charge on the case.

You've only got, then, 50 percent, you see, that you can restimulate with safety because the tolerance for restimulation, you see, is lessened by 50 percent. All of a sudden this character will run like a startled gazelle if you can get this service facsimile out of the road, because your environmental restimulation has nothing to kick back on.

Now, we used to try to solve this by "process him faster than the environment can kick him in." Remember? You know? Process him twenty-five hours during the week, keep him away from home, and his wife won't kick his head off, and when he goes back home he'll stay stable. You know? That kind of thing. But we were just hoping we'd get the service facsimile before he went back home. You understand? So if you could reduce that factor out of the case, then all the gains the case made in session would stay. So there's another bonus. See, the cases wouldn't drop between sessions, see?

Now, the amount of attention which the pc has turned in on this service facsimile, and it's the disabilities which accompany it, and so forth – the attention that he has on that – also keep him from looking at his bank. I could say that an expert handling of service facsimiles – this is just a wild guess – would probably raise the runability of a case about a hundred to one. How easy a case would be to audit. See, if every case has some of this and it only becomes visible when some cases make it impossible to audit, see, well, how easy is a case to run? Well, we probably don't know the answer to that question.

See, but we know some cases are impossible to run and those are the ones we have attention on right now. So, you take care of those for me just now, will you please?

Thank you.

R3SC

A lecture given on 3 September 1963

Oh, you're in for today! I wouldn't have applauded like that. *A-ha-ha! Blll, bmmm.* Bad business. Oh boy. In for it today. Wow! Can't you manage look scared? What's the matter, don't you believe I'm mean? Ah, I'm afraid you know me too well. Anyhow, what is the well-known date?

Audience: September 3rd, AD 13.

3 September AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And we have a lecture on R3SC.

Notice, Mom, no hands. [laughs] No papers, no notes. Cold, like that!

All right. Now, once upon a time we had something called a rock slammer. You remember the history of a rock slammer?

Audience: Mm-hm.

All right. You did a Scientology List One, which is not the L1 in that bulletin, but the old Scientology List One. And what did you find in this? You found that occasionally as you went down the line you picked up a tick, and when you put in the big mid ruds on that particular tick, you all of a sudden got yourself a nice, handsome rock slam. So you say "auditing" to somebody and you got a rock slam, right?

You remember this technology? Well, this meant that something was going to go wrong in the vicinity of auditing with regard to this person, by reason of aberration.

Now, of course, punitively, punitively, we said at once all rock slammers were bad, and they all ought to be shot, and so forth, until we found out that practically everybody rock slammed. [laughter, laughs] And then, of course, we had to come off of it. [laughs] But that isn't all that we came off of. We just dropped that piece of know-how in the mire and let it lie. You notice suddenly we weren't saying anything about that at all.

Well, that didn't mean that I forgot it, completely. That didn't mean that it was utterly gone as far as I was concerned. But I had seen some phenomena which I definitely had to straighten out. And that phenomena had to do with the reason a person doesn't recover under auditing. Now, that's the whole department head; that heads up that whole department: the reason the person doesn't recover under auditing.

Now, this has been with us, actually, since 1949, 1948. It must have been present then. I didn't run into it head-on until about 1950, and it became very crucial in 1950. One of the

reasons this would peak up is that in the type of auditing which I was doing in 1950 there was a great deal of slippiness. A lot of it was very slippy. And there was a lot of this and that would work its way through, and you didn't have a hard, tightly bound process, you see? And as soon as you got a tightly bound process that was limited to running of engrams, you ran into this phenomenon of people not getting well.

So again we have run into engrams and again we all of a sudden come up with this interesting datum – but not for the same reason – of people who just don't recover.

Now, in my catalog of things to be done, this business of rock slammers and reasons why people didn't get well continued to ride right along there and take a prominent position in looking over all new things.

And all of a sudden I collided with the old service facsimile. But the collide was rather oblique. And the way we collided with that was by a study of the tone arm, the necessity to get tone arm motion and the various positions of the tone arm.

Now, all of that material which you've had in a recent lecture – very germane to this. It became obvious that if an individual were audited for three sessions without tone arm action, he got into pretty terrible condition. Bad. Bad show. Bad show. Therefore, you had to audit with tone arm action.

I don't say he fell to pieces, but he just wasn't feeling well – he didn't feel so good. You'd find his session goals became gloomier and gloomier. In other words, you could predict any time that a case was going to feel not so good by noting that he had no tone arm action during the session you had just run. And this I tested out. And I tested this out. I watched it, coordinated it and so forth – no vast series of cases but that wasn't necessary. I had a considerable background on all this material.

Now, there we are – person gets no TA action during a session, person doesn't feel so good. Three sessions – they feel pretty wog. No TA action. So we mustn't run without TA action. So it became very, very important to find out what was stopping TA action. And there are several reasons why TA actions stop. Many of them... the basic reasons are still those; all the reasons I have given there are very valid reasons. But they fall away from the very high theoretical to the very easily applied practical aspect of it. And the practical aspect of it indicated just this: that an individual would release charge or an individual wouldn't release charge. And that's about all it came down to.

Now, that you are getting – now get these slight divisions here – that you are getting tone arm action does not guarantee that your pc will feel better. Now, that is one for you there. Doesn't guarantee your pc is going to feel better. But getting no TA action guarantees that your pc is going to feel worse.

Do you see that, see? So you haven't got quite a yes or no. Now, why the individual who gets TA action doesn't necessarily feel better is contained in restimulation and overrestimulation. The individual is overrestimulated – the restimulation is too high and yet the charge is still releasing. Now, that's quite interesting there. You've got maybe fifteen sources of charge that can be released, and they're all in restimulation. And you're only running one of them, so you're releasing charge off of that one.

Let your pc's attention wander off of what you are running and you instantly have added more restimulation to the case. All you have to do is be a clumsy auditor at Level IV auditing on the itsa line and you've had it.

Now, let's grade up auditors here – let's grade up auditors, just in passing. I: Well, we just leave it on accident whether the guy gets TA action or not. We hope he gets TA action, see – Class I. We just hope he does. And it's not going to endanger anybody very much because the fundamental questions that they're being asked are very unfundamental. They're being asked how they cured their lumbosis or something of the sort. All right, so they don't get TA action. So the guy gets a percentage of wins and he gets a percentage of loses, and we just hope the percentage of wins that the auditor gets at that level are greater than the percentage of loses, and that he doesn't get discouraged about it all, and so forth. We just hope, you understand? Because frankly, at that level of training, we can't do anything else. See, it's – look at the amount of technical material which goes into this and you see at once that it's too formidable. This guy would go on – he'd have to go on for months or years of training before he would come up to being able to cope with that situation.

Well, it's a very small price to pay. Because the funny part of it is, now, with the itsa line, we can take that chance very nicely and come out with a great deal of percentage of wins. But you recognize that the auditor at that level is taking that chance that he's going to run some sessions without TA action. He's going to listen to a lot of natter and he's going to listen to this and he's going to listen to that. And he's going to get a certain number of service-facsimile-type cases that don't get TA action, you see, and he's not going to get any TA action. And this isn't seriously going to put somebody in the hospital or anything like that, because the process isn't that strong, don't you see? But it's going to be the guy just doesn't really think auditing is getting him anyplace; that sort of thing, you know? And he just feels gloomier than he would ordinarily feel, and so on.

Well, what's happening with all this? Well, we can't expect at the level of training of Class I for the auditor to be able to remedy it. And of course the second that you, instructing auditors and so forth, come back to remedy this situation, you are no longer operating in the zone or area of Class I and you are actually trying to make a Class II Auditor. So you see, that still stays with the definition.

You start saying to this guy – the moment you start saying to this guy, "Hey, for God's sakes! Read those rules, man, read those rules in that R1C. Read 'em! You're asking this person for problems, problems, problems – what problems have they had in life? And what have they been trying to solve in life? That's a backwards question, a backwards question, man! Of course that TA is going to stick." You know? Well, you're working on Class II, see, straight away. See? So, you see, the condition still remains as it is in Class I, which is a relatively un-instructed auditor.

All right. Now, we move up into Class II: we get "with tone arm action." And the way we handle it there is actually not with the change and shift of processes, beyond just altering the question a bit. But we get listening with tone arm action, and that means that a certain amount of direction of attention is going to have to be done, even if it's just directed by the question that is being asked. "What have you done about your lumbosis?" See? Now, he's

supposed to know the rules of what not to ask, and so on, and to get TA action, and he's got some various ramifications there that are pretty good.

And he can do some things in this line, but it's very light attention direction, don't you see – very light indeed. In fact, we don't even instruct him to direct attention; we rather tend to instruct him not to direct attention. For instance, "Don't drop the E-Meter," you see?

All right, we get up to Class III and what have we got? What have we got at Class III? We've got a direction of attention at Class Level III toward service facsimiles and the state of Clear. Now we're starting to drop out this endless, wandering itsa line, don't you see? We're starting to clip this guy for letting the pc's attention wander off too far into other subject matter. We're supposed – that auditor at the level of III is supposed to be able to control the pc's attention to keep the pc's attention on what the pc is supposed to be talking about. We get – the limitation of attention is what enters in here, see, to some degree. We start telling the fellow, "Now, don't let this pc start wandering around on the early track. And don't do this and don't do that; and keep the pc's attention centered on what you're trying to run and don't let the pc's attention wander over into his environmental restimulation. And if it is there, clean it up with 'since' mid ruds." See, at this level we're using mid ruds; we're knocking down environmental attention. We're paying a lot of attention to the pc's attention at Class Level III.

Now, that control of the pc's attention is at a very high high, you see, there at III. That's pretty high, now. This pc is really being put in the groove. This pc is supposed to talk about A and B and his attention is supposed to be freed up from C and D so that he will talk about A and B. You get the idea? In other words, here's control – control of attention here is getting rather heavy. That's fine, has to be.

Now, let's take Class Level IV: Man, you're living with the lightning now. You've got this pc on a backtrack. You've got this pc there. You've got him on stuff that is quite overwhelming. All he has to do is skid around inside the GPM. All he's got to do is say "Let me go back up and pick up those two early items that we missed." *Zzzzzp!* – and he throws forty RIs into restimulation. Why? Because he had to walk through forty RIs to pick it up that are only – you see – that are not properly discharged. All right, that isn't so bad, you see?

"Let me repair – Oh, I see what this item is. Let me repair it in the earlier goal." And then, much to your embarrassment, you have missed a GPM between these two goals, and he returns up to the earlier goal and throws a whole GPM into restimulation, consisting of some 230 items in the Helatrobus. *Eeerk!* Look, you're walking across Grand Canyon on a wire one millimeter thick.

Now, if you see the various classes in terms of expertness of control of the pc's attention, all will start to make sense to you on the subject of these classes. If you only see these on the complexity of the information the auditor has, auditing will not occur. Oh, well, yeah, you know all about GPMs and you know all about engrams, you know all about processes, you know all about this and you know all about that, and therefore you're Class IV. No, no, no, no. There could be that one element missing – that one element missing – control the pc's attention with expertise – and you would not have a Class IV Auditor.

Now, you start letting a pc talk, you start putting in the itsa line on the backtrack. *Ha-a-a-a-a-a-a!* I've done it myself; I know exactly what I'm talking about, because I've got a

good subjective reality on that sort of thing. "Hey! I just had a cognition. There's a this and a that and a tho and a thee, and down there in that engram there's a spot and a *bolp* and a *bo...* oh, my God!" *Bow!* The roof falls in. You got the idea? Suddenly throw into restimulation fifteen or twenty chains of something, see, just with a nice cognition. There is something earlier! Zoom! See?

Now, the auditor in that particular case wouldn't even have time to open their mouth, you know? Pc is sitting there in a brown study. You think he's looking over the next RI, you know? Pc all of a sudden says, "I think this came – I think this came from – Yeah, there's a – there's a GPM there about eighteen trillion years ago. Oh yeah. Oh yes. There it is. And it's there and there, and that fits into the other two and it comes up to here. And then that is what gives you the background music of all that – *uh-uh-uh*. What's the matter with my throat?" The auditor actually doesn't have time to say a word.

Now, how does that situation take place? That situation takes place when the case is already overrestimulated – greasy on the track, attention hard to control. Greasy on the track. Now, if this pc is quite a bearcat, he will go right on getting tone arm action but very uncomfortably. He'll go right on getting the tone arm action necessary to resolve the case, that's for sure. But he's running in an atmosphere of exhaustion, of worry; misemotion comes up here or there. In other words, he's a bit overwhumped all the time. You see, you've gotten up to the point of overrestimulation, and with this overrestimulation now in progress, you are still discharging things. Do you see? Case still runs but the case isn't comfortable while running. Case will still make it, but doesn't feel like he's getting many auditing wins, see? Awful hard grind. Spends most of the time between sessions in a fog, don't you see? Case still making it and tone arm running.

Now, let's add this other liability. Now, you see that we've gone over some difficulties here. Now let's really clobber it. Let's say that this case we're doing this with has a fragile tone arm to begin with, which is susceptible to being stuck low or stuck high or stuck dead thetan. Let's add that liability to all this other complexity.

Now, what do you think is going to happen? Well, the auditor is going to spend all of his sessions worrying about the pc, and the pc may or may not spend any sessions worrying about auditing, or between sessions, but just going around being *blaaah*, or having a bad time or being very nattery or something.

But the auditor is wild. Auditor is trying to get tone arm action, trying to get tone arm action. And he keeps looking. He comes back into the session. He finally got tone arm action in the last session. Oh boy, finally got it. He got four blowdowns of one division in the whole session. Oh, that's fine. That's more than he'd seen for a long time, and so forth. And he comes back in; he got this pc halfway through a GPM, don't you see? Now all he's got to do now in the next session is pick it up and finish it and that means – you know, was getting tone arm action, more tone arm action, and you run some GPMs, you know, and you get tone arm action. That's obvious, you know, wonderful. That's obvious, and so forth.

And he comes back in, and there's the tone arm. "What the hell? Well," he says, "something must have keyed in between sessions. Something must have keyed in. This tone

arm is sitting here at about six and a half. Something must have keyed in between sessions. All right. All right. Something keyed in between sessions. All right.

"Since the last time I audited you – now, when was that? When was the last time I audited you? Last time, last time now? When – when was that?"

Pc finally thinks and thinks and thinks and thinks, and finally remembers. No tone arm action.

"Now, since the last time I audited you, has anything been suppressed?" There it sits. Right on down through all of those buttons, there it sits. Pc tells you all sorts of things, but there it sits. You say, "That's obvious enough to give anybody tone arm action," but there it sits! Horrible!

You say, "Well, if I can just finish off the rest of this GPM. Now, in this session, if I can just finish off the rest of the GPM." You say, "All right, now let's pick it up at the last item where we left it," and so forth.

And the pc says, "Last item? What – what's the last item?"

"Well, that last item. It was 'absolutably coughing,' you know," and so on. "Let's pick it up."

And the pc says that and then the needle doesn't twitch and nothing happens and nothing moves, and... You realize suddenly that if you stay there any longer, this pc is liable to do an around-the-clock and go into maybe a low-tone-arm case, or something like that. You realize that you're looking at something here which can't hold, because you're getting absolutely no discharge at all. And you hit the silk, and you get out of that. And you say you're going to put in the itsa line on auditing or you're going to do a Prepcheck on auditing or you're going to take anything that you've had as a good way, you know, to key off the case, and so forth.

Now, in this particular case we're talking about, this tone arm here, is – let us say, is gone at 5.75. So you say, "All right, we'll just destimulate the auditing. That's easy. Just destimulate the auditing and we'll get tone arm action back, obviously." So we say, "All right. Now, on auditing, on auditing, when was – well, how many years have you been audited?" or something like that, or "How many months? ...has anything been suppressed?" And of course you get the same story as the "since" mid ruds. There it sits at 5.75 – no tone arm action. The restimulation is now too great to permit even the discharge of the key-in. That's what you've run into. In other words, you're running this case downhill on a toboggan. And it all traces back to what?

Now, you see, this is quite a problem I've outlined to you here. And I see from the looks on some of your faces that you yourselves have had something like this problem. Now, the resolution of this problem is therefore pretty gargantuan. And that's what – just to get it all in line – that's what's been resolved with service facsimile.

Service facsimile, in actual fact, is not an accusative thing. It is simply a solution that the individual has himself so restimulated that it won't discharge and nothing will discharge past it. In other words, it's a solution that is so valuable, so survival, so magnificent, that if one got rid of it as a solution, one would, of course, perish at once – like a wax effigy, you

see, would just melt right there, you see, and be gone. Too horrible to contemplate getting rid of this solution. Actually, it is simply an overcharged solution. That is all it is.

Now, how does it get so overcharged? Well, it's because the pc is restimulating it. It isn't being restimulated by life. There's volition going on here. The pc himself is keeping this thing kicked in.

This girl has life solved, has life solved: Don't eat. Every time the boss is mean to her, something like that happens, "Well," she says, "I don't have to eat. That's the good, sensible solution to the whole thing. Therefore, really, I don't really need a job; I really don't need anything."

The husband, he's a little bit mean, nattery and upset some evening. So she says she knows what to do about this – he don't eat. Dinner accidentally burns or something like this, see? And one of the children gets upset, something like that. Well, she knows what to do about that – kid just won't eat, that's all. That's it. He's had it, see? And all of this is so complicated and so filled with ramifications that it actually has become a survival computation. And it sits there. It sits there like a mountain rising out of the plain or a dam across a river, and no charge can flow by it. Because if charge were permitted to flow by it...

You see, the difference between our rationale, and so forth, is we know people do things. See, it's not on the automatic, push-button type mentality of Pavlov, you see, and Wundt and the rest of these birds – gents – jerks – fellows. Push-button mentality, you see, so that it's always caused by some mechanical thing. No, there's also a being there. He's also up to something, and that's the further complication, don't you see? The person can do something, you see?

Now, if you tell somebody that the survival computation is "not to eat" – if you told somebody else – they'd say, "You're nuts!" But not – not this one. See, that is the survival computation. Well, naturally, it's aberrated, but unfortunately for this being, it works. Hubby always gets in line; the kids always shut up. Don't you see? And she can relax enough about her job or doing what she's doing, so that by saying "Well, I don't have to eat," you see, that actually that sort of – she stops attacking in that zone and sphere. And it actually has some weird, backwards, upside-down survival computation, see?

So what it is, is a non-survival solution which has become survival. And it doesn't make sense – not even to the person, when they begin to take it apart. It really doesn't make sense, but it appears to make sense. It appears to make sense. And that solution can become so fixed in the activities of the individual that the individual feels that if it were disturbed in any way, life would become unlivable. And this can be a pretty batty solution.

You maybe are looking at a service facsimile when you look at a suicide type of thing: The way to live is to dive off the top of the Empire State Building, see? Now, you say, "That's nutty." But the funny part of it is when you run it, if it weren't so pathetic, you would probably be able to sit there and just almost ruin your stitches, because this – it's wild! I mean, how this thing works out. I mean, the way the put-together, the A=A=A and the disassociate and so forth, of this is so – so fantastic.

And very often in the early stages of it, the pc will sit there and they give it to you with such a straight face and with such a solution to the whole thing and, "Well, yes, obviously. Obviously, the way to cure a fear of height is to fall off the Empire State Building," or something like this, you see? It'd be something fantastic. Even that's too sensible.

But what it is, is a solution which has become fixed and which the individual is actually working with. And maybe they've been overwhelmed by this solution – it's explainable in bank terms, too – but the individual keeps that chain or channel in restimulation. And then you start to audit the engrams of this thing, and all the individual sells you is "bring up more engrams of this thing," but oddly enough they won't erase.

And this was another source of search. The other source of search, of course, was why do some engrams erase and some engrams not erase. That is an old, idle datum – been kicking around for a long time. Some engrams grind out and some discharge. Why? Some pcs turn on mass when you prepcheck them and some don't – mostly don't – but some do.

What's with this pc who does? What's with this pc who can't erase this particular engram? You go over on the left and right of this engram channel and you can find engrams that will erase, but the pc never gives you those – they only give you the engram channel. That's because they're obsessively restimulating this particular channel in the bank. They're obsessively restimulating it, because it's survival to have that. Therefore, they will sell you as the auditor that particular channel if it is a service facsimile, because their penchant is to keep it restimulated. So they always sell you that channel.

And then you, you knucklehead, you going to run it out, man. Why, you've picked – if that person is a service-facsimile case, which – not all cases run this way, fortunately. Unfortunately for us, many cases run quite easily and smoothly without any of these complications, don't you see? In fact a little more than half of your cases will run smoothly, without these computations.

Well, that – that makes it bad, don't you see, because then you're unable to understand this other percentage of cases that doesn't run smoothly, see? So you say, "these techniques work, but on some cases they don't work." Well, therefore, you have to bring the broad line of restimulation and so forth. Aberration is always of some use. At some time or another anybody's aberration on any subject has been of some use to them – always. You can trace it always – you can trace it back. It's been of some use. Otherwise they wouldn't keep mocking it up. But it normally doesn't amount to this fixed service facsimile level crash, you see? And it erases, and it handles up, and the guy cognites on it, and it straightens up, and all that sort of thing happens.

But on a service facsimile none of these things occur. The engrams don't erase, the prepchecks don't work, the tools of the game are suddenly null and void, apparently, unless you know this little, secret channel down through the middle of it. And that secret channel is advised by any tone arm trouble – that doesn't mean that for a quarter of a session – since you always get the top of a GPM almost always early on in a case, you're going to find the tone arm hung up high or something like that. The tone arm normally will hang up on the first fifteen, twenty items of a GPM and then suddenly loosen up and tone arm action restores. That's on a Helatrobus-type GPM. In the first stages of hitting a GPM, you normally will get a bit of

a lockup. That's beside the point. That's just a point in the session where the thing locks up. No, we're talking about the case that gives you trouble with a tone arm, the case that is a dead thetan, a low tone arm case, a high tone arm case or a case whose tone arm hangs up at the drop of a hat.

The full, complete diagnosis of the case is done with the tone arm, not with how loopy they're acting in life. I think anybody on this planet is acting loopy in life, see? If you put it up against survival standards, you'd find it was very non-survival. You cannot be human and be right. So there's no reason at all to try to trace it back, analytically, or medically – psychiatrically – say he's got schitzobonga, or something, you see? There's no sense in any of this. This is all for the birds. There isn't any reason to do it off of a graph. There isn't any reason to do it off of any of your tests. Nothing. The only place you'll really see this is by putting the pc on an E-Meter, and then, if the pc's tone arm looks all right, running the pc awhile to see if you run into the trouble.

You see, you could even be fooled – and some of you will be – by a dead-thetan case that merely has a Clear read and a tight needle. Maybe the person isn't a dead-thetan case; maybe they're just sitting in the middle of a bump of some kind or another that's got the needle slightly tight. And you ask them one question and you practically have a free needle, see? Needles change in their characteristic. This may be hard to analyze, but that's the only state that is hard to analyze. The low tone arm, the high tone arm – the second you put them on the meter – the low tone arm, the dead thetan: definitely, always service-fac case. Dead thetan: service fac. Bang, bang. That's all.

This person cannot get discharge in life. In the process of living he discharges no aberration. So living is a very, very aberrative thing to him. See, he's right up against it there: there's no accidental discharge of anything. Give him a birthday present, he doesn't say "Hey, what do you know!" you know, and his tone arm moves, even though you haven't got him on the meter, see? No, nothing like that ever occurs. This guy's tone arm is fixed all the time, all the time, all the time, you see? Always fixed. And as he lives, he just gets unhappier and unhappier; life becomes crueler and crueler. And eventually he becomes a newspaper reporter, you know, or something like that.

It's a very weird thing how many newspaper reporters I've seen who're dead-thetan cases. Restimulation of life is too high for their level of understanding.

Now, the low-tone-arm case: definitely service facsimile. All you have to do is put somebody on the tone arm, see it's got a low tone arm, See it's hanging down below 2 here – nah, service facsimile. That's it. See? Diagnosis right now, bang. You just know.

High: questionable, but probable. You can question it, but it's probable. But you just accidentally put somebody on the tone arm – you just put somebody on the meter and you find his tone arm is reading high, that's enough, see: service fac.

Now, case down here at 3.5, 3.75, something like that, with a fairly decent needle and so forth: some possibility still exists that this is a service-facsimile case. So it goes from some possibility still exists to maybe/maybe not but probable on the high tone arm case. Low tone arm case: yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes – nothing else. Dead-thetan case: well, you're lucky if

you can get them to talk to you long enough to give you the service facsimile. Definitely service-facsimile cases.

So any difficulty with this tone arm – any difficulty with this tone arm... Now, I'm talking about tone arm difficulty; I'm not talking about difficulty with a case. You know, difficulty getting a pc into things and difficulty getting them out of things. And you can have a thousand different things that could be difficult in running a case. Well, just – it's just difficult to run cases. That's not diagnosis. That's just a banality.

Oh, this guy, every time you let him anywhere near the backtrack, why, he all of a sudden starts picking up things at trillions-eight, then there's one at trillion-thirteen, and then there's one at trillions-six, and so forth. Yeah, you have trouble with this guy. You have trouble limiting his line, getting him into something and so forth. Well, the case is simply overrestimulated. You could use this same technology and possibly hope you could find a service facsimile on him to cool it down. Wonder why this stuff doesn't bleed off faster or why the case restimulates hiself to this degree – maybe it still lies in the realm and zone of a service facsimile, you see? Possibility that it does. It's worth scouting, worth scouting.

But all these troubles I'm talking about are troubles with the tone arm. Anybody who's got a troublesome tone arm, has given you a bad time, won't move enough, gets stuck in these three positions with great ease – no, man, you're looking at a service-facsimile case.

Now, what you're doing is looking at the normal river of discharge blocked up with a great, big, high stable datum – "horses sleep in beds," see – with this slight trimmings: He knows that if he gets rid of this and if he no longer believed that horses slept in bed, oh, cut his throat! Finish him! The hallmark of a service facsimile is that some time during – in the running out of this service facsimile – some time during its run out or between sessions (you'll hear about it when the pc comes back into the next session), a person questions the wisdom of getting rid of it. I don't care if it's jabbing butcher knives in their right arm. He will question the wisdom of getting rid of this aberration. And you might miss hearing it on some cases, but it is always there. Sometime in the process of running it out, they got up to this level.

"Now, let's see, if I got rid of this, *uhhhh-ohhh* I don't know. I don't know." Say his service facsimile is "hitting policemen," see? "Oh, I don't know – if I got rid of that, man, I just might be in jail all the time."

You look at him in amazement, you know? "If you got rid of the service facsimile of hitting policemen, you would be in jail all the time." You don't treat him like that as an auditor, see, but you'll hear some weird ones. The guy is in jail all the time from hitting policemen, see? But if he got rid of the service facsimile of hitting policemen, something would go very wrong in his life and he couldn't survive and it would be finished, see?

It's where life has been so overwhelming and he has done so much overwhelming that it actually – it makes no more sense – he has abandoned it, and in lieu of any good sense he has erected this monument. See? And that monument is a monument to total asininity.

"The way to have good health is to smoke cigarettes," you see, "and never take any exercise," and so forth, and so forth. And you'll hear this guy going on along in this and you'll

hear a dissertation and it seems to be just a little bit offbeat. And you'll wonder how on earth this – what this really adds up to.

Well, without precise assessment you probably could not establish exactly what it was. But it might be as banal as "good health." The service facsimile is "good health." How do you have good health? Well, the best way to have good health is eat poisonous foods and throw yourself under trucks wherever possible, and so forth. You see, the thing is completely twisted around the other way to. It's an aberrated survival computation, is what it is.

Now, it might better be called a service computation, or a survival computation – but we already have this term service facsimile, so we might as well stay it – with it for the present at least – because it isn't just one facsimile. It actually isn't a facsimile at all. It's the guy himself keeping facsimiles in restimulation because he knows what's best.

You see all this wild aberration inside of a society which compels its citizens to do this or that. You're probably looking at third-dynamic service facsimiles. They get stuck on these things. Take the jail system which is used right now in the West. The jail system is rather interesting. Because they know for a fact, and all their statistics demonstrate, every single one of them demonstrates – the lot – that they increase criminality with the present prison system. All the penologists know this and they adhere to it slavishly.

In 1835 a study was conducted to find out what penal systems were in use around the world – not to find out which was most workable, but what ones were in use. And they adopted the present system in Philadelphia. They adopted this present system of the cell and the confinement and the guard and the this and that. And at the time they adopted it, they knew that it did the least rehabilitation.

I mean, the committee that did this had the data in front of them that they were doing the most they possibly could to perpetuate crime by adapting the present prison system. Now, this prison system today is so general and it is in use so far and wide, and the present court system – court system is not any part of it – is so wide and general and so forth, that everybody thinks that is the only prison system there could be. That is very far from a fact.

There are actually hundreds of prison systems. And yet they have hung themselves with the one which they found was the least rehabilitative, the least workable and produced the most crime. And that was done by study – by careful, analytical study. So you must realize that there are third-dynamic service facsimiles at work. It's a totally non-survival computation to choose the worst prison system you could possibly choose, and yet they set out to do so.

So I don't think they were studying public safety. See, they weren't any longer studying public safety. They were simply studying how to make criminals wrong!

So penology, by 1835, had ceased to be a study of how to make an honest society safe from the inroads of a criminal and had begun to be just a system by which to dramatize "the criminal is wrong," see, so no longer had any useful application. I don't care what money they're spending on crime today, if they'd stop spending it they'd have less crime. I don't care how weird and aberrated that happens to look. But I'm just showing you, here is a solution stuck in the society.

Not to go on this subject, this is not a horse I ride; it just happens to be an interesting datum. I got this out originally and was rather interested that Warner Brothers did one on this a long time ago. Crime colleges: that's what they've established. You want to – as I asked you in an earlier lecture, how is it that argot is the one thing that seems to be a current slingo that goes along, a language that carries along, and yet it's the most secret language there is. How is this perpetuated? Well, it's perpetuated by the state with its existing prison system. So with that argot then, must go all the systems of defrauding, robbing, murdering and wrecking the society. And they have gratuitously, at public expense, erected these universities all over the place in which these fellows can carefully communicate to one another the very best criminal methods. And this is all done at great public expense.

And that's a service facsimile at work. That solution – the prison, see – stands up there right now as the primary method why the society is going criminal. And yet it is supposed to be the reason why the society – or... the reason why the society is not criminal. See, it's erected to protect the public from the criminal. And there it is, however, educating criminals, perpetuating crime, going forward in a very businesslike way at great public expense to do the least possible rehabilitation for the criminal, make him feel the most outlaw of any other system, make him feel the most individuated from the society, spoil his reach and therefore his sanity. It makes sense to a Scientologist particularly – put a guy in his place so he can't reach anything, can't itsa anything, he's naturally – get a case deterioration. Well, if he's already a criminal because he's crazy, how about deteriorating his case? Well, naturally he'll become more of a criminal, won't he?

So, all kinds of actions of this character – I'm not even standing up for another system. Frankly, if you just erected a big stockade someplace or another and told the fellows to go in there for a while, and we didn't care who they took with us, we'd probably, you know, have a better system.

If the Scientologist were to go about this – I already figured this out for the federal prisons of the United States. The head of all federal prisons in the United States has required Dianetics to be read, by the way, by all his wardens. And I worked out a system for him. Too much work for me to put into effect and so never went into effect. We are not without friends or connections or influence, in spite of the fact that some two-bit – some drug addicts, the Federal Drug Addicts, are after us, because they're actually not under the government, they're under the AMA.

Well, that's who pays them, you know? People work for those who pay them, don't they, normally? Naturally. They, by the way, recently got some legislation through, I see. Now, so that anything is mislabeled, all they have to do is arrest the guy and throw him in prison without a hearing. I was interested in this new legislation that came through from the FDA. When they do something like this, they get a level of unpopularity that has exclamation points after it. So they're doing their best, and we'll help them out. The direction which they want to go, we will help them go, any day now.

But there is service facsimile.

Government sets itself up a stable datum: "Foods must not have noxious products in them." And this outfit is now protecting the public against good electrical equipment and cer-

tifying electric-shock machines that break people's teeth and spines. And they pass these. But the E-Meter – no, that's deadly. It's pretty grim – I mean, it's pretty gruesome when you start to think over the level of action.

Well now, that again, on a third-dynamic level, is a service facsimile in action. See, somebody put up this solution that the public shouldn't have to eat noxious food products or something like this, or poison should be kept out of foods. That, basically, you see, is a good idea. And then this idea starts going all mad, and madder and madder and madder, till practically the only thing that'll get certified is something that kills somebody. See? You get the idea?

Well, all right, so they must be there simply to make somebody wrong. I don't think they have anything to do with anything except making somebody wrong. I don't know who they're trying to make wrong. They're not going to make us wrong. But they must have somebody they want to make wrong, and we're not quite sure who it is. But there is, you might say, a service facsimile.

Well now, you take any good solution to a situation and then plow that solution in so that it lower-harmonics. It goes through several flips. Stays itself, you see, but it's lower and lower and lower on the Tone Scale. It finally gets below all other solutions and becomes itself an aberration.

Now, it isn't true that all solutions become service facsimiles. You could immediately conclude this. As a matter of fact, I have looked at it rather wildly occasionally and said, "My heavens, if you – if any time you solve something, why, you're in the soup." No, no, that isn't it.

A service facsimile is a solution which is insisted upon but won't itsa. It's a solution which is insisted upon but won't itsa. A solution, to be a solution, leads to a further ability to itsa.

Now, if you solve something on the basis of the solution reduces the itsa or the ability to itsa, then you've set up a potential service facsimile. This is one of the reasons why Scientology would never become a service facsimile in a society. See, it increases the ability to itsa.

Now, let's look back at the FDA for a moment. They are taking over a role of classifying for and protecting the public from making up their own minds about food. They're denying the public an analytical attitude toward products. And they step in there and protect the public from themselves, which is to say, they cut the public itsa. Now having reduced the public itsa very severely along a level where it didn't need reduction, they have then set up a situation where anybody they pass is okay. The public then loses the criterion of inspection; the public no longer does its own inspection. They don't buy Salinas Valley lettuce because it's good and avoid Mexican lettuce because it's bad, see? But the FDA, aberratedly, because it's in some wild state, then goes in and passes – because somebody slipped them a quick buck or something like that (slipped them Mexican lettuce) – and says, "Well, that's okay. Mexican lettuce: that's – that's all right, that's all right. Seal of approval – bang. It's fertilized with dysentery."

Look what happens to the public suddenly. The public can be caved in by it, because it's opened a gate which is destructive. See what they are? They are not, then, increasing familiarity with the environment. They are decreasing it and leaving this area in a mystery. And it's all set up on the irrational supposition that they're infallible.

They had some non-pregnancy drug the other day and it had wild side effects, and they passed it. They passed it. There's been several drugs of recent times that have been passed that are terribly destructive one way or the other. Now, obviously, some role exists for such an agency. But every time you set up such an agency, you set up a potential service facsimile, which will then accumulate to it a great deal of evil. And the next thing you know, you have set up a situation where nobody can live with it. Now, you get how that's done? It's by reducing itsa.

For instance, you'd almost never look for travel agencies to aberrate a society. See, you wouldn't look to a travel agency as a primary source of aberration in the society. They could bring in a little bit. We had a situation here – we had a situation here in England where anybody that could buy a ticket in the West Indies, you see, could come to London. And some shipping company made millions shipping everybody to London. And this was looked on in some particular lines as something. And then oddly and wildly enough, the Parliament up here was faced with the embarrassing situation, suddenly, of limiting the amount of immigration from one of its own colonies – very embarrassing. They managed to get over it and pass it and nobody has ever heard of it since. And they've limited immigration in that particular line. But I'm afraid this wasn't even much of an aberration. I mean, that's about as close as a travel agency could come, you see?

So it doesn't mean that all these sources are perfect. Little randomities exist around these other sources, don't you see? But broadly, those that directly reduce the itsa – those that directly reduce the itsa and don't help or support the itsa line in any way – are most likely to become service facsimiles. They're a solution without inspection which is too broadly applied.

This girl has a survival solution. She simply says, "Families are no good." This is what she's made up her mind to. She holds that in place. She proves it to herself all the time. She works day and night. She sits there – you can see her in a brown study, you know? She's sitting there and so on. "Hmm, yeah. Yeah," she'll say to herself, "yeah. Proves it. Mother didn't say anything to me this afternoon, so that of course proves, you see, families are no good." See, and it all works out. Now, she doesn't have to look to find out why didn't Mother speak to her all afternoon. And that brings about a no as-isness of mass. There's no necessity to inspect. She's got it solved. Mother didn't speak to her all afternoon because families are no good. That's it. She didn't have to inspect the fact that she, last evening when she took the car out, bent the front fender and then didn't say anything about it and didn't offer to do anything about it and put it back in the garage. And Mama found it at noon and cut the communication line because she already knows that it's disastrous to try to talk, you see?

So you've got a situation there. Now, that little ARC break is never going to blow away, is it? It's never going to be talked about, not going to be any communication on the subject and so forth. Well, what's preventing it from being talked about? "Families are no good." That proves it.

Now this, added to – you understand, it gets charged up because every one of these ARC breaks that contributes to it in its immediate vicinity charges it up further, and the person holds it in line harder, and more ARC breaks pile up on it until it eventually becomes an accumulation of mass. And therefore, when you prepcheck somebody with a service facsimile around the vicinity of this service facsimile without hitting it on, you turn on mass. The source of the mass is: nothing has been itsa'd.

Now, you're prepchecking them this way: "Since the last session, has anything been suppressed?" Let's say it's auditing that's the target. This is in vignette; this is not a real service facsimile – "My auditor is no good."

("There is no reason to answer this question because my auditor is no good, because auditors are no good.") "No." Now, the case is in a solid, continuous ARC break so it doesn't register on your meter.

"Since the last session, has anything been invalidated?" you see?

"Nope." ("Auditors are no good. Wouldn't do me any good to answer the question anyway, because auditors are no good.") You see?

Yet the case isn't thinking this consciously. Case isn't thinking that consciously. That's just everything that you ask the case comes up against this.

And you – my God – you're trying to talk to this case. You're trying to get this case to talk. You're trying to get this case to do something. And you do know what you're doing. And yet you're going up against some kind of a barrier like this in this case. And then all of a sudden, you wheel back and you say, "Uhh-uhh! I'm a failure as an auditor." No, you're not a failure as an auditor. You just didn't clip the service facsimile that made auditing impossible. You see that? And this is expressed by the no-motion of the tone arm action. Because there is no itsa in that immediate vicinity, there's no, then, dismissal or discharge of the charge hanging up on it. You see that?

Now, you're listening to this opinion, "Auditors are no good," on somebody who is... who never inspects an auditor or auditing. There's no itsa. In other words, the whole thing is just completely unjustified. How do they know whether the auditor is no good or not? They've seldom heard one; they've never looked at them. See, how would they know?

And let's get another situation: I'm very, very sure that some of you have been over the coals of being considered immature, or some other way, by either your mother or father or family – irresponsible, see? Now, you probably have never asked yourself this other question: "Did they ever look at me?" Now, there's lots of mothers, the last time they looked at little Roscoe was when he was about two. And they're still trying to advise two-year-old Roscoe at the age of thirty what he should do about his marriage. Well, they don't know anything about him.

If you want to give somebody a send that has a lot of family trouble, just ask them questions along that particular line, and so on. Ask them what they have observed about their family. There's a good R1C. Probably get tone arm action out of that, you see, because it's on the fringe of something if they're having trouble with something. And they're liable to come

up with the realization that their family has never looked at them and doesn't know them. See, we're on a no-itsa situation, some preconceived notion.

Societies tend to get stuck with these things, to get stuck with some idea. And it's very interesting that this is probably the way that a society reduces its strength, just as an individual reduces his strength this way. I feel sorry for this society, in a number of ways, because in certain zones and areas which the society depends upon for its control of mean, vicious, nasty persons and things like us, these guys haven't got any itsa line out. Do you realize what's happening? If you want to look at it bluntly, these guys are sitting back taking the wrong actions with regard to certain situations. They're trying to prevent – through their wrong itsa on Scientology – they're trying to prevent certain zones and spheres of activity, which is to say, "the public must not be practiced on by an unqualified guy who doesn't happen to pay dues to us," and that sort of thing.

All right, now they're set with certain set, fixed ideas, see? They believe these ideas. And they believe that what we're doing and what we have to do with is no good and it's corn, see, and that it's not any advance on anything.

And my God, during this whole period of time we're moving right straight on ahead into more mental technology and more technology about life and livingness than they ever dreamed could ever exist. We have actually been effectually isolated and insulated from any further interference, or from having our energies drained down by being made to comply with or agree with the mores of their particular practice lines. That would have slowed us down like mad, don't you see? We're moving forward at express-train velocity.

There isn't any faculty of any college or something like that is going to tell you or me whether or not we had better research or not research some particular sphere of existence. If we can put an itsa line on it, we look at it. It doesn't then make it "bad" or "impolite," see, or something like that – "this is why we shouldn't look." And we're actually traveling as a subject without a service fac, and it's making fantastic velocity. And here these poor sods are, whose whole life is bound up in these – you know, the mustard-plaster level of healing. And they're not in contest to keep their developmental line coming forward, so there they sit, and there we go.

How high can it rise before the potential suddenly explodes? They're nuts. That's what it makes them look to us. The potential will eventually explode in their faces. In what way? They suddenly won't have any patients. Nobody will be paying any attention to them, because they have a wholly authoritarian educational system. That is to say, they put it on TV, "You must see your local doctor. Your local doctor receives you in open arms." Well, they're so unreal they don't realize that that isn't the public line. Their word of mouth – I don't care how much advertising you buy, you got to have good word of mouth, man. You can buy newspapers full of advertising to get somebody to go see a movie that's no good and the theater will stay empty, because their word of mouth is bad, you see? And the word of mouth on medicine is very bad. Very bad.

And while they're taking fortunes away from people in the United States for not healing them, and not advancing their own technical lines, and not really measuring up the way they should, they're not making the effort necessary to survive. Why? Because they have a

service facsimile on us. They don't even know they've got it. It's hidden down amongst their case, amongst any other batty lines.

I had a good news story on the subject. I didn't release it. It might have woke them up. They have to reorganize the whole of mental and physical healing before they could cope with what we're doing. This potential – these poles are stretching further and further and wider and wider apart, and eventually they will become a no-factor. That's what happens to them – they're a no-factor. They simply are not powerful enough or influential enough or anything else enough to do anything about it.

You may not think that we're growing. But I look back over any six months of the last ten and eleven years, and frankly, I hardly recognize a comparable size – just six months to the next six months. This is a rather fantastic thing, only this is going on internationally.

Now, did you ever double a penny for thirty-two days? It's the old mathematical trick. A guy says, "Well, you needn't pay me anything but one cent doubled every day for thirty-two days."

And somebody says, "That's fine," but of course at the end of thirty-two days – I don't know what the figure is. It's either a million pounds, or it's something like that that it has grown up to, don't you see? It only takes this type of curve growth going on up.

Now, therefore, they're not impeding what they should be impeding if they wanted to survive, themselves. They're not handling the situation within its own zone of reality. And that's all aberration is, is a failure to handle the situation in its own zone of reality.

So this, then, is the service that a service facsimile performs. It makes it unnecessary for an individual to handle the situation in its own sphere of reality – makes it unnecessary to do so. So nobody ever does anything about it; so mass accumulates up on it. Now, any mass that accumulates on a case, any mass that accumulates by reason of Prepcheck, any body mass that occurs by reason of processing and so forth, must to some degree or another then be batting up against a service facsimile. And if a person cannot be knocked out on the subject of a psychosomatic illness of some character or another by processing, then that must be part of a service facsimile.

Those things that auditing won't change are, then, rooted in this other mechanism. They're a solution without inspection which pulls in upon it all the uninspected mass. That's all. And of course, mass disappears because it's as-ised. And when a person does not as-is the mass that is there, he naturally gets an accumulation of mass. And the mass that accumulates around one of these service facsimiles is rather marvelous to behold. And of course, it's that mass accumulating which holds and prevents the Prepcheck action. And those are the technical mechanisms which prevent tone arm action.

If you don't get tone arm action, it's because the individual does not as-is and has not as-ised any mass in that zone or area for a long time. And not having as-ised any, when you get into its vicinity, you go into it with a thud if it gets anywhere close to processing, getting well or handling the environment in which the individual finds himself.

The auditing session, to this effectiveness, extends out to everything the individual does during the period of time that he's being audited and every environment he finds himself

in. So that if any service facsimile exists which is being reacted upon in any of his environment, anyplace, it will to some degree influence his auditing. And the more of these things exist, the harder it is for you to get tone arm action – until it gets impossible.

Now, an individual can have a service facsimile and still get tone arm action – get some tone arm action. And it would be better in some cases to make sure that the service facsimiles are out of the way before plunging backtrack. The amount of time that you could save in processing is a very large factor. I've just made a restudy of this. And I've been brushing off Clear left and right and saying no good, no good – you know, I mean, and so on, Keyed-Out Clear. And I recently found out that you can stabilize – there's a possibility here of stabilizing a Clear by the eradication of the things that will key in. So, you see, if you knock out a number of service facsimiles out of an individual, why, the case then stays stable to the degree that it doesn't still have service facsimiles.

Now, R3SC is an extremely workable process. I have written it up; it's been released. Of course, one can expect certain refinements of a process of this particular character. But this is peculiarly complete, because we accidentally already had a couple of types of assessment that you could do for this. We have the old 2-12 assessment, and we have the R3R assessment – preliminary step. They're perfectly adequate, don't you see? There are slippier assessments that you can do and I'm sure we'll have some fancier assessments on it one way or the other, but these happen to be adequate assessments. And you'll find that the mere inspection of a folder from beginning to end will give you a bunch of candidates. Just inspect the folder. Just start turning over things and looking at auditors' notes and mentions of this and that, and what the individual has had *bing-bang* runs on of one character or another – whether they gave tone arm action or not, you see? But look particularly for periods of no tone arm action and then go back before those periods and find out what was being addressed on the case. And you'll probably have a service-facsimile combo sitting right there, and just use it in your ordinary steps of R3SC.

You get an idea: let's take a period – we found a period here the individual was audited for an intensive and toward the last half of the intensive got no tone arm action. We notice this from the old, old, old, old auditor's reports, see? We find out that on Wednesday "form" was addressed by the auditor and that was the end of tone arm action. We notice that there may have been two subjects there that could have been addressed. Well, run them both! Don't be chichi, see?

Now, you can run almost anything with R3SC, which is what makes it very good. Just don't overrun it. And if the pc says no, and he can't give it answers and so forth, come off of it; don't shove it down his throat. With those ramifications, then, it doesn't much matter what you pick to be the service facsimile. But if you do a slippy assessment, which is a preliminary-step assessment, it's a bingo assessment right dead-on – and something like that – boy, you get action, man, you'll get action. But if you pick almost anything else, you will also get some action.

So it's not critical – the assessment is not terribly critical. Of course, the faster you get what is really the service facsimile on the case, then the faster your tone arm action restores and the case reverts to battery. So there's a lot of ramifications to this sort of thing. But in the

final analysis is, here is a process, full bloom, which totally replaces your R2-12 type processes – makes them utterly unnecessary – and takes care of this thing we call a rock slammer, and takes care of body mass and a lot of other things in cases that we've been particularly worried about, and particularly takes care of the auditor's main worry which is "How do I get tone arm action on this pc?" Obviously, if he can't get tone arm action on the pc, the pc is sitting in a service facsimile. I mean, that's the end product of that.

Now, you may have to run two or three or four service facsimiles, but by that time you're going to Clear. So you might as well go ahead and clear the guy. Throw it all out of restimulation; make the case sit there with a free-flop needle, and so forth, and say, "All right, I cleared you." Let the guy enjoy it. Let him enjoy it for a day or an afternoon or something like that before you reach for the earlier GPM.

All right. Now, that's R3SC. And I hoped – I noticed – do you notice that it's tabulated 3? I want to make a short note on that. It's the tabulation of 3 is because, actually, it is a 3 process – being a clearing process. We rehabilitate Scientology levels against the existing scale, and that means that your R3N, and so forth, will be called R4N. It's a reorientation. But I'm not going to reuse their letters when they're moved up to 4. And there aren't any other R4s, so they're very easy to recognize, and they won't get you tangled up in any way. And then we'll be able to throw these clearing techniques in straight where they belong. And there are a few of them there, so we want them tabulated. We're getting our house in order, and it's making very good sense the way it's going together.

That means that there's quite a few cases around here will have to be cleared before they go on to OT. I'm sorry, but that's the way it is.

Thank you.

Remimeo
Level IV Checksheets
Class IV Auditors
Supervisors
C/Ses

ANATOMY OF A SERVICE FACSIMILE

REF:

HCOB 22 JUL 63	YOU CAN BE RIGHT
HCOB I SEP 63	SCIENTOLOGY THREE CLEARING, CLEARING, CLEARING, ROUTINE THREE SC
HCOB 23 AUG 66	SERVICE FACSIMILE
HCOB 30 NOV 66	ASSESSMENT FOR SERVICE FACSIMILES
TAPE: 6308C27	SH SPEC 299 RIGHTNESS AND WRONGNESS
TAPE: 6309C04	SH SPEC 302 HOW TO FIND A SERVICE FACSIMILE
TAPE: 6309C03	SH SPEC 302A R3SC
TAPE: 6309C05	SH SPEC 303 SERVICE FACSIMILE ASSESSMENT
TAPE: 6309C18	SH SPEC 308 ST HILL SERVICE FAC HANDLING

Facsimile: A mental picture unknowingly created; a copy of the physical universe environment, complete with all the perceptions, at some time in the past.

Service: A method of providing a person with the use of something; the action or result of giving assistance or advantage; work done; duty performed.

Computation: That aberrated evaluation and postulate that one must be in a certain state in order to succeed.

Service Facsimile: The Service Facsimile is that computation generated by *the preclear* (not the bank) to make self right and others wrong: To dominate or escape domination and enhance own survival and injure that of others.

Note that it is a computation, not a doingness, beingness or havingness. We could call this a "service computation" but we will maintain the term we have used to describe this phenomenon throughout the technology: "service facsimile."

It is a computation that the pc adopted when, in an extreme situation, he felt endangered by something but could not itsa it.

It is called a service facsimile because he uses it; it is "of service" to him.

Aberration, anybody's aberration on any subject, has been of some use to them *at some time or other*. You can trace it back. It's been of some use, otherwise they wouldn't keep

mocking it up. But *now,* if you put it up against survival standards, you'd find it very non-survival.

The pc adopted this because he couldn't stand the confusion in a situation. So he adopted a safe solution. A safe solution is always adopted as a retreat from the environmental restimulation. He adopted a safe solution in that instance and he survived. His safe solution became his stable datum. He has hung onto it ever since. It is the computation, the fixed idea, he uses to handle life, his service facsimile.

HOW THE SERVICE FACSIMILE BECOMES FIXED

An idea is the thing most easily substituted for a thetan. An idea doesn't have any mass connected with it basically. And it appears to have some wisdom in it so it's very easily substituted for a thetan. Thus the idea, the stable datum he has adopted, is substituted for the thetan.

How does this stable datum become so fixed? It gets fixed, and more and more firmly as time goes on, by the confusion it is supposed to handle but doesn't.

The stable datum was adopted in lieu of inspection. The person ceased to inspect, he fell back from inspecting, he fell back from living. He put the datum there to substitute for his own observation and his own coping with life, and at that moment he started an accumulation of confusion.

That which is not confronted and inspected tends to persist. Thus in the absence of his own confronting mass collects. The stable datum forbids inspection. It's an automatic solution. It's "safe." It solves everything. He no longer has to inspect to solve, so he never as-ises the mass. He gets caught in the middle of the mass. And it collects more and more confusion and his ability to inspect becomes less and less. The more he isn't confronting, the less he can confront. This becomes a dwindling spiral.

So the thing he has adopted to handle his environment for him is the thing which reduces his ability to handle his environment.

Those things which do not respond to routine auditing, that routine auditing won't change, are rooted in this mechanism.

Therefore, it is important to find the idea on which he is so fixed. Pull the fixed idea and you free the individual for a broader perimeter of inspection.

In service fac handling the reason you get tone arm action when the fixed idea has been pulled is that the confusion which has been amassed and dammed up for so long is now running off.

RIGHT/WRONG, DOMINATE AND SURVIVE

Right and wrong are the tools of survival. In order to survive you have to be right. There is a level at which true rightness is analytical, and there is a level at which rightness

and wrongness cease to be analytical or comprehensible. When it drops below that point it's aberration.

The point you degenerate from survive to succumb is the point you recognize you are wrong. That is the beginning of succumb. The moment one becomes worried about his own survival he enters into the necessity to dominate in order to survive.

It goes: the insistence upon survival, followed by the necessity to dominate, followed *then* by the necessity to be right. These postulates go downhill. So you get an aberrated rightness or wrongness. The game of domination consists of making the other fellow wrong in order to be right.

That is the essence of the service facsimile.

The reason the service facsimile isn't rational is because you have A=A=As along the whole line. Coming down the line it works itself back and forth in an aberrated A=A=A. If the individual is surviving he must be right. And people will defend the most fantastic wrongnesses on the basis they are being right.

In PT and at any point along the track, the fellow is trying to be right, trying to be right, trying to be right. *Whatever* he's doing he's trying to be right. In order to survive you have to be right more than you're wrong, so you get the obsession to be right in order to survive. The lie is that he can't do anything else except survive.

It isn't that trying to be right is wrong – it's obsessively being right about something that's obviously wrong. That's when the individual is no longer able to select his own course of behaviour. When he is obsessively following courses of behaviour which are uninspected in order to be right.

There is nothing sane about a service facsimile, there is no rationality to it. The computation does not fit the incident or event occurring. It simply enforces, exaggerates and destroys freedom of choice over the exercise of ability to be happy or powerful or normal or active. It destroys power, destroys freedom of choice.

Wherever that zone or area is you'll see the individual worsening. He is on a dwindling spiral. But he himself is generating it.

The intention to be right is the strongest intention in the universe. Above it you have the effort to dominate and above that you have the effort to survive. These things are strong. But we're talking here about a *mental activity*. A *thinking activity*. An *intentional activity*.

Survival – that just happens. Domination – that just happens. Those are not *intended* things. But you get down along the level of *intended* and it's right or wrong. The strongest intention in the universe.

It is always an aberrated solution. It always exists in PT and is part of the environment of the pc. He's generating it. It's his solution. Overwhelmed as he is by it, he is still generating it. It's aberrated because it's an uninspected solution. And it is something that everyone unintentionally or otherwise is telling the pc is wrong and causing him to assert that it is right. The perfect solution when he first got hold of it. But now it monitors his life; it's living his life for him. And it doesn't even vaguely begin to take care of his life.

That is the anatomy of the service facsimile.

You are going to find these on any pc you audit. A service facsimile is the clue, the key to a pc's case. The route to succumb which he blindly asserts is his route to survival. And every pc has more than one of these.

Fortunately, we have the tech to salvage him. We are the only ones who do.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:dr

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 assess-

ment 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.)

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.cden

SERVICE FAC ASSESSMENT

A lecture given on 5 September 1963

Thank you.

Well, you're very lucky today. Very lucky today. I'm not mad at anybody. What is this date?

Audience: 5th of September.

Five Sept. AD 13. And we have a lecture here on Scientology Three, which wraps up the field of psychotherapy.

I don't wish to overemphasize these banal, sweeping statements – and I don't even think you heard it. In fact, I know you didn't!

I'll say it again. I have a lecture here which wraps up the field of psychotherapy. [applause]

Thank you, thank you. [laughter, laughs]

All right. Now, we have been walking around the edges of the field of psychotherapy, by which we determine its relationship to the neurotic and the insane, and so on, for a very long time. We've been giving the boys, who we thought were holding down this field, the courtesy of more or less staying out of it, and so forth.

But there are some interesting things which you should know before I go into the technical material involved here. And this is sequitur to the two lectures which you have heard this week, but there're some things which you should know at this stage.

The word psychiatry has no proprietorship, has no legal definition, is supposed to be the treatment of the neurotic or the insane, and isn't owned by anybody, isn't patented, means nothing in law, and so forth, but does mean something to the public. I consider that's interesting.

We were having some press trouble here a few weeks ago and I wrote at that time some articles on this particular subject which clarified... I had to study two particular spheres – that of newspaper, and had to study the field of psychotherapy to some degree. And although I was talking a great deal about psychiatry, I finally differentiated exactly what I was talking about. I was talking about the untrained mental doctor in the field of psychiatry.

He has no business there. Of course, you always look for an aberrated situation, you'll find that there's a lie connected with it.

Things which people can't solve have a lie connected with them, and that thing we call a service facsimile. And this happens to be the third-dynamic service facsimile. The medical doctor who is not trained for and has no business in the field of mental healing is attempting to take dominance over this particular field.

See, he's not a trained mental practitioner. In fact, somebody just gave me a clipping – down in Australia, some London bigwig comments on the amount of training given the medical doctor. And I think it was ten half-hour lectures, most of which were unattended by the students. A real roast.

No, this man is not trained in the field of the mind. He's trained in brains and surgery. So therefore, he applies brain – gray matter and surgery and force and electric shock – naturally applies these things because he doesn't understand the mind at all. He has no proprietorship over the mind. And as a matter of fact he's not trained in the mind at all, he's trained in the brain. He knows it occupies the skull and that you can shove ice picks in it. And this he considers mental healing.

Ah, but he's told a big lie. He's told a whopping lie. And he's put it across on legislatures and that sort of thing: that the medical doctor is qualified to operate in the field of mental healing. And of course he's not trained in the field of mental healing.

And all you'd have to do is bring pressure to bear on legislatures that people who are not trained exclusively in the field of the mind may not practice in the field of the mind and you've secured the entire field of the mind. I think any legislature would pass this. "People who are not trained in the field of the mind must not practice in the field of the mind." Banal.

It's on that stable datum that most legislatures pass laws – misrepresentation. You've got to be trained in the field of the mind, you see? That's the is-ness of the situation. The big lie is that people who aren't trained in the field of the mind at all are practicing in the field of the mind and calling themselves psychiatrists, which they are not. They're medical doctors. The only person you have to deny the field of the mind to is the medical doctor, and he has no business there.

As far as the field of the human mind is concerned, George the other day, did a survey out of all existing society records and so forth, and found out there were 272 mental practitioners in England outside of Scientologists – 272. And there were some eight nurses who were also qualified to give diathermy to the disturbed – 272? Well, we outnumber them, man! Over and over and over, I mean, just active Scientologists outnumber them in England. They're nothing to outnumber. There are 70 in South Africa. In all of South Africa there are 70.

In other words, there is no field of the mind. There's apparently a great deal of advertising, there's the medical doctor, who is numerically very short in supply, and there's lots of articles in the newspapers saying "the field of the mind, the field of the mind." There's legislatures, there's appropriations. Everything is all laid out just as though there is a field of mental healing.

I wish to point out to you, my fair friend, that it's a totally unoccupied field. There isn't anybody in it. They rattle around like an atom in a cubic light-year of space. See, they aren't. You don't have an opponent. And one of our lies, then, is that there is some opposition. And

we have done the trick of putting an item where it isn't. See? We've said there's opposition there; therefore we've mocked up our own opposition. And you know how serious it is with a pc when you put an extra item into a GPM. See? Well, we've done that.

Now, somebody, gratuitously, someplace or another, I don't know on what budget, is advertising the existence of mental healing. I don't know, but they're spending fantastic quantities of money on it. There's nobody to receive the results of it except us. This becomes a ludicrous situation.

Therefore, people qualified at Level III will very soon have available to them a certificate as a psychiatric consultant. It's perfectly all right with me if you call yourself a psychiatrist. [comm lag, applause] Marvelous! People must be looking all over the society for these psychiatrists, you see? That's 272 of 'em. Isn't this a fantastic situation? When you look at it – when you look at it right in the teeth – you see that it is a fantastic situation.

Now, when you recognize that human illness will surrender to R1C, and certainly to R2C – you know, that's just "What solutions have you had to your lumbosis, bud?" – you're going to get 60, 70 percent returning. There would be 30 percent, 40 percent, something like that, that won't recover. That's because they require further care.

But just your ordinary healing: You know what you can do with an assist, you know what you can do in this various levels. The medical doctor isn't even then safe in his own field of healing. He isn't safe there because I think that an HCA, an HPA, very shortly, will be graduated in the field of healing. He'll know the three corners of the ARC triangle and the eight dynamics, and he'll know some of the basics of Scientology, and he will know how to keep in an itsa line and keep it directed to the person's illness, or something like that.

And just about that level we have an HCA/HPA. And then your Level III is somebody who can list and do a Prepcheck. So we've opened the gates here by taking out and training and specializing in.

Now, when you think of your level of training, well, this is something else, isn't it? So that requires a much broader recognition. And there's a lot of HCAs and HPAs right now who won't be just eligible – through the training they are getting right this minute – they won't just be eligible for an HCA or an HPA, they'll be eligible for an HSS, don't you see? All they've got to do is round off their qualifications for HCA/HPA with their itsa line, don't you see, and that gives them that. But they've already gone on to Prepchecking and meters and all kinds of wild things of this particular character and so on, so they've practically completed their HSS.

Now, how about you? How about you sitting here, you see? What do we do with you? Well, I don't know, we've already got you a certificate, haven't we? And we can also make this other certificate available to you, "Psychiatric Consultant."

So if you want this certificate, listen to this lecture! Because I'm not going to have it said about us that we give ten one-half-hour lectures which nobody attended. We'll go them one better: You're here, listen! [laughs]

Now, you've already had two lectures on this subject. The difference is, we expect now that you produce some results with this. Now, you've been getting your fingers...

(This is the lecture I'm giving you now. Those were mainly announcements. Giddy world we live in.)

The orientation of Scientology – reorientation of Scientology – looks very innocent. It looks like nothing much happened. I put out these five levels of Scientology, you know, and it brought order, order, order, order, order, and everything has been snapping into place beautifully. Well, you're the winner because you've gone all the way on up through the lot, don't you see? And the future face of Scientology will look a bit different.

But Level III is expected to be able to clear. And it also, incidentally and accidentally, takes in the whole field of neurosis and psychosis and gives you a greater purchase on this particular zone and area than any mental practitioner in existence on the face of this planet – or any other one, for that matter. You'll be far more qualified to treat the insane if you can do this particular trick, because this is the only thing that makes them insane.

This is the basis of insanity. The basis of neurosis and the bringing about of a state of Clear are all the same breed of cat, except they're just different degrees. It's what is it wrong with the mind, but it's in different degree. The degree is whether a person can live with it or not. And if he can't really live with it but just worries about it all the time, all the time, and really can't live it at all, and so forth, well, we say he's neurotic. And if he can't even manage himself in his environment, we say he's insane.

But what's wrong with him? He's got the final solution. He's got a final solution and that solution is not necessarily the solution of being insane. It is some solution which is all-pervading and makes it unnecessary to itsa anything. After that he never has to look. So of course, what happens to him? He just disappears in a mound of un-as-ised mass. He never has to look. All he needs is the solution.

Now, in processing, a certain amount of introversion takes place. A certain amount of introversion takes place by reason of processing. But that introversion is only undertaken to bring about extroversion. The actual progress of a case depends upon the raising of the A, R and C of that case, step by step, forward. The only way that introversion does not lead – introversion and erasure of something – does not then lead to a greater ability to reach in the environment or greater ARC, the only reason that does not occur, is when overrestimulation is brought about.

In other words, you restimulate twenty units and pick up ten of charge, you see? Well now, although you have advanced the case by means of erasure, you've actually increased the introversion of the case by running it at too high a level of restimulation. That factor still exists in Class IV. You've restimulated too much.

But it is full track, whole track, that is most likely to get a pc into this condition. You're not likely to get this pc into this condition in the very circumscribed area of one lifetime. You have to let his attention wander all over the whole track and on to the backtrack, and let him itsa this GPM and that GPM and another GPM, and this chain and that chain, and not flatten these things, and so forth, at Level IV, in order to get this individual more introverted by reason of processing than extroverted. But of course, you're winning all the time, even though you're winning with an introverted pc.

In other words, he's looking in all the time, he's looking in. He is not reaching more. He will eventually come out of the woods at the far end of this thing and have a tremendous reach. But during the period of his going, he is overrestimulated and therefore introverted.

That's the ills of overrestimulation. They are not very great. You're not likely to spin anybody.

That's at Level IV. What about overrestimulation at Level III? Well, at Level III you take somebody who is very, very batty. You could probably overrestimulate him in this life-time. Let's take somebody who is in catatonic schizophrenia. Let's use a fancy term – doesn't mean anything. Catatonia means they're lying still, in apathy, unmovingly and not reaching anything. Schizophrenia means "scissors." I don't know how you can lie still in a scissors, but they've managed it.

Just shows you what happens when strange people who don't know anything about the mind try to invade the field and advertise that they can do something in it: They get things corned up this way.

Let's put it more factually. This character is in total apathy – total, unmoving apathy. He's lying there in the asylum. If you put your finger on the exact button this person could talk about and would talk about, the person would communicate with you. But if you put your finger on a half a dozen other things and plunge them into even this-lifetime engram, or some-thing like that, the person would spin more, don't you see? So the worse off a case is, even in one lifetime – and this is true for all cases, even on the whole track – the worse off a case is, the more careful you have to be about overrestimulation. If you restimulate something, pick up the charge you have restimulated. That is the byword on this.

Now, you won't see very great upsets by this, but once in a while somebody will – who is pretty bad off, somebody who is pretty neurotic or something like that – if you're treat-ing this person, if you're processing this person, and you all of a sudden just ask them acci-dentally for any pain or anything that was connected with that incident – and of course they've been running it on a conceptual basis and weren't close to anything like that – and they sud-denly go into more pain and they practically spin in front of your eyes. You got the idea?

So the worse off a case is, the less reach they have, the less ARC they have with their environment – these are the things which measures worse off, see, the less reach, the less ARC – the easier it is to overrestimulate the case. Becomes very easy to overrestimulate the case because you're using very powerful tools, actually, and they go into the mind like they're going through hot butter. And it's very easy to do this.

So remember this; this datum monitors all clearing efforts, and that's Level III. You see, you're not going on the whole track to clear anybody; that is the next thing you must real-ize, that you're going to stay off the whole track. If you're going to clear somebody, you're going to stay in this lifetime, and that's the only place you gonna stay! If you're practicing Level III, you have not left this lifetime; if you're practicing Level II, you have not left this lifetime; Level I, you have not left this lifetime. You got it? The only place you leave this lifetime is Level IV. And the only reason you take somebody down the line on Level IV, if their tone arm is sitting more or less in a very active conditon. And it never goes low and it

never sticks high. And then you're going to run somebody down the track because then it's very difficult to overrestimulate them.

You can overrestimulate them at Level IV. You can just, perforce, overrestimulate them, in spite of good tone arm action and so forth. You can do it.

But this is Level IV. This is Level IV when you take them on the whole track. So Class I, Class II, Class III, whole track? Nyet, nyet, nyet. See, strictly Russian participation in world affairs. No!

Guy says, "You know, I think I've lived before."

"Oh, good. Thank you very much. I'm glad of that. Now, in your immediate environment here, have you noticed..."

You understand? Why? Because if this person is having trouble... Now we get to the next factor of restimulation, see? This is all a piece with what you've been hearing about restimulation and everything else. It all integrates together very nicely. You got another factor you're working uphill with, with any pc on this planet particularly, and that: environmental restimulation.

And it is environmental restimulation that is the straw that breaks the pc's back.

If you can audit the whole track on a pc who also has environmental restimulation, you are doing something heroic. It can be done; it makes hard auditing, and you are doing it right this moment in Z Unit. So don't think it can't be done. But you know, right there, that it's a source of considerable amount of upset and worry. Guy has PTPs, he has this, he has that and so forth. What are all these things? What's all this constant level of restimulation in this environment?

You take, in an HGC, where people are walking in off the street: these people have PTPs; they're just nothing but a walking PTP. Well, all right, that means their environment is keeping them tremendously restimulated. Day after day, night after night, their environment is restimulating them. That's environmental restimulation. That's the wife's natter and the kid's demand for another shilling. That's the income tax folder that is lying in the mailbox. That's the news that just comes out on TV that all males are now going to be conscripted below the age of and above the age of, or maybe, see? It's this, it's that, it's the other thing. Environmental restimulation.

When this source of restimulation is at a high level, the pc is unauditable. And the difficulty that the auditor has in carrying forward a case to a good win is basically – when dealing with the public at large and that sort of thing – is basically auditor versus environmental restimulation, not auditor versus bank at all. Now, this is so great that an individual who has tremendous present time problems in his environment does not make progress on his auditing. He will not change his graph.

Now, we know that. That's a stable datum, man, that's in with spikes and rocks and welded. They know that in HGCs; before they operate very long, they learn that one. Pc has a continuous PTP throughout the intensive, there will be no graph change of any kind whatso-

ever. If he has a PTP throughout the intensive and ARC breaks during the intensive, the graph will worsen.

How to make a high graph? Well, you've got to audit the pc in such a way as to get around the environmental restimulation. Therefore, the practice of an HGC operating mainly with raw public or partially interested Scientologists or just newcomers, something like that – or even old-timers, very often – is a battle with the environmental restimulation, the surroundings in which this person lives. It's not a battle with the reactive mind at all.

Now, when this environmental restimulation rises or when the pc is more susceptible to it, he gets into states which are called neurotic and psychotic. There are no psychotics on the whole track – no whole track psychotics. Psychosis is a temporary condition which normally exists in one lifetime. Interesting look, isn't it? Very temporary condition because it's environmental restimulation monitored by the susceptibility of the individual to that environmental restimulation and that's all there is to it. It's his ability to withstand the restimulation of the environment versus the environmental restimulation.

Now, of course, a person's ability to withstand the environmental restimulation is one erg of thrust-back, you see, and the environmental restimulation is three ergs. Right away you're going to get a condition – of course, I'm giving you an erg or a dyne or something like that, you see, as some fantastically... I think a dyne is the amount of force exerted by one something-or-other, infinite – one gram going one centimeter? What is this thing? It's something on the order of a lead pencil dropping – a lead dropping from the end of the pencil to the table, don't you see, over a distance of about a half an inch. You know, just nothing, see?

Well, this guy's a very weak little fellow and he lives on a little farm, and it's a long way from every place, and it's awful quiet. But his environmental thrust-back is capable of only one erg, see? And by God, one day the pigs get loose. And by God, he spins. You see, this is proportional. This helps you understand what happens to cases. And this other guy has three megatrons of resistance, and he's got forty foot-pounds of thrust in his environment, see? Nothing, you see? Doesn't even dent him, see? Run the whole track like crazy, see? See, his environmental restimulation is fantastic, it would have killed forty people, see? It just doesn't happen to bother him. He can handle that much, don't you see?

So it's the environmental restimulation on the one hand and the ability of the individual to front up to it on the other hand which gives you your difficulties of cases. It's those two factors in combination – see, these two factors in combination. It isn't just the environmental restimulation. Well, you see, there's fifteen office workers, and all of a sudden a concrete mixer sets up across the street. And they start putting up a new building, and one of them goes batty and the fourteen do all right. What's this? It's the same stimuli. See, same amount of environmental restimulation, but one of those girls had very low resistance – that is, low thrust-back.

Well therefore, if you simply studied the environmental restimulation and sought to reduce environmental restimulation by social or public measures, making it a very quiet life, you would make a lot of people go sane – this is perfectly true – but a lot more would go mad with boredom. See, so the do-gooder with his idea of "Peace, peace, peace, peace" is trying to get himself an environment that he can live in, that he won't spin in, see? Don't you see?

And these characters that go out beating the drum along this line as an exclusive thing, you see, they'll work the hardest at it because they're the most worried about it. But they create, in the final analysis, a very dull world, and therefore they get protested against.

For instance, people have hobbies. Some people have some hobbies, some people have other hobbies. Some people have the hobbies of knitting. Some people have hobbies of sitting still and daydreaming. Some people have the hobbies of riding motorcycles and some people have the hobbies of shooting down airplanes. See, there are various hobbies. This is how much randomity an individual thinks is necessary to the environment.

And you're coming back now to an old principle of acceptable randomity. Well, acceptable randomity is this ratio which I just talked to you about. People, for a long time, couldn't understand this factor; well, here's the understanding of it. It's the amount of restimulation of the environment measured against the amount of restimulation which the individual can withstand. And these two factors together give you a constant.

Now, it's very hard to work out this constant because we have no actual figures, but express it in terms of life: This individual is able to stand one dinner party. See? And he gets two funerals and a suicide. You see how you can work this out? And here's this fellow who can withstand two massacres, you see, and a wreck, and he gets as his environmental restimulation one dinner party. See, so you get these differences amongst people. And it makes them all look different, but actually it's on the same basis, and it's on this basis of restimulation.

Now, you're busy auditing: You're auditing this guy that can stand the randomity of one dinner party, and you audit him into an engram where he had a wreck. Now his environment consists of what? The ability to withstand a dinner party, but the restimulation of the environment is what you're running him on, which is one wreck. He's promptly swamped. He's promptly swamped. He can't run that kind of an incident. He just goes in over his head, don't you see?

Well, one of the ways pcs solve this is by not going in. And it is probably the favorite method of resolution. They audit only what they consider safe. This is almost line one of Book Three of Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health, see? The mind monitoring – you know, it won't go in over its head. We got techniques now which can push a guy in over his head but that's beside the point. The point is that the mind tends to shut off any restimulation that will overwhelm it. It just tends to.

It's like, this guy can stand one dinner party. And you say, "How would you like to have two funerals and a wreck?"

"*Uuuhgh*, no!" See?

Actually, this gets so bad, that if two funerals and a wreck incur in his environment, he can actually just be completely – they didn't exist. They aren't real to him. He locks them up out there as not having happened. And so does he lock up his bank as not having happened.

In other words, his ability to resist restimulation is too low for him to face up to track, and there's your problem as an auditor. How are you going to get rid of any track with this boy, huh? How are you going to get rid of any track at all? How are you going to get anything

done on this case at all? Because that case is liable to sit there and not even come in close to its track, or ambitiously going in over its head all the time.

So cases actually divide into three categories: those who are audited easily, those who won't even approach the bank and those who are always trying to commit suicide in one.

We'll call these cases Three, Two and One, with the One, the case who can be audited, you see, and the other two, you see, as cases that always are going it too strong, man. In eating, you'd say their eyes were bigger than their stomachs and all this kind of thing. Then the other fellow who just won't – Two, you know – just the guy that just doesn't even come near the bank, he just doesn't have anything to do with it, see? "What bank?" you know, "What bank?" Engrams all over the place, you see; he just got through – just got through going through a windshield, see? "What engram?" you know? He's cutting his throat with it all the time. Doesn't exist, see?

And you say, well, "Let's run out this accident you just had," see?

"What accident? Where? No accident. I just learn to take things calmly in life, you see?" And he's sick and sick and sick, man. He's just learned to take things calmly in life, see? He's got something going there, see?

Well, how do we convert Case Two and Case Three into a Case One? How do we convert these two cases, one which audits at a suicidal level and the one which audits on a no-approach basis at all, and you can't get anything done. And that no-approach basis is your most flagrant example of the stuck tone arm, the low tone arm, the dead thetan – these misbehaviors of the tone arm, see? Don't come near the bank. Hasn't got anything to do with him.

Now, how do you convert that case into one that is auditable with good tone arm motion? Well, now I have – I've given you a lot of technical data here. I don't really expect you to do too much with it or think about it too much. I'm sure you understand it. But I'm giving you the actual technical background to the highly elementary material which I'm now going to give you. This material is very elementary.

All cases tend toward the safe solution. All cases tend toward the safe solution. You're making a note on it, write it down and underscore it. That's very, very important. That is an element of simplicity the like of which you never saw, see? Some cases – some cases – also adopt a vengeful solution: "Getting even with them by dying."

Now, when I say all cases adopt a safe solution, oddly enough the dangerous solution comes under the heading of a safe solution. This gets wacky, but "the safe thing to do is to jump off London Bridge," because it all comes under the heading of a safe solution, don't you see, but it's actually, sounds highly dangerous. And they very often go in over their heads. That characterizes, then, your cases that you're having any trouble with or having any trouble in processing. One has simply adopted a good, safe solution, and the other one has adopted a dangerous solution because it is safe. I know it doesn't make sense. That's what's the trouble with it.

Now, if you move these cases over into the auditable line, you will move them over on the channel of safe solution: All cases move over on the channel of safe solution – safe solu-

tion. Very, very important. Safe solution can be stated as "safe decision," "safe assumption," "safe treatment," "safe environment," "safe position."

You have a world here which is security-oriented. It is, for instance, trying to keep up the ideals and ideals of human rights. But we notice that human rights and human liberty are succumbing. Why? Because twenty bystanders stand around and watch the cops mess up a citizen's human rights, because they're all operating on a safe solution. So all human rights disappear down the channel of the safe solution.

That is the hole in the bottom of the bathtub. It's the most dangerous thing in the world to have a safe solution because that is the hole out of which sanity drains.

A safe solution inhibits observation. And anything which inhibits observation destroys. Whether a person is merely difficult to get over toward his bank or is going in headlong or in a much worse state – these are specialized states and are not gradients of the other state – is very neurotic or is completely psychotic (they are not cousins to these other states), it's just to the degree that they have adopted a safe solution. That's all that establishes it. That's the common denominator.

Now, you could make a lot of hay out of that – out of just that statement, just as a philosophic truth. And it is a philosophic truth. And that is the plow that plows the furrow straight down through the middle of the problem of the human mind as it has been approached and as it has been attempted toward solution by mental healing – granting this thing called "mental healing" that just plows it right up, man. That's the end of that. This datum underlies mental healing with the same sweepingness as "survival is the common denominator of existence," you see? It's actually another method of saying survival, in aberrated form. People make survival solutions which then become so safe that they become contrasurvival.

So you have entered a brand-new datum here. You've got a brand-new datum which is as compelling and as sweeping and so forth in the field of mental healing as survival is in life. People solve things in the direction of survival even when it means they have to succumb. When it gets into mental healing, you are actually investigating the difficulties people are having surviving. But the basic method of survival is the safe solution, and that makes the individual right and makes others wrong, and therefore, intends to enhance the person's survival by bringing about a position of dominance; permits him to escape domination and permits him to dominate others; and then at the higher level permits him to survive and causes others to succumb – he thinks. With great amazement, you'll find committing suicide as a survival computation as it becomes more and more aberrated. How to survive: not to survive, of course.

Everybody is solving that. The miser: How does he survive? How does he survive? Well, every once in a while in New York they dig somebody out of an attic or something like that; he's been dead for three or four weeks. And the guy has got no stuffing in his mattress at all, there's nothing in there but hundred-dollar bills, you see? And his method of survival is to have lots of money. And that's a very safe solution. But he's neglected, in his obsession with this safe solution, to spend any of it in order to live.

So as attention becomes more and more concentrated, it becomes less and less sensible.

For an individual to be totally wise, it is necessary for him to be able to observe his environment. He also must be able to permeate his environment. He has to be able to have reach.

It isn't good enough to have a couple of maxims tucked behind your left medulla oblongata to which you can refer in times of stress. The Arabian ruler, every now and then, would be calling up poets to help him out in his efforts to rule a flea-bitten population whose favorite pastime was executing rulers, and they would come up with such things, such gems, as "That, too, shall come to pass away." Very wise. Very wise. And yet if it were adapted totally, it'd kill somebody.

People have philosophy all mixed up with these witticisms, these platitudes. They look through philosophy for safe solutions. And you can take a philosophic textbook that has been down in the local library and has been read by pencil margin-scribblers, and all you're reading there are things which they widely agree with but which they also consider safe solutions.

Philosophy, then, is not a study of wisdom. Philosophy is simply a study of safe solutions. Makes it a very low-level activity, actually. For instance, Kant had himself a safe solution and I imagine that's what made him batty. He had a good, safe solution. A lot of things were unknowable. They were so unknowable that nobody would ever know about them. And this, of course, is completely nuts. If these unknowable things can never at any time be sensed, measured or experienced, how the hell did he know they existed? Well, he didn't. So he made up a fantasy over there someplace called the unknowable. And this made him very comfortable. He could live in the knowable.

And this is so general, and so forth, you even find it in Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health – says you don't have to know everything in order to know this. Well, that's fine. And that disarms one's thrust into this, and the amount of overwhelm; it lets him compartment things and look at things in sections rather than just be overwhelmed by the whole, don't you see? Well, that's an entirely different operation than finding a safe solution and then drawing off into a corner someplace with this safe solution and never looking at anything again. And that activity is what you will find most people engaged in.

Now, that safe solution is what we call a service facsimile. And that's all it is.

Now, you can be a very cunning auditor. You can be a very clever auditor. And sometimes (let me impart this to you on the side) you're going to have to be clever. You're going to have to turn up your genius to a cube level to find that safe solution in somebody. It'll be lying right in front of your face and you'll feel like a fool when you finally pick it up. But there it was. But to find out exactly what it is, and to use that, and so forth – it's very easy to state, very easy to do this. But remember, in the pc it is extremely alter-ised, complicated, and so forth. Even though it's sitting right on top. It's not believable. That's one of the things.

There could be thousands of them, don't you see? And it's picking out the one from those thousands. That's what's going to give you the most trouble. And sometimes you're just going to do this on sheer genius and find that you were dead right. And other times you're going to exert a great deal of time and trouble and sheer genius, and you're dead wrong. So the final test of it is, is did it resolve the case?

"Have I found the service fac?" is answered by "When audited, did it resolve case? If answer is 'yes,' I have found a service fac on case. If answer is 'no, it didn't resolve case,' I have not found service fac." And in the first ones you find, the most you can hope for is that you have found something that moves the tone arm and has moved you closer to finding the service fac, see? So you always willing to settle for that – always willing to settle for something that moved the tone arm because that, of course, will move you closer to finding the service facsimile. See, always willing to settle for that.

And sometimes, after you've found two or three of these – and each one you knew was *the* service fac, but somehow or other this pc didn't go free needle – actually, they've been very droopy for the next couple of days; *hahha*, you know, didn't resolve the case. "We sure found the service fac on that pc, except it didn't resolve his case."

Yeah, I can hear you now, sitting around the table in the evening, coffee shop, saying, "Well, sure found Joe's service facsimile, you know? I sure found it. It was a very brilliant job. We managed to get these three coordinating lines, and they all crossed exactly in this place, and it was 'swallowing swords.' And he's always thought of that, and so forth. And we got his service facsimile," and so forth and so on.

Joe comes up and he's looking... [shows something, laughter] Or now he's in total propitiation: "Yes, they found my service fac. Yes, yes, they found it. I feel terrible – I mean, I feel good."

So you see, the test itself – the statement is very simple – and the test of whether or not you found the service fac is also very simple: It actually reads on the meter. If you have found a service fac on the case, the needle will be looser and the tone arm in a more reasonable condition. See? And if you finally walked it all the way through to *the* service fac on the case, see, it's like all of these extra service facs you've been pulling off it are something like bands of trees and sod that lie up against the mountain peak, you see? You haven't got the mountain peak, but you sure got a lot of trees off of it, you know, and you got some rocks off of it, and it's looking more like a peak, anyway. It was just surrounded in clouds when you first located it, see?

The test of it, in each case, is looser needle, better-acting tone arm. See? So you're always willing to settle for that.

Now, the other rule that you come up against here is, that which doesn't run on the right-wrong when found, you prepcheck. And that which won't run on a Prepcheck, you run on the right-wrong. So you got it coming and going. This is pretty loose.

Well, let me see. You looked through the pc's folder, and you found "peanuts," and you found "brothers" – and this was other... you know, this is old-time stuff that's been found on the pc, assessments of one kind or another – you found "mechanics," and you found "dog biscuits," and you found "me," see? Various things, you know? You dug these up out of his old 2-12 and his parts of existence and his this and his that and that sort of thing.

Well actually, you could make progress with the case if you just applied this rule: is just prepcheck each one. Got it? You could assess the list and take the one with the biggest read and prepcheck that, and then assess the same list again. Because it must have some resi-

dence in the case, you see? And whatever else you find, prepcheck that, don't you see? And just prepcheck anything you found. See, just prepcheck it. And the second that you're not getting tone arm action from the Prepcheck, run... This is awful crude what I'm giving you right now, you understand, but I'm just showing it. You can take this gun that's been developing – that's R3SC – you can just take this gun and point it in almost any direction and birds fall out of the sky, see? It's marvelous hunting, I mean. Case is going to make improvement no matter what you do.

Well, that which you can't prepcheck with tone arm action you could treat as a service facsimile, see? I mean, just one, two, one, two, see? So it either prepchecks or it runs on right and wrong, see? "How would it make you right and make others wrong"

Well, a pc... it doesn't do much on a Prepcheck, and it doesn't do much on right-wrong: All right. All right. So there weren't any birds in that section of the sky the gun went off into. I mean, you haven't done anybody any harm.

You haven't done anybody any harm at all. And this is sort of creeping up on the mountain. You take a layer of clouds off of it and you cut a couple of trees on the slope and you bulldoze away an avalanche away from the side of the thing and so forth. And it's looking bigger and starker and so on. More clouds coming off of the thing, you see, and it's getting clearer and clearer to view. Because you can't keep up this type of action without displaying, eventually, the service facsimile.

Now, the funny part of it is, even the most obtuse auditor, if he kept up this type of action of assessing something or finding something that had been assessed, and he – prepchecking it, and if it didn't prepcheck well, run right-wrong on it, see? You know, run the steps of R3SC on it, see? If you can't prepcheck it, it's obviously turning on mass, so therefore, if it's turning on mass, obviously it has something to do with the service facsimile. So you run the right-wrong and you get that out of the road, and so forth. You just keep going at this sort of thing and keep a list of your debris of other things that have turned up, maybe, in the process of doing so. And your cleverness – your cleverness will pay off in length of time. The cleverer the auditor, the shorter time he can do it in. This is about the only thing you're narrowing down.

But the very, very clever auditor can be too clever. I'm not warning you against being clever; be a genius, man. Perfectly all right. But you actually can take this case – now, that's why I started this lecture with the restimulation data – you can take this case, and there is an assessment I'm now going to give you which is so powerful that this poor guy has the resistance of one dinner party, see, and you're going to present him with the guts of his whole case. You're probably going to spend the next few hours holding his hand, because the walls keep going *bloooo-zooong*! [laughs]

Now, I told an old-time auditor who is a guest here today, Mike, told him a little while ago, I says, "You see, we're auditing the stable datum out of the road of the confusion, so the confusion will flow off and that's what the flow is on the E-Meter." And he went *b-zz-zz-zz-zz*, you see, because he's been taught differently. He's been taught that you don't pull the stable datum out from underneath the pc or you'll get the confusion, see? If you do too sudden a

yank, you see? And he turned rather pale when I told him this. So you'll probably be rather pale occasionally. [laughter]

In other words, you can climb this hill too vertically. You can immediately grab the mountain and say, "It's gone," see? And the pc is saying, "My God, what am I doing in all this mist? Where am I? What is this? What is this? See, what – where, where, where, what? Ooh-oh-oh-oh! Something terrible is happening to me!" And he feels masses going this way and that way, and pains are turning on and off, and the end of the room – the boards all look like they're going like this, see? [laughter]

See, with great genius, you just, "*Tsk!* One mountain less!" [laughter]

So you see, it isn't necessarily the wisest thing in the world not to sneak up on the case. But this isn't going to do him any harm, providing you run R3SC on it until it's flat. Now, you do this assessment and drop it in his lap, this is going to be the immediate result. It's got to be audited, now, to make it all right. So you're going to see periods on pcs when they're not going to be happy about the whole thing.

Now, I told you that any pc is liable to say, somewhere in the running of service facsimile – one of the tests of a service facsimile is, does the pc say at any time, "I'm not quite sure that it is wise to get rid of this?" See, he's going to say that on a real, honest-to-God service facsimile, somewhere along the line. That's what he's going to say. Well, you find the service facsimile, he's going to say it all at once. "*Huhhh!*" He's going to try to put on the brakes all over the place. Of course, he isn't going to make it.

Now, you're not going to do anything very desperate to this person as long as you finish him up. Oh, so he's going to have a few bad days – it's all right. It's all in the business.

But you possibly, you possibly – now, let me give you this word of caution – will practice in a field of neurosis or psychosis at some time or another, see? You go into that field, you make awful confounded sure that you unburden the cliffs before you pull the mountain out by the roots. Because that person, by reason of being spinny, cannot withstand the environmental restimulation in the first place, so you've added the processing restimulation plus the environmental restimulation to somebody who cannot stand the environmental restimulation. So of course they can't take any. So, the only course you can follow with that case, even though he is standing there – and this will be true: he will be standing there nakedly saying his service facsimile. It becomes very tempting. You look at some of these characters and they'll be just saying their service facsimile. It requires very little genius to figure out exactly what the wording is to make that service facsimile there, because he'll be saying so.

Now, therefore, the environmental restimulation has got to be reduced to some degree on the case. You follow this? In other words, the reduction of environmental restimulation should always follow, and you should be able to make good that minimal environmental restimulation during processing will occur, must always occur and continue to occur during a course of processing.

You have any environmental restimulators present in the vicinity of a psychotic and you're not even going to come near it, anything, no matter what you know. See, because you add the environmental restimulation of processing to, you see, the actual existing environ-

mental restimulation, and it – guy is already in whelmed – overwhelmed by the environment, so of course he just spins, spins harder. So that's why you must approach this on a gradient.

Now, with cases that are just walking about, I don't really give you any caution about it at all, because it doesn't matter to me whether or not these cases go to bed at night and have holes fall in the middle of the floor and various other odd phenomena occur, because they're going to get processed again and the process will take care of the restimulation.

It's a ghastly thing to confront. And the better the assessment and the less the assessment has been approached on a gradient – see, in other words, the less slopes of the mountain you have processed before you process the service facsimile – why, the greater shock it is to the person. There's plenty of restimulation. You've just taken their whole difficulties of this lifetime and done an "ectomy" on it, just like that – bang! out, gone, man! There it is, you see, and you leave him with nothing but the confusion. There sits the confusion. And it hasn't any E-Meter to bleed through and no auditing commands to guide it off and so forth, so it just starts hitting the pc from all directions.

Remember, this pc adopted this because he couldn't stand the confusion. So he adopted a safe solution. A safe solution is always adopted as a retreat from the environmental restimulation – always, inevitably.

Well, therefore, doing a service facsimile assessment doesn't necessarily require great accuracy at first. There have been things found on the case, there's things this guy is worried about on the case. Take some little stable data, R1C type of approach to the situation, that sort of thing. It's very good for the case. And this becomes healing, you see, at Level II of Scientology. You've got healing now.

You say, "Well, what have you done for your lumbosis? Anybody in your family have lumbosis? What did they do for it?" don't you see? "What have you done about them?" Any kind of a crisscross that might occur on a valence shift or something, you just get the person talking about it.

But it's solutions. You're asking them for safe solutions, stable data. And the more stable data they have put in, the more safe solutions they have put in place about their lumbosis, the less the lumbosis will discharge. So you keep plucking these things out and eventually the lumbosis will.

But of course, when the environmental restimulation is too great, no charge will flow off of the case and you will have that percentage of case which, just by talking about a few things, won't give you a tone arm shift. And that's because this person is already pretty overwhelmed. See, the environment itself is the overwhelming factor.

But let's get back to the other. How do you raise – how do you raise the ability of an individual to withstand environmental restimulation? If this is a big factor, as I gave you in the beginning of the lecture, if that's a big factor, how do you raise his ability to do it? Well, you do – you pull his service facsimile. His service facsimile is what, in actual fact, reduces – besides his innate capabilities, which might be different – it's what reduces his ability to see his environment. The more safe solutions he has adapted, the more environmental restimulation he isn't as-ising, the more he isn't confronting up to, the less he can confront up to. This

becomes a dwindling spiral with great speed and rapidity. So therefore, the thing which reduces his ability to handle his environment, oddly enough, is the thing he has adapted to handle his environment for him. You remove that and you at once increase the individual's ability to handle the environment.

Because he's now seeing it. He's inspecting it. It might not make him happy, but that's not what we're trying to make. We're not trying to make a happy person, we're trying to make an able person. There's many a lunatic who is quite happy.

Now, if you bring about a condition, then, at Level III, where an individual does not have environmental restimulation, he won't be interrupting his processing because of environmental restimulation, and you will be able to go at Level IV onto the backtrack because he's no longer fighting the environment. And that restimulation is not added to his case all the time. And it's that added restimulation which can be counted on to lock up his tone arm if he has any fragility of his tone arm, see? It's this little added restimulation of the environment. The environment is too restimulative, therefore he can't go on the backtrack, see? So it's very important that you get that out if you want a smooth, faster run to OT.

And now I will let you in on why I have suddenly gone into this line: is because I want a faster run to OT. I don't care anything very much about whether anybody gets Clear or not. That's just between you and me, see? Make a hell of a lot better human being, it solves neurosis, solves psychosis, makes a guy able, is a fast thing to do, it is not a slow freight through Arkansas. You can make a Clear by getting off enough service facsimiles. You can make a stable Clear so you don't keep apologizing for the fact he's only a Keyed-Out Clear, because he's going to stay that way longer, you see? And all this is better human beings, better human beings, and so forth, and that's fine. And it's a well worthwhile state to achieve, and people will be happy with this state, and everything is fine.

And just between you and I, I don't really care about the state at all – I want somebody to be able to hit the whole track, see? So it's been developed, and I put up the speed of development to cut down the length of time in processing at Level IV, which is already a sizable amount.

So by reducing the environmental restimulation off of Level IV processing by knocking out the service facsimile – which is what encourages the environmental restimulation – we then have enough attention free so that we can go whole track and erase things faster. And we're not always being held up by "The guy is a low-tone-arm case…… The guy has a high, stuck tone arm," "We started to do a GPM, we got a little bit mixed up, we went into the Bear goals, and then we got into the Helatrobus, then – ha! – *uhuugh!* Didn't realize it but we were in the invisible-picture goals all the time!" [laughs]

Now, we don't want that pc's tone arm all locked up because of environmental restimulation, see? Session restimulation also drops because any difficulty your pc is having in session is actually environmental restimulation because the session is part of the environment also. So if he has session trouble and he has rough sessioning and that sort of thing as one of his difficulties, of course if you delete that off he can get a lot more done on the whole track anyway. So I'm just getting rid of sources of restimulation, don't you see, and reasons of res-

timulation in order to buck into the backtrack and really hit the things that have to be knocked out, so we don't have to worry about these other things, you see? That's important.

Now, what is this "assessment beyond assessment"? I see you've all got your paper ready to put down this assessment. Two or three of you are going to be very surprised; you're going to pick up some folders tonight and find yourself looking at it and say, "Why haven't you done this?" You know, I mean, that kind of an attitude. I'm good at that sort of thing. After I get something figured out, I have no patience with people who don't understand it! [laughter, laughs] Yeah.

Anyway, the assessment is a simple one. And we're back into our old, worn-out, creaking technology of listing and nulling lists. And if you don't know how to do this, man, you just haven't been around and I feel sorry for you. But I'm afraid nobody is going to waste much sympathy on you. There are many liabilities you can get into with listing and nulling lists, and if I hear anybody running a parts-of-existence list 187 pages, why, we've got a quiet place over at the other end of the estate where a gunshot won't be found and so, watch it!

Because this just becomes asinine, man. I mean, some people can take these lists and run their service facs crazy on them. Oh yeah, that's a fact! I mean, just run fabulous amounts of lists.

How long is a list? Well, a list is as long as it has to be to be nulled. It's got the item on it, and so forth. And I can see now, people fighting dirty needles and listing. And I can see now, "Well, did they get the service facsimile on Jay? Did they get the service facsimile yet on Jay," I'll be saying.

And "Well, no, they're still listing."

"Let's see, when was that? Oh, that was, see, let's – when did they start listing? Let's see the folder. Oh, well, they started listing a month ago." You'd be amazed. I've had this happen.

So come off of the corn. Come off of the corn. That's just nonsense. A list is as long as it is necessary to be in order to keep the pc from ARC breaking because it's incomplete. And it's just a list, don't you see? So we get into all that trouble. But that's perfectly all right. We can handle that, now. Any nonsense that we see about it, I've already given you what the remedy is, see: a quiet corner of the estate. Because I frankly am tired of this point of randomity.

My lists never go longer, never go longer than about eight, nine, ten pages, with about twenty items on each page, see? So I don't understand a long list. I don't see any reason for a long list. If your list isn't complete, it won't null, of course, but I've never had to do one longer than that in order to get the thing to null, so I don't understand all this other – unless it is simply safe to keep on listing! [laughter]

So anyway, you do a list, parts of existence. Now, some of you are highly – you're already rich because sitting right in your pc's folder will be a complete parts-of-existence list. Probably already been done. Parts of existence – thing has sometimes even been nulled.

So you do a parts-of-existence list and then you null it. And I frankly don't care whether it comes out to one in, two in, three in, four in, something in that range. I don't care. I

don't care if it rock slams, rocket reads. I don't care what the resulting item does, just as long as it expresses itself some way on the E-Meter. I don't even care if it is right, as long as the pc isn't in argument about it. That's the one thing that is subjected to here.

So you do a good workmanlike job of listing. Just try to get yourself a nice list and null it down rapidly, and so forth, to a point where you've got one item in. That's fine, that's fine. You do that job, bless you. But if it comes out that four were left in and the list probably wasn't complete in the first place and there's a lot of randomity, we'll just do the second step to all four levels left in. You understand? We couldn't care less. It's just as long as the pc isn't saying, "But that couldn't possibly – it's because I'm objecting to it, you know? I accidentally put down 'hoop skirts' and I don't know why I put them down, it doesn't have anything to do with my case at all! It doesn't even answer the question."

And the auditor says, "Well, it's what is in, 'hoop skirts'."

Because you're going for a service fac, so all things apply. And basically the individual is very interested in his service fac.

Now, the funny part of it is, the pcs will only come close to the mountain, and they'll go right on up. They can't stop themselves.

But there's a funny zone or area before you get close to the mountain, and they sure bounce off of it. Because they'll dramatize it; they'll only do what is safe; they'll only say what is safe. And they walk very carefully and won't tell you anything mixed up in anything like that. They're walking through life on a tightrope, see?

And therefore, you may have to do several approaches, and this whole assessment may have to be done several times. So the accuracy of your first do and the ease with which you can do it or the difficulties with which you do it, I don't care about. Do you understand? You probably already got enough in the pc's folder to prepcheck or run R3SC on for some time, you understand? But I don't even care if you use that – because nobody here is in a tremulous condition – or just drop the bottom out from underneath him with this assessment. Because if he's too bad off, he's not really going to give you the service fac, but he'll give its cousin, and that cousin is just as good as anything else.

Now, you've got a list of parts of existence, haven't you? All right, and you assessed it, didn't you? And you wound up with one, two, three or four bits in. All right, dandy, dandy. Now, we tried to wind up with one in. We hoped one would be in. Makes life simpler.

And then we take that item that we found, and we now list safe solutions for it, or safe assumptions about it, or safe decisions that can be made about it. It's what we can clear with the pc. What we really want are safe – what we really want is service facs with regard to it. But that's best expressed by "safe solutions" or "safe assumptions." And then you not make a list there. And once more this isn't 187 tight-packed pages leading out, because that isn't the processing. That's just trying to find something to process, you understand?

So, to the best of your ability, you get yourself a complete list that is nullable and that's got a significant phrase or item on it, and so forth, and you get that out. Now, that doesn't mean you've got the service fac. The item there is probably, however, either as close as

you can get to the service fac at this time or the service fac. It's one or the other. So we're going to treat it, regardless.

Now, we're going to take this item; we're going to work it over. We're not going to do a "represent" list on it, we're going to work it over. We're going to get this thing chewed on, the final thing that we found out, see? I don't care what it was – "wearing petticoats." I don't care what it is, see? And we're going to chew on this thing until we can get it till it's a solution to more than that dynamic.

We just meanly – we found "peanuts" on our parts of existence, and the thing to do with peanuts, the safe thing to do with peanuts, was "not eat them." That was our item, see? Now, that is the resulting item for "the safe solution to peanuts": "not eat them." See? All right.

Now, you actually could process this. See, you could prepcheck it or run R3SC on it – you probably won't be able to prepcheck it. Because it's too close in, it's going to turn on mass, it's going to make things pretty sticky. But if you talk about this for a while to the pc and ask the pc to phrase this up variously, "How might this type of an assumption apply to other dynamics? Is there anything else that this would...?" And the pc will have to give you a variation of it. We're taking the parts-of-existence list now, and we're trying to see if this solution fits any other parts of existence, and how it would have to be rephrased in order to fit other parts of it and "peanuts." Get the idea?

We're trying to do a subtle adjustment here that throws us into a broader version of our safe assumption, so it applies to more than one dynamic. And if we can do that, why, hurrah, hurrah, hurrah, see? We're probably sitting on a much bigger zone or area of the service fac. This is a way of graduating it up, don't you see? But I've told you, it's perfectly all right for you to just process it, just what you found, do you understand? But you're going to get very smart, sooner or later, and you're going to say, "Well, what do you know? You know, this fellow says 'not eat them.' Hmm-hmm. 'Not eat them.' 'Not eat them.' Now, let's see. Does that fit to any other part of these dynamics?" and so forth.

"Not eat, yeah, not eat. Ah, yeah. Uh, it fits, uh, yes, actually fits on the first dynamic. Fits on the first dynamic. Fits on the first dynamic," and so forth. "When I'm processing, I always feel like I'm eating my bank, you see, it's this 'not eat,' you know, 'not eat.' And oh, yes, yes, fourth dynamic. You shouldn't eat men. Yeah, fourth dynamic, and fifth dyn... You sure can't eat MEST. That's the best answer to MEST, is not eat it, you know?"

And so forth. Well, you've got it away from "not eat" then. This is your most elementary address to the situation. You see this thing is broader. There was just one little flag sticking up, just one little piece of a dynamic had this assumption on it. But this assumption doesn't actually handle peanuts: This handles the whole cockeyed sweeping lot. And when you've got one that handles the whole lot, man, you're sitting there with your paws full of service facsimile. And if you haven't got it, you've got to audit what you did get… You're going to prepcheck it; if you can't prepcheck it, you're going to run R3SC. Or you're going to run R3SC on it, and if you couldn't run that easily – you know, questions didn't come up – then you're going to prepcheck it. See, you're going to handle what you found.

And then you're going to do the whole operation again. Only it's going to be a new parts-of-existence list, because, listen, you've prepchecked a part of the service fac, so his lookingness is going to change, so he's going to give you a different parts-of-existence list. See. And then you're going to move in on that, and you're going to get whatever part of existence you now assessed, and then you're going to take that part of existence and you're going to list that, you know? Safe solutions to it, safe assumptions about it, safe solutions to it – whatever it was you could list that gave you things that sounded like service facs, see? You're going to get that list complete and then you're going to rip down the line; you're going to take one of those out. There it sits. Now you've got a nice thing. And it says, "assuming everything will destroy me." *Uuuuughh*. Boy, you have hit the bottom of the barrel. Safe assumption. If you don't assume that, something might. And of course "eat peanuts," well, that's actually devour – "devour me," "destroy me." That's as close as he came into it. So on your second assessment he just moved in on the center of it, see? "Assuming everything is going to eat me up." That was the service facsimile. You just found an offbeat of it, don't you see?

And you keep working on it, you keep working on it and keep working on the pc until you can't make your meter work. That's when you end.

Needle gets up toward the middle and it falls, see? And the needle – have you seen a needle that is too difficult to set? You can't get it into the set area, because it goes? And you can guess about where the TA should be, but really can't make it very well. Now, that's really a free, free needle.

Pc's sitting there. The pc's not worried about anything.

But don't think the pc isn't going to worry at some place along this line, because you're going to hit this point on every one of these things that you found. As you walk in on this, if you're doing any kind of a job of assessment at all, he's going to say, "Ooohh, I am not so sure. If I get rid of this... No."

Now, there's one other thing you must know about this, is you have sometimes processed something on somebody, let us say – well, let's just use "eat" – "an inability to eat." And you've processed this out gorgeously, see? And the pc is still in a horrible state with regard to it. There's one more step you can do with it. After you've finished it all up and the pc – the needle got looser and everything, but the pc, "Oh, I'm not so sure about this thing. *Theaa*." You've just cut the top of it off, see? So now do "a safe assumption about the inability to eat" or "a safe assumption about eating." You understand? You didn't get close enough to the service facsimile. You got the idea?

Let's say, "an inability to eat." Well, actually, I gave you a bum datum then: "a safe assumption about eating" is much more likely to produce the service facsimile. In other words, this is a flip-flop. He not only used "eating," but you only caught up to one portion of it, you understand? And you can work your way through this thing, you can get a better statement of what you just got through running and finishing up. And sometimes you can't get that better statement, at which time, of course, you made it with the first statement.

I'm just talking about the adjustments of the assessment, see? You sometimes will get something like "an inability to eat." That's a service fac. And it ran, he made people guilty with it, and you know, he made people wrong and himself right, and it all ran out and prep-

checked, and everything had gotten better. But you notice the tone arm still hanging awful still toward the end of this thing. It ran well for a long time, and still at the end of this thing the pc feels kind of...

You say, "How do you feel about, now, the 'inability to eat'?"

"Well, I don't know, I mean – *whooa*. There isn't anything for me in it, to eat, no..." and so on and so on.

Well, you've flattened everything you could flatten out on the thing, don't you see? Well, you better assume that you came close in on the mountain, and you'd better do a safe assumption about the subject of what you found before. That's the rule. There's some safe assumption with regard to eating that the person could make. You're sort of doing a safe-assumption list on the safe assumption, don't you see? Represent. And you get closer into it, and that tears up a lot more ground. Got it?

Now, that last one may have confused you. I couldn't care less, because I am not at any moment saying that you must not exercise the highest level of genius in doing this. Look for identification. Look for identifications – that is to say, A=A=A. You're doing this Prep-check; you're doing this Prepcheck on "dolls" – for some reason or other, "children's dolls," in this lifetime, and so forth, on "dolls."

And they say, "All dolls are cheap," or, "Dolls are always given away."

Just watch for it. This is a totally unreasonable assumption, don't you see? "If you don't watch dolls they are liable to attack you." Oh, yes? See? Completely unreasonable assumption. Draw a little box around it in your auditor's reports, because you've hit an A=A=A computation that leads in toward a service fac, don't you see? It's a completely unreasonable assumption.

You know why the person is having a bad time in this particular zone. He's just said so. Doesn't resolve, but the person just said so. And you'll find out that's a cousin to the service facsimile, or dead on it, see? And you keep fooling around, and all of a sudden, why, the pc will come up with it, and you'll come up with it, and you'll come up with it and the pc will come up with it, and *ughh*, all hell will break loose, see? Confusion starts running off and knocking the pc's head off. And the pc can't sleep at night and has to have the light on until you get back and process it again.

But that's all expected randomity. This is what's keeping everything in restimulation for the pc, and in taking it out you get a certain amount of restimulation going. But there is the way you find it. And the formula I gave you of do a parts-of-existence list and then do a list of safe assumptions or solutions for the item found, and then using that as a service facsimile directly, you will find – will find most of the service facsimiles; or if it doesn't the first time you do it, will find the next time you do it, you see, because you can move in on it – or maybe the third time you do it. So you can do this on a crude basis, you understand?

Now, that – there will probably be other methods of doing this released. There will probably be other material developed on this. But let me invite your own lookingness on this subject and not at any time get over the idea that a certain amount of genius must be invested in it.

Okay?

Thank you very much.

Service Facsimiles

A lecture given on 12 September 1963

Blue: needs to be checked.

Red: Omitted in the NEP tape.

Thank you.

Sorry to keep you waiting, I had to turn down the static!

I see my casualties here, are doing to badly. (laughs)

This is the what?

Audience: The 12th of September.

12 September AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And you're into the horrors of hidden standards, GPMs, chronic PT problems, service facsimiles, non-observation by the pc, a postulate being where the pc ought to be.

How's it feel to audit a postulate? I mean, you always thought you had a pc in the chair and you haven't. You got a postulate: a postulate which is designed to make others wrong and themselves right. I think that's quite interesting when you get right down to think of it.

We've had all these things in the past. This is Scientology Three I'm talking to you about, and as it flips over into Scientology Four. We've had all these things in the past, and the difficulties that a pc has in getting forward with his case are actually just those difficulties which I just enumerated. I'll go over them again for you seriously.

Pc has a hidden standard. Almost any pc that isn't making excellent progress, getting good TA action, and so forth, has a hidden standard.

What do we mean by a hidden standard? Well, he doesn't even know what he is measuring his progress by. But it's that which he measures his progress by. You say, "Did you make any gains in this session?" and he consults this standard of some kind or another. And then he says yes or no in accordance with whether or not this standard had shifted.

Now, this is your lower level of case that does this – not necessarily lower level, because you can get a case into restimulation so that I suppose he does have temporarily a hidden standard. Pc's got a headache. Had a headache for a week, been processed for some little time – a considerable length of time – and a headache has turned on. Well now, he's liable to measure his processing as to whether or not it turns off his headache. You see that all the time.

Well now, expand that. Of course you can take by gradients all kinds of aspects of things, and you can see that these tiny little things can graduate into very serious, overwhelming proportions. That is to say, any insanity or any complete spin condition is simply an exaggeration, *ne plus ultra*, to the exclusion of all other exaggerations, of something that is quite normal in most anybody.

You see, you eat. You see, you consider that normal. It isn't very normal, but you consider it normal. And that somebody is eating is not used by you as an auditor to measure whether or not the individual is Clear or not. You just don't pay very much attention to it. This is something you don't think about very much.

But as a case gets a little bit worse off, why, you have to start paying attention to it because this may become a very great exaggeration. And it can become an exaggeration: a not-eat or an eat-too-much or something like this, you see?

Now, several other facets of life drop out at this particular time, and if you took this same phobia at a lower-level case, you could get somebody who did nothing but eat – didn't do anything else, see? And you say this person is crazy. See?

Supposing they just ate everything in sight, see? Pencils, razor blades, rose bushes. See, you'd say they're crazy. And supposing they refused to eat anything of any kind whatsoever – similar condition, see? If you want to understand what is an aberration, it is simply an exaggeration of the positive or negative of the usual. You can take anything a thetan can do and exaggerate it, *in extremis,* and it becomes an aberration. That's anything, don't you see?

You could say even exteriorization can become "extremis," see? Somebody always flies out of his head; he is always out of his head; he cannot get near his body in any fashion or another; he worries about it all the time; he can't contact his environment via the body or contact the environment. Well, you'd say he's batty on the subject of exteriorization, don't you see?

Well, what is this then? It's simply an exaggeration of a condition which a thetan ought to be able to do well. Well, everybody is a bit batty on this particular subject at this particular time because practically nobody exteriorizes easily, or they're always exterior. See? There isn't any halfway measure on this particular line of exteriorization. That's because they are assisted to exteriorize by various means, don't you see? I mean, the implantation and other means to exteriorize them.

But this is an aberrated condition. But you see people around and they're not exteriorizing easily and you don't think this is odd. Then we look at that.

So that's an accepted neurosis, see? That neurosis is the common denominator of the society or the "normal." See, that's "normal." Well, just because everybody is doing it… Man has an interesting way of measuring up what's right conduct. He has it measuring up of what's "normal."

One day you get into a society where everybody in the society is terrified of spiders. You get into this civilization – everybody in this civilization is terrified of spiders. They're picking spiders off of themselves all the time, you see, and they sleep in their beds surrounded by spider traps, and they, you see, just go on and on. Well, there's practically no girl in the

room who isn't a little bit nervy on the subject of spiders, don't you see? You find a spider crawling across your nose, you boys would be upset, too, you see? But this society does nothing whatsoever but fight spiders, see – nothing known in its activity but that one thing.

But this isn't crazy because everybody does it, you see? So, according to those blokes in that society, they look at each other, and there's one guy there who isn't afraid of spiders, see? See? One guy there, so they say he's batty. He doesn't use spider bait around his plate while he eats, you see? Guy's crazy, you see? Obviously!

So this shows you, this shows you of course, that a departure from the norm – I use an old cliché – a departure from the "normal" is no indication of aberration. It is actually of no real concern of the auditor, because you're bound, sooner or later, to find somebody who doesn't put spider bait around his plate while he eats, you see?

This, by the way, what I'm saying here, occasionally causes auditors trouble. And they'll have trouble with some case – case runs too easily.

Supposing you found somebody that just clipped off engrams in chains: *bzzzzzp*, bong! – that's the end of that chain of engrams. Well, you have trouble with him, you see, because it's not a normal auditing response.

I remember old Ray Thacker, she used to be worried about auditing me after lectures and so forth. She'll tell you about it today, I think, and so on. Changed too fast. It's upsetting.

Finally got this thing taped. It isn't that I'm so good, but I thought it was rather amusing, you see? I run Havingness, and *zing-bang*, cognitions – *brrrr* – and that's the end of the long chain of this and that sort of thing.

Well, that's a different auditing response from the normal, so you're not completely proof of making a mistake as an auditor, so long as you accept this normal or this average, you see, as the index as to whether or not a person is getting better or how he should behave in processing, you see?

Well, this gets booby-trapped, too, because you start processing somebody and he says he's out of his head and he's on the moon and he's here and he's there and he's taken care of the whole bank, and that sort of thing. And you're processing this bloke and you may find out it's not true, you see? And this upsets you.

So a few weeks later you're processing somebody who is close to an OT and is doing it and it is true, see? Well, it's just whether or not the guy can do the process – that's your thing – or whether or not he gains and whether or not he can get tone arm motion. Now there's a good index, see?

Pc get tone arm motion, you know? Pc stay in session. Pc go on willing to talk to you as the auditor. See, these are your indexes. And those indexes are constant. They have nothing to do with the speed with which a process works or the slowness with which it works; doesn't leave you, then, hung with this thing called "departure from the normal." You don't have to then have a normal for the human race (God help us all) as an index as to whether or not somebody is making progress in processing.

I dare say, if you went through an insane asylum, almost any insane asylum in the world, you would find in there somebody who was supernormal and who was not crazy. I dare say there's probably one per asylum, see?

But if insanity or neurosis, see, is measured by just this one thing: whether the person is "normal," why, then you run into all sorts of trouble in trying to adjudicate it. So what you'd stick with is your auditing tools, see? You find out whether or not this person gets good TA, see, on what you're running on him, and whether or not this person can do the process and can stay in session with the auditor, and if the expected gains and that sort of thing are made on the thing. And that's your index, you see? His behavior, his actual behavior in life is not of any great worry to you.

Now, I give you that as a word of warning, because as you move up the line with modern processes you very often go through periods of change – and particularly with a service facsimile and so forth – you go through periods of change which may be very swift. And a case does some sort of a flick of some kind or another and goes from A to Z without bothering to stop at any other of the letters in the alphabet. Or does it momentarily and hits a high and then does a slide back from the high, or something like this.

And if you were worrying all the time whether or not the pc had normal behavior, you've just added something into the whole problem of auditing which you just haven't anything to do with. That's all, see? And take it from me, it's of no value – no value at all. We don't care whether they're normal or abnormal or supernormal or something like that.

You can define various states. And it's easier to draw up a scale of abilities in life and try to measure somebody up against that, if you must study behavior, don't you see? Let's get a scale of abilities, only let's take a whole row of abilities, you see, and let's find out how the person measures up on each one of these ability lines, and so on. You might have some idea of his condition as a thetan, see? But that again would have nothing to do with normal, see? Nothing whatsoever.

You try to measure up thetan to thetan, why, that's rough.

Now, you get some case that doesn't behave well under usual conditions of auditing – and you are having trouble under usual conditions of auditing, don't you see? – well, you've got another problem staring you in the face here. And we don't care – that problem is not solved by saying the person is normal or abnormal. It is solved by the condition of restimulation of the case. That's how that is solved.

And I've given you a whole chart here which, by the way, has a great deal of value, and you could put any pc on this, or monitor any auditing against this particular chart, and start cutting down restimulation on the pc. And you can cut down environmental restimulation, you see, and cut this and that down. And you can cut down session restimulation in numerous ways, you see? Just don't give him anything new to audit, and that sort of thing – and numerous ways of doing this (anyway, those various zones I gave you there the other day), and you'll pick up the necessary TA action at some stage or another, see?

Now, that's completely independent, you see, of what process you are running on the pc. That, too, that doesn't come into it either. You could probably make almost any pc get

tone arm action on almost any process, providing you reduce the restimulation in various fronts and sectors till the pc's attention could be centered on it and the restimulation was at minimum. And you could probably get, on almost any pc, tone arm action on almost any process. But on some you'd have to be a lot more careful than others because the restimulation is very great. You see these as the factors with which you, an auditor, handle a case.

Now, let's take a look, then, at the fact that there are some case peculiarities.

And these case peculiarities all come under the heading of the material you've – that I've just reviewed this minute, see? Nothing in these things violate that. Now, that a person has a hidden standard does not make him subnormal or supernormal or normal or anything else. It merely means he has a chronic restimulation. That merely means he has a chronic restimulation of some kind that is throwing on to the case an additional amount of charge.

Now, that was given in your chart I gave you here about what's in restimulation, see? And that comes under the heading of that. And this thing is in restimulation; it's chronically in restimulation. Now, in service facsimiles and other reasons and so forth, we get the reasons why it's in restimulation. But we're not examining why it is in restimulation at this particular time. We're examining wholly, totally and only that it is in restimulation. You got that? Just reduce it to that simplicity. There's current stuff in restimulation. All right, if there's current stuff in restimulation, it includes, in some cases, this thing called a hidden standard.

And you say to the pc, "Did you have any gains in this session? Did you have any gains in this session?"

And the pc looks sort of hollow-eyed for a moment, and he looks back into his skull with his eyeballs or something of the sort, and he says to you – he says after a minute or two, he says, "No."

Now, what – what brought him to say no? What brought him to say no? Well, the thing that really brings him to say no is no tone arm action. So you can predict whether or not he's going to say no.

But this hidden standard is terribly interesting as a little mechanism all by itself. And it's a mechanism that you should look at as fascinating in its own gimmickry. It's in chronic restimulation. It's some engram, some facsimile, you know; it's in chronic restimulation. And if it was changed in the session, then he's had a gain. And if it wasn't changed in the session, then he didn't have a gain. You understand?

Now, that's what makes the pc say whether he's had a gain or not a gain. And, of course, there's the mechanical fact that if you get tone arm action, you must have been discharging some of that restimulation. So, of course, it will have changed this thing and he will say he did have a gain. See, it's as elementary as this. But, nevertheless, his gain is measured by this thing called a hidden standard.

So there he is, there he is with something which tells him whether or not he has had a change. He, actually, most of the time is not aware of this. Now, if that – if that was the only thing that happened in the session with regard to a hidden standard you would be in clover, because you could cope with that, because you just have tone arm action, see?

But that isn't all that happens. Unfortunately, that isn't all that happens. There is something else going on during the session that you should be very interested in. And that is the fact that he's taking this thing, whatever it is, into every facsimile, into every process, and is trying to fit the process to this thing. He is always trying to find, hectically, scramblingly, and so forth, what it is in the incident that you are trying to run on him, in the process you are trying to run on him, in the picture he's just been presented with, which resolves this thing. You got that?

In other words, he takes this little red wagon everywhere he goes. And he doesn't look at the picture. He says, "Did it wash up that little red wagon?" See?

Now, you're going to run – you're going to run some kind of an implant or something on this fellow, you see? And the stuff is spitting and spapping and burping at him and so forth, and he hasn't got really any attention on any of this stuff at all. He's trying to find out whether or not it's doing anything to the paint on this little red wagon, see? Which in effect is what? It gives a pc such an introversion in a session that he doesn't as-is anything and you don't get tone arm action.

And time and the tone arm fit together. Now listen to this one because this is very important: He drags this thing into every other incident or thing to fit it up, and therefore is misdating something for the duration of the session and all sessions. He's always misdating something.

That's worth knowing, isn't it?

The fellow with a hidden standard, then, is always misdating, because he's dragging the hidden standard – he's dragging the hidden standard into everything you're trying to audit. And of course that isn't the date of it. That's a fascinating little set of phenomena. He's dragging this red wagon, which may have the date of eight trillion trillion years ago, you see, and he's dragging it into yesterday and he's dragging it into the breakfast table this morning, and so forth. And he's dragging it here and he's dragging it there. If you tried to run birth on him, he would see whether or not it did anything to the little red wagon, you see? Wouldn't do anything to him. So, in essence, he's put eight trillion trillion years ago into birth, he's put it into breakfast, he's put it here and he's given it a new date every time. It's the most effective stopper of TA action there can be – the hidden standard. Misdate, misdate, misdate.

Now, there is a way of getting rid of it. A process which is called – was called 3T. Actually should be called, now, 4T, but could just as easily remain as 3T. And until we do a complete revision you can write it as "3T" – Routine 3T – which simply asks the pc (now, this is very germane to your service facsimile, because this is very cute, very cute), you ask your pc for his chronic psychosomatic. What does he mainly complain about in auditing.

Now understand, you have asked him bluntly and directly, "Hey, bud, what's your hidden standard?" But all he knows about it is that he experiences it and that it is always present. So, you ask him what he is experiencing and what is always present.

And he says, "This lumbosis, this – this lumbosis, this lumbosis."

And you slicker him. You slicker him. And that's just called R3T because the total action of it is you date it. You date it and let him get the itsa line in on it. And you'll find to a very marked degree, in most cases, that's the end of the hidden standard.

What you have to know, in order to understand this completely, is the hidden standard always expresses itself physiologically. The hidden standard is never hidden physically. It's hidden from the pc, and it'd be hidden from the auditor if he never inquired into it. It's that thing by which the individual measures his gains in processing. But that's actually just about as hidden as an elephant in the middle of a ballroom. It'll be what he complains about in processing.

And sometimes it's going to take you an hour or two of itsaing just to find out what it is. And that too is very good auditing. What's this thing he's been trying to solve in processing. What's the physiological condition which most worries him in processing and which he has been trying to solve? And he will eventually lay it out on the silver platter. And he will say, "It is my stomach pains."

Now he's got that all settled. Now, that, by the way, has already alleviated it to a marked degree, and has given you some interesting tone arm action, maybe where you didn't have any before.

R3T is one of these things you can use *in extremis*. You just put the itsa line in like mad on the guy's chronic somatic, you see? "What are you trying to solve in processing?", see? He gives it to you and he gives it to you and he gives it to you and he gives it to you. Now, the only difficulty with this: if he starts giving you problems, you've sort of had it because that problems isn't an itsa. You understand? So your question probably ought to lean in the direction of "What physical condition are you trying to solve?"

He'll eventually isolate these gut pains. Gradually, gradually, gradually, you know? Itsa line, itsa line, itsa line. It's good auditing, see? It's marvelous auditing. He'll gradually itsa this thing out into view if he doesn't tell you at once. Sometimes he spoils the whole process. He says, "Oh, it's my lumbosis!", see? I mean, you've had it, see? Then you'd have to go into it on the basis, "Well, when has this troubled you in processing?" Then you'd probably get some TA action out of it – sort of an anticlimax. But you could probably get some TA action out of the thing, even so.

And that may be the only way you can handle it, you know, is "When has this troubled you this lifetime?" or something, you see? But you can take that, with R3T, and you say, "Gut pains. Gut pains. Order of magnitude. Years ago? Tens of years ago? Hundreds of years ago?"

Keep going, man, keep going. Don't stop just because you've hit a trillion. Some people get allergic to this thing called a trillion. I don't know why. They got lots of them! [laughs] You have big problems in how to express trillions, and big problems in how to this… I've even had some suggestions that we invent a new unit of time, some kind or another. I'm all in favor of that, but I'm afraid it would have had to have been done some time ago for it to work on the thetan. Thank God we aren't measuring it in numbers of heartbeats!

Anyway, you just get that order of magnitude, see? And this is, by the way, good auditing to do this. You date very alertly, and sometimes you say, "I've got a read here; appar-

ently it's in the order of magnitude of trillions of trillions of trillions of years ago." And the gut pains go *bbzzp-brrp-booom.* And that's all you hear about it and that's the end of that process. That's the lengthiest process in Scientology in terms of numbers of years covered but not in hours of auditing.

One warning here: you try to nail this thing too closely, and you get yourself in trouble. And you find a pc is sitting in the engram, and you're going to have to shift to R3R right there. He's so stuck. And if he was in a GPM you'd have to shift to 3N. And if he was in his own GPM you'd probably – oh, well, 3M2. So therefore, you can make too much of a good thing out of R3T. See, that can be, too. So the dating – now get this – the dating is done with an eye on the pc as well as the meter. And that's what makes it a process which commonly will fail because it is simply overrun.

You find out this thing is thousands of years ago, and he goes *dllukglunk-tum*! And you see *hhhp!* It's almost as good as the meter, see? He'll go… [short comm lag]. And you say, "All right, I had a nice read on that. That was thousands of years ago. All right. Now, how do you feel?"

"Oh," he says, "I feel better."

And at that point you haul in the itsa line and go flank-speed ahead into your next process. You hear this? Why? He gonna push himself into things.

I remember, old-time Dianeticist, been around for Lord knows how long – he's down in Los Angeles now – and he was in at 42 Aberdeen Road, and I was showing him what Straightwire was. I was showing him, unfortunately, the difference between Straightwire and engram running. Unfortunately, see?

So I took his chronic somatic and his worry about this lifetime, and I straightwired it out of existence like that. I just spotted the time and somebody else had it and it blew, and that was that, see? He was the happiest man you ever laid your eye on, you know? He was just pleased, you know? He just was shining and pleased. And then I said, "All right, now we'll pick that up as an engram," proceeded to do so and keyed it right straight back in.

But it was actually a terrible cruelty to do that to the man, and I actually wouldn't have done it had I realized that he was setting so much store by it. So let that serve us as a lesson. It's a mistake I haven't made again.

What's the essence of this, then? When the pc drops this one off, bail out. Too much of a good thing here. You can even make up some homely platitude, you know? Something about "A little auditing goes a long way if a long auditing goes a little way," or something like that, don't you see? I know, it confused me, too! But there's something about medicine, you see, "If a little bit of medicine did a lot of good, why, a lot of medicine will do lots of good," and you can actually get caught in between this on this little process.

So the process is not greatly advertised. Terribly effective – it's been with us forever – because it's dating the somatic, you see, and getting rid of it. But in this particular case you're not dating the pc's somatic. You're asking him what he's trying to resolve in processing. You get the difference? And that's the only reason it has any importance at all, is because once you've dropped that off the pc, he then won't consult it to find out if he's made his gains, and

he won't be dragging the thing into every facsimile or anything else you try to run on him. So he's going to make some progress and he's going to make more TA action because he's not always misdating something. You got it?

But a little of it goes a long, long way. Slippy, quick, fast. I dare say – I dare say when you first use it, about 80 percent of the time you will overrun it, when you first start using it, and then you will get very, very expert and about 50 percent of the time you will overrun it. See? And you'll eventually, if you keep using it, time to time, why, you'll suddenly find out that you're getting pretty slippy; you're getting pretty slippy. You see, if it disappeared on the itsa line, you'd bail out. It *isn't* likely to, but if it did, you would.

You'll find out that some horrendous body masses come off of the pc by reason of this operation.

The only thing – the only thing it's used for is this thing called a hidden standard. You got that?

Now, a hidden standard is not always present in every pc to a point where it ruins the auditing. But it is present in any pc who has a difficult or delicate tone arm. So on your deli-cate-tone-arm cases you have another little weapon. And if you don't have a delicate-tone-arm case – this character is just running fine with the tone arm action and that sort of thing. It isn't always stop, you know, and isn't always this and isn't all that. And you find yourself going around worrying about somebody's tone arm, that is your immediate and direct answer.

If session after session you've worried about somebody's tone arm action and you're doing everything reasonable in order to get the tone arm running and you have not made it, and so forth, then you just remember this little point on the time track, or this little point on the tape, when the old man said, "Delicate tone arm: probability – hidden standard. Remedy: R3T." And remember, he also said, "A little of it goes a long way!" [laughs] You can get en-thusiastic with this R3T; you could probably try to run a whole case with it.

All right – let's see how you can run a whole case with it. All right, now, "What are you trying to resolve in processing? What pains, agonies, illnesses or sicknesses or physical sensations are you trying to resolve in processing?" and so forth. Pc gives it to you. Order of magnitude: date it, date it to the second – you even have to do that sometimes – but you date this thing to the second. Find the pc stuck in the engram – find out it is an engram – shift to R3R, get that out. And then find the engram is stuck in the middle of the GPM, so you shift to 3N, you see? And you get that handled, you see? But then you find that this, in actual fact, is part of one of the pc's own GPM's RI, so, of course, you have to shift to 3M – R3M2. All right, now you've shifted to R3M2, and you find out actually it's reaching up into PT, so you run a service fac on it. Now, having run a service fac on it, you accumulated quite a few ARC breaks during this auditing, so you…. [laughter]

A little of this goes a long way! And you'll finally get expert at hitting the silk.

But you actually could take everything the pc was worried about, see, and do this whole thing. You could do R3T, even well done, on everything the pc was worried about in present time. Now we're being sensible, see? This isn't ridiculous, this is true, see? You say,

"What are you worried about?" You know, "What are you being processed to resolve?" and so forth.

And he says, "Well, my gut pains."

"All right, that's fine." R3T gut pains. Order of magnitude. What's – where's the gut pain? Well, to hell with that. That's the end of that, see? All right. "What else are you trying to resolve in processing.

"Well, my headaches."

"All right." R3T headaches. *Pssheww!* That's the end of his headache. "What else are you trying to worry about in processing?" and so forth. "What are you trying to resolve?" and so forth.

And says, "Husbands."

"All right, let's date husbands." And – fact, see? All right, *pssheww!* Order of magnitude on husbands, you see? "Your worry is back there at trillions-thirty-five. That's it." Okay. No itsa line. *Ahw-v-v-vh!* See? Trillions-thirty-five. That'd be good.

"All right, anything else you're trying to resolve with processing." and so forth.

"Well, I'm trying to resolve having a body – having a body. I'm trying to resolve having a body. Get in my way – get in my way all the time. You have to wash 'em, you know, have to wash 'em. And they dent, and they drip blood all over the place when you stick holes in them, and so forth. They worry me, they worry me."

"All right, body. Order of magnitude, - body." *Bzz-bzz-bzzz-bmp, zump, zump, zump, bop.* "Well, well, 208 thousand years ago. Very good, all right. That's it."

Pc says, "Yeah, there's an interesting – interesting thing there."

"Well, good! Good! Thank you." That's when you want to get that TR 2 in there, see? "Good! All right! Well, what do you know! Well, I'm certainly glad you found that! Very fine. All right, I'm glad you found that! Okay. Now, what else are you worried about, in actual fact, in processing?"

You see, you let his line go on the backtrack, and he's going to have you wrapped around into every process you ever heard of, man. You're going to lose control of that session.

When you finally finished up, you'd have a Clear. That is a method of clearing. Got it?

Needle would go free, TA would come down, and so forth. Impossible as it seems, it is a method of clearing. That'd be every hidden standard he ever heard of. Anything he could dream up here. But don't let him pull any back from the backtrack. Ha-ha-ha! That return journey – no payload. Return empty, see? Nothing, no baggage. Otherwise he'll start scraping that track up and bring it up to PT, and the next thing you know, why, you're doing "Oh, my God," see?

Now, the service facsimile – the service facsimile – has to be severely located on the time track. And we say "this lifetime," but actually what you're doing is circumscribing the duration. This is your absolute limit of your service facsimile activity – R3SC – is the pair of

RIs he's currently sitting in on his own GPM line. Now, that can be a pretty broad sphere. But if you limit it very severely to this lifetime, you could even work to key that out, don't you see?

But if for some reason or other this becomes so complicated and you can't get down to it, and somehow or another it doesn't come, and they just can't make it out, and you – and you get to wondering why you ever came to the session in the first place, you see, why, you've still got another string to your bow – You've got R3T – R3T clearing. You can still make a Clear; he can't stop you from doing it. You see that?

Now, this is with the pc that you can't seem to find a service facsimile on that runs over any period of time. You know, difficult, difficult. Now, I say you're going to get some difficult pcs – it's impossible to say otherwise – because the hidden standard in this particular case is the service facsimile. But it just happens to be, for some reason best known to some-body else, completely undentable.

Well, there's one thing that will dent it, and that's to pick it up, wrap it in a small black bow, wind your arm up around your head and pitch it with high velocity down the time track to a place where it belongs. And that has a degree of workability.

Now, of course, this is all under the heading of destimulation. So, because it's under the heading of destimulation, you have to be very careful not to run anything. See, that's why it becomes absolutely ridiculous to start running things. Because you start running things on the whole track on a case that you're already trying to destimulate – why are you trying to destimulate the case? You're trying to destimulate the case so that it doesn't have PT problems and so forth to kick your auditing session to pieces. So therefore, if you start a destimulation action – if you start an action of destimulation – what have you done if you suddenly start running something on the backtrack? Hm? And if the pc's service facsimile has in it "to make you wrong as an auditor," that's the first thing the pc's going to do: He gonna try to restimulate more than he already got.

Now, how do you keep the itsa line in on a pc who wants to restimulate more? That's your problem! How do you keep from ARC breaking this pc? How do you keep him from actually actively cutting the itsa line?

Well, the best way to do it, actually – and I will help you with this problem – is be awful damn careful of your whatsits. Use that whatsit line with great skill. Knock out of your auditing all social actions. That's the first thing you do. Avoid all violent attention shifts. Avoid all attention shifts that you possibly can which are directed by a whatsit. In other words, don't direct the pc's attention in such a way as to ARC break the pc so he starts to get even with you by restimulating more, or some weird combination like this occurs. Just avoid all that. See what I mean?

Be awful careful of those whatsit. Don't say "How have you been today?" You understand? That's a whatsit.

Gives him an opportunity to say, "Well, actually, I was sitting in – up in the lounge at the Bide-a-Wee Club, and so it occurred to me, you know, saw this figure in Roman armor."

See? You've had it. Got the idea? It isn't a matter of withholding something, unless you're obsessively social. It's just don't use them.

Now, the type of Model Session that is employed on a case that is very prone to restimulation – isn't getting much tone arm action anyhow – is your W Unit Model Session. That's your zero social. Oh, let him discuss anything he wants to after a session – discuss anything he wants to after a session – but he's aware of the fact you're no longer auditing him and he actually won't plow it in. You get the idea? Now, don't keep putting the brace on him and shutting him off and stepping all over his toes and that sort of thing. But in session: "How did that go?" *Hmmmm* – you're walking along the edge of the precipice, don't you see?

Any delicate-TA case, any case that you're having trouble with, any case that you're having difficulties trying to stabilize them into a process, any case – you know, overrestimulation leads to self-invalidation. You should know that. Case is invalidating his own case and he's chewing himself up all the time, and he doesn't know, and he this and that. Well, actually, the more you restimulate, the more he's going to self-invalidate and the more he's going to invalidate Scientology and other dynamics. You understand? This is a symptom of overrestimulation.

You can actually classify aberration into these two classes. There's the symptoms and reactions occasioned by overrestimulation, and then there's the particular significances caused by the service facsimile and other things, you see? The significances – the dramatizations the person goes through – that's one channel, and restimulation is another channel. Of course, restimulation gives you the degree of dramatization, too. If you raise the restimulation on a case, you can raise its dramatization.

If you handle these problems in the guise and line of restimulation and monitor nicely with destimulation, and handle a case very nicely like that, you can get the case up to a point of discharging a great deal of stuff and you can get a case to discharge lots of charge.

But if you go at it so knuckleheadedly that everything you say to the case leaves the case wide open to the restimulation of more actions, you see, on the track, everything you do with the case, and so forth, leads to more restimulation, and then if your queasiness in handling the case also gets in your road and prevents you from really running a process – or the pc's nerviness or overrestimulation – then the case is just going to get less and less and less and less and less controllable; less and less and less controllable. Do you see why? Restimulation is catching up with you.

So, therefore, the destimulation of a case is an art, and it is a peculiarly positive sector in the field of auditing. And most of you are on this sort of thing right now – service facsimile, see? Now, the service facsimile, discharged, decreases the restimulation that the case is subject to, even though it's just discharged right here in this lifetime – present time, a lot of action and so forth. Case is subject to less restimulation because he pulls in less present time problems in his environment, don't you see?

Now, the present time problem, the aspect of the present time problem, is another category of upset to you. Case with a tremendous present time problem does not make good processing gains. If a person's graph remained the same throughout a week of auditing, you can assume this case had present time problems. The way to handle present time problems is

to handle that factor in the case which causes the case to have present time problems. What causes the case to have present time problems? There must be something in restimulation to the case which pulls in present time problems.

I'll give you another method of listing for a service facsimile which actually nails present time problems with magnitude. You realize that there are so many solutions in the zone or area where we are operating at this particular moment – there are so many solutions to the thing – that it'd be very hard to give you a total coverage of all of these materials. And you're going to discover quite a few solutions in running somebody with an itsa line and handling service facsimiles and that sort of thing, see? You're going to discover a lot of these things.

There are certain standard ones, and this could be classified as a standard one: "What's a safe assumption about your environment? What would be a safe method of handling your problems here and now in life?" Now, a question and a list of that particular kind is going to drop into your lap, with a thud, the stable datum that the individual is holding at bay various sectors of his existence. So it comes, in that wise, a method of destimulating the environment. All you had to do is just list the list with some such question as I just gave you, and you'll wind up at the other end with what he uses to handle his family, what he uses to handle his job (that may be another one, see).

All right, now let's expand that process and let's take the pc's whole environment to pieces. Let's take this big sector we call the pc's environment. Let's take that whole sector and let's compartment it. Let's find out – in present time, let's find out where his life is in conflict or contact with what. Let's find out the whole lot, don't you see?

Now, this is terrific itsa line stuff. You're not saying "this lifetime," now, you're saying now, man. There's no opportunity to go restimulating something else, you see? It's now! And his idea of now will probably go back to yesterday afternoon, or it might go back for a year or so. Somebody living in a farm community or something like that and things are pretty calm, he may consider his present time, you see, much broader. You ask a London city dweller what his now consists of, and he will tell you about his sandwich at lunch, you see? That's about as far as his time goes. It's very hectic.

But let's just take this guy's environment, just in a social sort of an auditing way, because you've got such a terrific limiter on it, you see, that you can be very relaxed with your auditing. See, you can ask him almost anything as long as you don't throw his attention on the backtrack. All of your questions have to do with right now, your present time.

"The life you are living at this particular moment: what have you been in contact with?"

The person will say, "What period?"

"Well, you know, now. Now."

"Well, now I'm in contact with the session." This guy's too sane to ask such a question of.

So you say to him, "Well, in the last thirty days, you know, what are you in contact with?" That might not include his parents – they haven't had a letter for thirty days, something like that – but it's part of his environment.

Let's just get that environment all torn up, see? Let's get him to tell us, you know, where each sector of this is. This is terrific Scientology One. The guy's got the is-ness of his environment. How many people have ever sat down and seen exactly what their life contacts consisted of here and now? You talk about orientation, man! This is orientation. Well, that's going to throw you with TA action, and that's going to loosen your needle – just that.

Little innocent questions from you, "Well, where are they?" see?

"Oh, and I know the Smiths. I know the Smiths. The Smiths. I know the Smiths pretty well. She's pretty nice looking, and he makes awfully good rum nog and punches," or something, you see? And, "Yeah, I know the Smiths."

Well, he's just liable to go on saying, "Well, I know the Smiths," you know, "I know the Smiths." Your tone arm action will die down after a while.

Wake up. Well, what can you say? Well, it's like the questions you use in 2H, see? "Well, where are they? Where are they?" see? Now, there's – there you're running the locational process on him. You know, "Well, where are they?"

"Oh, they – they're – they're up at Eastbourne," see, "they're up at Eastbourne, and they live at – they – they moved. They moved. Let's see, they used to live at 13 Galloway Street, and they now live at 42 Yard Road – yeah, at 42 Yard Road. I don't know quite where that is. I was up in Eastbourne the other day – ." and so forth and so on. "Let's see, Yard Road…" and so on. "I think you come up from the dock. No, no, it's that one under the hill. That's – that's – that's the one. Yeah, that's where they live. Yeah, I've seen the place before. I haven't seen their new house, but I know where that place is. Yeah, I got that, see?"

See that tone arm action go there, man. You watch that fly. You see, "Where are the Smiths?" It's apparently got nothing to do with the price of fish, see? But now you've got the Smiths, not only categorized, but located, see?

And he works for the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company, see? All right, that's fine. Of course, you can reduce all this to a rote procedure that takes all the life out of it very easily. Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company – he's telling you very interestedly about the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company. They get – they're located there, and he goes down there to work every morning, and so forth. And there's a porter there by the name of George, and George has always got his hand out for an apple or sandwich or something of the sort, and he's always got some wisecracks and so forth, and there's a lot of people around there. And they're pretty good people down at the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company.

Well, let him get away with this "down to the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company," you see, just so long. And well, you want to know "Where is this Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company?" you see? He's run the tone arm action out of what it is, you see? Well, let's get some tone arm action, let's bleed it down with where it is, don't you see? And man, he gets the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company parked, and he's all of a sudden liable to have a terrific cognition. He all of the time, because he goes in the underground, it's lost sight of the fact that it is actually twelve

miles from where he lives, see? So, his Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company… And then he realizes they got a lot of branch offices around here and there. And he's been to several of these branch offices. And you can just see this Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company: He'll start to expand – take place, and you see the tone arm start moving on the thing. You get a lot of nice tone arm action out of it and so forth. And he finally – finally he gets down to the personalities on the thing. And you'll notice, it will be the things which he's having a gradient scale difficulty of confronting. And you'll build up this gradient, see? And you'll see his confront starts going up on his environment to the degree that you blow charge off of it, see? And his confront starts up on his environment.

And you can notice this in his kind of answers if you're very clever about it. You'll notice that he just goes down to the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company, don't you see, and he sees George. You know, George – that's the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company, you know? That's about all he's got of the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company, even though he goes there every day, is George. And the only important fact about George is the fact that George has always got his hand out for an apple. See? Something of that particular sort, see?

Now, however, he expands the fact that he actually works in a certain section of it and he has certain associates there who are something-or-others, you see, and they work in a little bunch of offices. And then he all of a sudden tells you all about George's family and where George lives, see? He'll revert to that and do a wider confront, see? And then he'll go up and then he tells all this and, of course, he finally can tell you who's managing director, and you'd consider his confront is adequate then at that moment.

But you'll see how pinned down his attention line is in the environment. It doesn't take a terribly clever auditor to do this, but it takes one that doesn't mind a pc being gabby. And you're just putting the itsa line in: What's his present time consist of and where is it and who's in it and where are they? Next thing you know, you got the guy permeating all over the place, see?

This is a lot of auditing. This is a lot of auditing. It's a terrific HGC approach, see? After that's happened to somebody in an HGC they'll know very well that the HGC has got their good interests at heart. Well, they have, you see? But they know that because a good Scientology One has been run here on the person's lifetime.

Well, when he's all through with this and he's got all of his environment laid out and his wife's relations and how likely it is at any moment they're liable to come to visit him and when he's got everything all taped every place under the sun, and you finally now decided that you've got his present time. Because you've used this, you see, "present time," a lot of times with him in the discussion – and you don't let him catch sight of that, otherwise he's going to tell you his war stories. False itsa line. False line. You don't want anything to do with that, see?

So what your lineup here consists of is his present time – got that all categorized – and then you throw in that process I just gave you.

Now that you've got all sections of it – and you could actually lay out a plot of it and draw a map – you now know where are his zones and sectors of problems and you know which one he's most fascinated with, because he gets gloomiest whenever he talks about it.

You don't need an E-Meter to tell you that. Although if you kept talking about it very long, it's problem, problem, problem, so your tone arm action would die down, you see? "Oh, well, there's my parents. [sighs]"

About that time even the most imperceptive auditor would notice that there were problems in that vicinity; he wouldn't even have to look at his E-Meter, see? But if he also looked at his E-Meter, don't you see, he would see all of a sudden that it started to rise and it wasn't doing any blowing down. Got that?

Well, that's a weird way to do an assessment. But that's a very accurate assessment. There's more problems there than he can confront. See, a rising tone arm is a no confront – always, you see? He can't confront this many problems, so he can't put any itsa into the vicinity.

Now, why can't he put an itsa into the vicinity? Well, you say you can explain that very well. "Sons feel odd sometimes about their parents," you see, and so on. You can explain and explain and explain, you see, and you can figure it all out and you can figure it all out and you could worry yourself to death. But let me point something out to you: The longer you spend worrying it out, you see, at breakfast, and that sort of thing – the longer you spend doing that – if you catch yourself doing too much of this, realize that you are not, at the time you are eating breakfast, putting an itsa line in on the pc. And even though you come to a total conclusion with regard to the thing, you won't have moved his tone arm one bit. And I point that out to you, see? You won't get any tone arm action on him at all.

Now, in your idea, you should be getting tone arm action on him; that's a reasonable assumption, see? So, use this as your assessment line. Now, isn't that an interesting assessment? It's not an assessment by tick and click and reading lists, you see? That's an assessment of zone. And it's an assessment by "Oh, yes… yes…" An assessment by rising tone arm. And you've located a zone where he has a service fac in operation. Right like that, see? Now we know. Now we know.

Now, why do you get a rising tone arm? He obviously isn't confronting it. Now, it's no good for you to assume that there are lots of reasons why he can't confront it and it blows up in his face every time he tries to confront it, you understand? That's nonsense for you to assume that, for the excellent reason it's not true. You're going to find out he can't confront the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company because "biscuits are no good." Stable datum. He never confronts the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company; he confronts, and is, a biscuits-are-no-good, see? So as long as he's got that problem totally solved in present time, he never has to look at the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company. So now he will continue to have present time problems with the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company.

I'll give you the most elementary type of present time problem with the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company: If he can't confront the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company at all, he's going to make mistakes on the job, and it's going to make present time problems for him. Doesn't have to be anything esoteric about it, you understand, because present time problems are in direct ratio to the no confront. The frequency of present time problems are the measure of no confront. And here's the recent datum stated at a terrific simplicity at the service-facsimile level. Here's this recent datum, service facsimile: No confront is caused by a substitute confront.

Now, that gives you a brand-new look at life. You always assume, you see, that the reason the thetan isn't confronting is because he can't confront. See, we don't care whether he can't confront, but that statement doesn't lead to a solution of the problem. That's all we need to know. See, so don't worry about whether he can't confront it or not. Yeah, colloquially we speak all the time, as Scientologists we're always saying, "Well, well, you know Joe, he's always in trouble, he just can't confront that," see? That's fine, that's perfectly true, in its limited sense. But in actual fact, that doesn't lead to a resolution of that guy's case, because it isn't factual. It isn't quite factual. The reason he's not confronting is caused by the substitute confront which we call a service facsimile.

It's something like he has set up a little radio tower in the middle of the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company on which has got "I hate biscuits" see? And that thing, that thing confronts the whole Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company for him. And so help me Pete, as long as he's got that thing, the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company is going to cave that guy in and is going to knock down the case between sessions to a point where you're always having to handle the restimulation of this case in his environment. And if you're only auditing this case two and a half hours a week and the case is spending forty-some hours a week at the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company, in that two and a half hours you're not going to even come close to removing the gathered restimulation of the past week.

You add up the number of hours which you've spent with the case on the subject of the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company, you'll find out that they will vastly exceed, in efforts to handle his PT problems with the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Companies, the effort you would make to simply compartment his environment with great care and find the stable datum that he uses for the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company. Find that and run it as a service facsimile with R3SC. See, that'd be the smart thing to do.

Well, the opening gun on a case, obviously is, if you've got the tools to do it, is to clean up his present time problem so he isn't going to be accumulating, continuously, this, see?

Now, the present time problem which generated in his environment is a different thing than this other thing I was talking to you about called a hidden standard, see? That's a different thing. Now, it stems simply from a bigger zone, however, of restimulation. But it's being pulled into restimulation arduously and forcefully by the pc, continuously, for some reason best known to somebody else. And the reason it's in continuous restimulation is just all these things are bits and pieces of the RI the pc is in. And it's interesting that you can put that RI to bed and take the thing apart in this lifetime. That's what's fascinating: that you can do it at all.

But this thing of Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company, he does this all the time. It's one of the best things a thetan does. He gets tired of walking down the halls, so he puts a postulate in the hall, "I hate biscuits," and that's the end of the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company on his confront. But the damn fool continues to stay on at the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company.

You can put right conduct down, is "Don't remain places that you don't want to keep confronting." See, you can put that down as a little lesson in life, see, completely aside from processing, don't stay in places you don't want to keep on confronting, see? Because your don't-go-on-confronting will then lead you to stick up a stable datum of some kind or another

to do your confronting for you in that vicinity and the next thing you know, this is going to be a gorgeous piece of mass, and it's going to be giving you more present time problems than you can ordinarily count. And your life is going to become very restimulative indeed. That's a little social lesson I give you there, out of Scientology Five. Anyhow – how to get along in this universe, if possible.

Now do you see, in essence, the compartmentation of the environment and the selection of these little odd bits and pieces, you see, that he's using as stable data in his environment? And the knocking these things out, you see, with your R3SC processes and so on, you will find a very easy activity. That was what R3SC was originally designed against and for. It, however, goes a little bit deeper in that it can take apart a service facsimile. When R3SC is running very, very hard and very arduously, and your pc is being knocked all over the place by all of this sort of thing, recognize what you have collided with. You have collided with the RI which is the current RI in the forming GPM of this particular lifetime. It's very difficult not to collide with it. Well, it also surrenders to the techniques of R3SC, but makes a very much more arduous run of it, you see?

So you would say there's two versions of R3SC, see? But in view of the fact that they are both handled in the same way, we classify R3SC in terms of what assessment was done in order to find it. And we number the assessments. Regardless of what stable datum you find, you are going to handle it by the steps of R3SC. You could enter the thing at almost any of these levels. You can also enter it at a fourth level, solutions. "When have you used it for a solution," see?

But you've got this pattern by which you address a stable datum – R3SC, see? Now, how you arrived at that stable datum would be the assessment you did for R3SC, and there are several of these numbered assessments.

Now, I've just given you a very simple one. A good Scientology One done by a Class II-type auditor – but it's Scientology One, orientation and is-ness, you see? He just does this with the itsa line in and everything running along gorgeously and he gets his environment all oriented on the pc and he gets this thing all taped and he locates the most prevalent source of PTPs on his pc by an assessment of mostly "Ohhh," an assessment also with a rising TA, but that is less observable than the pc's attitude about it.

He's been talking about, you see, "Well, actually, I uh, I'm – I'm in contact most of the time with airline companies. I go down to airline companies and deliver things and that sort of thing and talk to a lot of people. Have to talk to a lot of passengers and so forth. And talk to hostesses – a lot of hostesses to talk to down there, too, you see? Once in a while I get to talk to pilots. And uh, I get out to the airport quite often and go over there. There's a girl at the magazine stand I like to talk to; she's – she's lots of fun, and so forth. And any of the toys get worn out, why, she gives them to me for my kids, and so forth. We have a pretty good time out at the airport, and I do that, and so forth."

Well, the real knucklehead of an auditor comes in after that dissertation and says, "Now, what stable datum do you have for the airport?" He isn't going to have any.

He'll finally say, "The dispatcher's tower." See, he'll give you something in the airport. You know, "The girl at the magazine stand." You see? "She's a good stable datum for the air-

port. She always tells me what's going on." In other words, you won't get one, see? So you have to be perceptive just to that degree, and….

Now, you're going along, and you say, "All right, now all right, we got all that taped and so forth. Well, how about the socialist club that you belong to – you mentioned a moment ago. What about that?"

"Oh… [sighs]"

Well, the auditor after a while should wake up and realize that what isn't being called on here is another whatsit. What's being called for here is a safe assumption for the socialist club. He must have landed right in the middle of it, because he obviously has a nonobservation. The easiest way to look at it is, if the pc hasn't got anything to say about it, he isn't observing it.

Obviously, then, it's being observed for him. Well, who's observing it for him? What's observing it for him? Well, that being, person, idea, thing, television set – that's a service fac for that zone or area. What do you do with it once you've assessed it out and so forth? Why, you've got it lying there and you – *voilà*! Just run your R3SC steps on it. That's all. "How would it make people right, and you wrong?" And the person said it wouldn't. "Well, how would it dominate somebody?" "Oh, well! *Ho-ho-ho-ho-ho-ho-ho-ha-wha-ha.* That's a different thing, huh? That's the most dominative stable datum that you possibly could have. That – that's – that – that – that – that's the most dominative that you could have. Yeah. That – that – that – that is. That is. Yep."

You keep sitting there waiting for him to answer the question. Well, hell, he's answered it and he's blown the level, too. See? Here you've got to come back in there and say, "All right, now, what's the – how does it get you to escape domination? Help you to escape domination in any way?"

"Ho-ho, ha-ha. Perfect solution!"

That's the end of that level, see?

"All right, how is survival with regard to this thing."

He's realizing things all the way along the line. It doesn't matter, you see, whether you flatten any of these processes or not at the first run through. When you finally check them over, just don't leave one of them hanging out unanswered, do you understand?

It doesn't matter how you chop these things up, see? Don't be neat, because it's not neat, see? At the end of the thing, get neat. See, make sure you've got them all now and it's all straightened out, and that sort of thing, see? Now be neat.

But he's – "What – what do you mean? What do you mean, 'domination'? Dominate – how would it dominate somebody, dominate somebody, dominating somebody? How would it dominate? I don't know how it would dominate anybody. I don't have any idea at all how it'd dominate anybody, you know? It doesn't dominate anybody. Haven't got any idea."

Well, of course the auditor's a real knucklehead if he says "Well, yes. Well, the question was – I'll repeat the auditing question for you. How would it dominate somebody?"

"But that's what I'm trying to tell you. Dominate somebody? It doesn't dominate somebody, and so on." See?

You say, "All right, okay." Take his answer – it wouldn't dominate anybody. "All right, all right! That's all right. How would it assist your survival?"

"Oh-ho! Well, that's a different thing. Come to think about it, it – it just is. It just is survival. It is – is survival. It's – it's – it's – it's – it just is. It's just life to me, you know? I never really looked at that before, but it is just – it's – it's life. That – that's what it is. It – it is. It's just life."

And the auditor who says at that time "All right, thank you. Now, how would it assist your survival?" is being a complete knucklehead. The guy has answered the question. He's not answered the question, he's answered the whole universe of questions with regard to it. He's given you the perfect answer, which it is. That is the most perfect answer there is about anything! Thing you got to do is keep your tone arm moving. And you do that sort of thing and you do it real slippily and only ask the pc what he can answer and only take it, and so forth; don't start getting hard or tough on the pc till you finish it up, see?

"Now, let's go over these things. *Tsk! Tsk! Tsk! Tsk! Tsk!* Ah, that one ticked. That one ticked. That one ticked, right there. All right, now, how would it make people wrong?"

"Well, I meant to tell you, but in actual fact I – I used to use this quite a bit, quite a bit on all of my girls. I've been reluctant to mention it. But there it is." And he clears this thing up and of course you're away.

In other words, you've got a variety of processes here that are all running more or less at once, and the reason why you have a variety of processes all running at once is you're running a variety of confusion, so it won't be very orderly. It won't get orderly till toward the end. Most of the confusion is discharged. You see, that service facsimile held in abeyance all the confusion that was there residual. It's that confusion running off which gives you the tone arm action. Your tone arm action doesn't come from stable data flying off. It comes from enunciating and as-ising stable datums which then permit confusions to fly off which have been held in abeyance by those stable data. So if your confusion flies off, you're going to get charge releasing, because charge is in essence a confusion. That's all there is to that, see?

It's elementary. You're going to untangle a ball of string, you're going to have string. If you don't untangle a ball of string, you're not going to have string. I mean, that's all there is to that. You untangle a ball of confusion, you're going to have tone arm motion. And if you're not going to untangle a ball of confusion, you're not going to have tone arm motion, that's it.

There's two reasons why you don't get tone arm motion, then: You're not untangling the confusion or there isn't any confusion there. That's the only two reasons.

So you enter into this problem at these various levels, and you'll find out there's a beautiful assessment that gives you service facsimiles like mad. Now, how you run the service facsimile after you've gotten it, I've just covered. But it's always the same: You always handle a service facsimile in this particular line. You'll get very slippy at it after a while. It's slippy auditing. But the number of ways that you can arrive at what is the pc's service facsimile are practically uncountable.

Now, the very best method I know of, at this particular time, is the method I have just given you – not the method of picking up the RI from a pc's goal, see? That's liable to restimulate the whole GPM, particularly in very inexpert hands that couldn't rescue it, and list it out anyhow, if it did happen, see? But this other one is a doll. This other one is a doll. I can see you now, supervising auditing someplace or another, and you hand out this assessment sheet, you see, that the auditor is supposed to fill in, see? And you hand him this assessment sheet, you see, "Who are your parents and why not?" and all kinds of things, and they all go down the line. And the thing has got about three pages and you've got this assessment sheet.

And you say, "Now, you're running R3SC. Make sure to keep the itsa line in very, very well while you're doing this assessment sheet." And you give him this four-page sheet, see? Takes care of his job and his profession and where it's located and all that sort of thing.

The auditor bounces up forty-five minutes later and hands you the sheet all complete. We obviously have somebody there who "had to get something done," as an auditor, see? He just blew the intensive, that's all! And I'm sure this is going to happen to you. Every one of you that's supervising any auditing at all, this is going to happen to you. You just blew the intensive, see, for the pc. Now what do you do? Now what do you do? Where do you go from here? I mean, that's it. You obviously have to run some other process.

No, you can go off on to parts of existence and that sort of thing, but in actual fact, the assessment sheet was never filled in, don't you see? You just said, "Who's your father? Who's your mother? Mother's name? Mother's name? And brothers or sisters – got any brothers or sisters? Thirty-three brothers, four sisters and eight cousins. All right, that's fine. How old were you last birthday? Forty-seven. All right, thank you very much," so forth. And "Where do you live – what's your address? What's your address? All right, 933 North Elm. All right. Cincinnati. Very good. And what company are you with? Oh, the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company. Very good. All right, thank you very much. What's their address? Where are they located? What's the address? Oh, 29 Front Street. Thank you very much. Now, so…"

What's missing here? Well, the only thing that's missing is the total assessment. He isn't… he just missed the whole purpose of what he's supposed to do. You want to know all about this pc's present time and everything he's in contact with, you see?

Well, in a matter of fact, you could come back to the question I just asked you before, if you were scotched to that degree. You could come back to the question I gave you about assumptions about your present time environment, and that sort of thing. You could get a stable datum and you could get the pc to run without the assessment, don't you see? Look at all that gorgeous tone arm action that you missed out on, see? You might have missed out there two sessions, three sessions of gorgeous tone arm action. Marvelous, you see? The thing would be flying all over the place. The guy destimulated all over the place; the guy practically Clear and flying, see? It'd just be in the difference of emphasis of the assessment.

So the understanding of the assessment and understanding that an assessment in R3SC is to produce tone arm action, not data. We don't care anything about the data it produces. But the tone arm action! Now that assessment's supposed to produce some tone arm action, and you'll see that it's – an R3SC becomes a peculiar brand of assessment. And the individual in Scientology Three who has been carefully, carefully, carefully educated in doing an R3SC

assessment, keeping the itsa line in, keeping the tone arm running like mad, moves into Scientology Four and does an assessment for a GPM goals list with the itsa line in wide open. *Uuhhh!* Well, that's one case we wrote off, see?

R3M, see, is done *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*, see? No itsa line. Data, data, data, data, data. All of a sudden the pc cognites on something, you see? Oh, that's fine. He tells you something about it and so forth, see? All right, good. Data, data, data, data, data, see? Item, item, item. List, list, list. There *th-th-thuh,* "There's your item, bang! 'A schnook.' Got it. That's your item."

"Oh, yeah." Now let your itsa line go in a little bit. "In this lifetime I really had… Oh, yeah, a schnook could really – would really – really mow a schnack down, man! That – that – that – that – that's it, that's it, that's it, that's it. That's it."

"Fine, all right. Good! All right! Here's the next list. Who or what would a schnook oppose? *Tsk-tsk!* Rapidly, rapidly. Come on, come on, come on, come on! Come on! Give me the data. Come on and so on and so on. Schnook-oppose. All right. Good, good, good, got it, got it, yeah. Your next – come on, come on, come on, what would it oppose? Well, all right, you can cognite. Give you thirty seconds to cognite." Something like that. [laughter]

Give you the idea? That's 3M2. See, you could go dragging your heels doing one of those assessments and you'd wind up five intensives later with two RIs found, see? Pc in total restimulation, everything gone to pieces. You wonder what's wrong. You get the difference?

This lifetime, present time, itsa line in, assessment: "Well, I don't know, I don't know. I think we're going to have to get rid of Bill as an auditor, because he had one of these present time assessments and it only lasted him two intensives! He found out all about the guy by the middle of the second intensive. *Tsk.* Nothing else to do on the pc. Finished. Wrecked the case. Wrecked the case. Pc not Clear yet and he's got the intensive filled. Now what are we going to do?"

See, there's a different end goal in progress here, isn't there? Entirely different atmosphere involved in these assessments.

So you must keep in mind that there are two different moods of assessing. And if you don't keep that severely in mind, you're going to make an awful flub, because it's another auditing style. R3SC: leisurely, quiet, calm, drag it out endlessly, itsa line in. Because it's all guided, you see, by present time and a lifetime and that sort of thing, see? R3M2: *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa!* "Gimme-gimme-gimme-gimme! What is it? What is it? Let's make it! Speed, man! All right! Oh, you only found four RIs in this session. Going to have to speed it up in the next session," you know?

Assessment: Do a goal-oppose list. "We did – we did – we did a goal-oppose list, and so forth. All right, it's taken us two and a half hours to find this next goal."

"What's the matter with you? It took you two and a half hours to find the pc's next goal? What's the matter with you? What's the matter with you?"

Guy had been doing Scientology Three all the time. "Well, I thought I had until the next intensive."

"Oh, man, you're doing another type of process here entirely, and so on. Let's get that goal-oppose list listed and nulled and that sort of thing, two hours. That's all you got. That's it, that's it. No more than that. So you understand?"

Why? Because backtrack, you got to keep the itsa line shut. Got it? Otherwise you restimulate the pc; your tone arm action disappears.

All right? I've kept you a little bit overtime. Start your sessions fifteen minutes tonight. [laughter, applause]

Okay? Thank you.

Thank you.

Tech Hats
Auditors
Level IV
Students

ASSESSMENT FOR SERVICE FACSIMILES

The location of service facsimiles requires *a proper listing question,* the absence of which can lead to missing the actual service fac or overrunning a lower release grade.

Of the assessment methods, the following should probably be ruled out as an overrun of earlier grades or on the basis of getting a free needle on a previous grade:

1. Slow assessment with ITSA (overrun Grade 0)

2. Assessment by problems (overrun Grade 1)

3. Assessment by parts of existence (overrun Grade 0)

   This leaves as acceptable methods:

1. "In this lifetime, what do you use to make others wrong?"

2. "In this lifetime, what do you think your service facsimile is?" (for a Scientologist trained to Level IV)

3. "In this lifetime, what would be a safe solution to….?" (the blank having been obtained by questions given on the tapes to find either a *hidden standard* or *hidden problem).*

4. Assessment of a prepared list, using level found, in "In this lifetime, what have you……(prehav level)?"

The point being not to start out at the beginning by listing a question which **obviously will not result in finding a service fac**, in which instance the rule of declaring the grade on a floating needle obtained on the list could not possibly apply.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jp.cden

SAINT HILL SERVICE

FACSIMILE HANDLING

A lecture given on 18 September 1963

Thank you.

Well, now, this is the – ?

Audience: 18th.

The 18th of – ?

Audience: September.

September. What planet?

Audience: Earth. AD 13.

AD 13. And solar system. [laughter]

They're tearing down Alcatraz, did you know that?

Audience: Yes.

Did you know they were tearing it down?

Audience: Yeah. They are tearing it down.

Yeah, they're abandoning it and tearing it down, and I think that's awfully good news, and so forth. And we're of course going to follow suit with this planet. Anyway… No, no. Don't – don't get me wrong. We don't intend anything violent. I think we need a rehabilitation center and this one will do as well as any. Okay?

Male voice: Yeah.

Now today, today I'm going to talk to you about the service facsimile and the state of the pc and a Saint Hiller method of moving in with a service facsimile and straightening up a case.

Now, you have to know where the stops are on the organ before you can play an organ. This helps a great deal. You have to know where the keyboard is, and with the new elec-

tronic organs you have to know where the switch is and a few things of that particular character.

So you – just sailing in on a case with great nonchalance, you see, and not turning on the switch of the E-Meter and not finding out anything about the case's PT and having no safeguards of any kind whatsoever and not knowing what you're doing anyway might be rather adventurous, might be rather adventurous. In fact, I think every psychiatrist that has been along this ground is very adventurous. Never was so much done by those who knew so little.

This situation, however, stems from lack of technology and lack of know-how. Now, this know-how situation with regard to the mind is very, very hard to arrive at. There are so many suppositions that – just walking through a forest of favorite beliefs. And when you realize that every case and every practitioner in the field of the mind would be concentrated on one aspect of existence and then dedicated to not observing existence except through that one evaluation of existence, you see at once the tremendous limitations imposed upon the discovery of anything about the mind, and then, secondarily, getting any application of any truth known. Do you see that this, then, would be a self-defeating proposition?

Not only are we given a vast panorama of data, any one of which is – can be a favorite aberration (not a truth but an aberration, don't you see?) in this vast forest, but then we ask people who themselves are concentrated upon favorite data, you see – substituting for themselves to handle this situation – and you get a difficulty; you get a randomity right there.

Now, let's compound the randomity and realize that knowledge about the mind means freedom for life and beings in this universe. Once you recognize that as a principle, you will see that anyone who is dedicated to total enslavement or the dwindling spiral or caving anyone in and caving everyone in, and so forth, are immediately not in favor of total knowledge of the human mind, but quite on the contrary are in favor of great ignorance.

And there's two ways of accomplishing that ignorance. One is simply a denial of information, which is practiced but sometimes cannot be fully enforced. For instance, the Catholic church for many, many centuries made a great thing out of "ignorance is wisdom," you see? Everybody had to be good and stupid and so forth, and whether you're Catholic or not you'd have to admit that that was the modus operandi of the existing church over a period of about, oh, I think it must have been eight hundred years or something like this – is almost their total devotion was to ignorance.

Well, it doesn't go just that far. That sooner or later gets interrupted. But there's something that can be substituted for total ignorance and that is false data. And false data is probably a much more effective means of denying freedom.

One of the ways of going about false data, for instance: The fellow wants to get out of the woods and there are two trails. And one trail lies much deeper into the woods and the other trail goes out on to the plain. And all you have to do is put up a sign at the crossroads and point to that trail which goes deeper into the woods and say, "This way lies freedom," you see, and you've promptly trapped a lot of people.

And that is such an easy action that when it is added to the fact that everybody is sort of mired down in their favorite fixated data, this can become quite a vicious morass. The trick is, then, to find the exact mechanics – the exact, precise mechanics which apply to all minds.

Now, the moment you have found the exact, precise mechanics which apply to all minds, you can then get a broad agreement on the situation because they override the minor data on which the people are fixated. In other words, they also would have this broader perimeter of data and they'd recognize the truth in the broader perimeter of data. But the moment that you move even a sixteenth of a millimeter sideways off of what is generally applicable to all minds, you are again into the particularities and opinions. So therefore, if you had a broad sphere of knowledge which was true, and these were all high generalities and everybody would agree with them, frankly it'd be very easy to bankrupt and upset that whole operation by taking it, and by false relay – you see, bad instruction and bad relay of the material and dropping out a datum here and a vital datum there and substituting something or other – you eventually could then again effect a sort of a slavery out of that information.

In other words, even if you arrive at the technology, you still have the task of safeguarding the technology because, once more, it can easily turn and become a false technology.

These are the various ramifications that Scientology has had to deal with over a period of many years. And the solution to the difficulty is results because once the technology is applicable so that results occur by reason of its application, then of course, you don't get any arguments with these. You don't get the intrusion of a great deal of crisscrosses.

So the whole contest has been not for the achievement of certain truths – we have had many of these for years – but a workability so that we attain an application of those truths toward a rapid release of attention from favorite and fixated data. And in that wise, then, the truth is carried out by a demonstration that if it is used a greater freedom is attained.

And we have to look at how long is the attention span of a preclear. Well, in actual fact, as far as Scientologists are concerned, their attention span, their willingness to go along and try in this direction, is terrific. But the casualties which occur along the lines occur because the body of knowledge has not arrived in an individual in the release of his attention from his favorite data. Do you see that?

This fellow is sure that all horses sleep in beds. Now, it isn't only that he has this as a fixed datum; he also has this as a total datum. And any data that does not contribute to horses sleeping in beds he will discard. You see, it's not just that he's got this one idea. He's got this idea which then bends all idea toward this idea. And the truth of any existing situation is whether or not it fits this *idée fixe*. His idea of separating truth from falsehood is whether or not it fits his *idée fixe*. Now, if the thing is false, it doesn't fit his *idée fixe* and therefore should be thrown away. And if it is true, it does fit his *idée fixe* and therefore should be retained. All of which is rather interesting because if his *idée fixe* were "horses sleeping in beds," he would only listen to mental technology that affected horses or beds.

Therefore – therefore, the early discovery, and the long dormancy, arising in a greater use and application of the service facsimile means a great deal to Scientology. Means a very great deal to Scientology because you're now dealing with the one reason you can't get across

a general truth to a preclear. You're not trying to teach this preclear anything but you're trying to show this preclear that by reason of what you are doing you get a release of attention so that the world looks brighter and he can look further and he feels better and more powerful.

Now, if you do not attain this in a session with any given pc over – sometimes it can be a very long period of time – but if you do not eventually attain this, you will eventually lose your pc. Sometimes it lasts only an hour and sometimes it would last for several years.

Now, the degree that it – the pc will sit there patiently has direct ratio to how fixed his idea is. Now, the pc who will sit there for years waiting for a greater truth does not have his attention so involved with an *idée fixe,* you see, that he cannot absorb the greater application of the material which he is presented with to process. And he will get perimeter benefits even though his *idée fixe* is not touched. He gets these perimeter benefits solely and totally because he is not that fixed! Do you see? He's just not that fixed.

Now we take this bloke who says that horses sleep in beds, and that is the total modus operandi of life. We have to look at the totality which this can become. This is the eighth, seventh, sixth, fifth, fourth, third, second, first dynamic, see? All sex is answered by the fact that horses sleep in bed. The way to run a family is to have horses sleep in beds, you see? God is actually a horse sleeping in a bed, see? This has really got to be a fixed datum.

Now, to the degree the datum is fixed, he is not able to explore the perimeter of his ideas and therefore cannot see a greater truth. In other words, he's more entrapped and more imprisoned than the next one. Now, that is what is known as very bad mental condition: It's how fixed this one idea is.

Now, when you're dealing with neurosis, you have somebody who has an *idée fixe* which only occasionally arises to wreck his life, and he can see a little more beyond that. But when you have psychosis, you have only the *idée* fixe – only. Just as I just told you: God is a horse sleeping in bed, see? You'll find the institutions are full of these blokes.

Now, that's it. Now, that scares you when you start thinking about the fact that you, of course, have a service facsimile that is an *idée fixe* and so forth. All right. It's degree, then. It's degree. Your attention isn't so pinned down by that that you can't examine a greater truth or you wouldn't be sitting here this very minute. See, so immediately you're lifted out of the ranks of the insane and the neurotic. See?

Just by definition. That proves itself – quite self-evident. Now – you can see some wider idea.

But let's take Mamie Glutz or somebody, the cashier at the local service station, and we try to explain to her – we try to explain to her – that beings are beings and that each one of them has a mind. Let's just go that far, see?

Now, if she's got a very furious *idée fixe* of one kind or another, such as "all men are alike," see, this doesn't fit. So therefore, you become false. To her, you are false, do you see? Then any datum which you utter on the broad perimeter of life, if it doesn't add up to "all men are alike," is a false datum. You could have an elephant stand in the middle of the room, and say, "That's an elephant." Well, it's not a man, so therefore it's a false datum, don't you see? So that you're indicating that an elephant is standing in the middle of the room – and there is

an elephant there – you are indicating a false datum to her. And therefore you are saying something foolish.

She knows this. How does she know this? Well, she knows this because, naturally, "all men are alike."

One fine day you happen to tell her, "A lot of men are aberrated. In fact, most all men have aberrations of one kind or another." You're in there cooking; you're now true. This one accidental datum goes by and latches on to this service facsimile, see? Just one. Now you spake truth. And perhaps from there on, everything you utter, she will say, "That is true." But once more, it's without evaluation or inspection.

Now, get the degree, then, the degree of fixation upon an all-resolving datum and then you have the degree of enslavement of the individual. These things actually are not degrees of knowledge or ignorance but simply degrees of freedom or slavery. It is secondary – entirely secondary – that truth is truth and falsehood is falsehood. It's whether or not it leads to freedom or slavery that establishes your final amount of truth, because fixation is only upon falsehood. You can never get fixated on truth. That's quite a fascinating thing.

Truth is an all-freeing mechanism. If it is not all-freeing, then the truth to some degree must be limited – either limited in its conception or limited in its reception or limited in its application. So that you can say that anything you were worried about must have a falsehood connected with it. There is always a lie connected with anything that you are having a hard time with. You go out and you can't start your car. And you fool around with it and fool around with it and fool around with it, trying to start the car. And you finally realize that it must be the carburetor. So you have the carburetor fixed. And you still can't start your car. Obviously you conceived a falsehood about the car. It couldn't have been the carburetor because after you fixed the carburetor the car still didn't run. This is easily demonstrated in the field of mechanics, you see, because things run or don't run. So there was a falsehood connected with your analysis of what is wrong with the car.

Now you say, "Well, it's probably the spark," and you fix the spark in some way and the car runs. Therefore, that must have been the truth.

Well, we can't observe to that degree people running or not running. Their motors don't purr or stop and they appear to be all right when they're not and they appear to be not all right when they are. And very often an auditor has been very embarrassed at the end of session to sort of start apologizing for what a terrible session it's been and get the whole load in his face on the subject of taking away the pc's gains: "Why, I had a fine session! It's a marvelous session! Found out a lot of things! Had a terrific time!" you see, and so forth. Far as the auditor's observation was concerned, the pc was sitting there quite glumly and hadn't had much of a session.

All right, another way: An auditor is looking at the pc, and the pc is smiling sweetly and so forth, and so forth. And actually the pc is practically spun in by the session, don't you see? Now, you can make that observation of the pc a modus – well, a cause here.

Let's look at how far we have come in this direction. You are actually now in a position to determine, without the faintest difficulty, whether it was a good session or a bad ses-

sion for the pc without asking the pc. Now, that's rather terrific. This doesn't look like much, don't you see? But that's pretty terrific.

If the pc got an acceptable amount of tone arm action in the session, the pc by session end might have even been roughed up by something but still would have had a gain and will be fine the next day. But the pc who did not get tone arm action in the session will not feel good at session end, no matter what they say, and the next day will probably feel terrible. One session, no TA action: pc bad off.

Now, that doesn't look like much. That doesn't look like much. That looks like a datum which you now know and which you're living by and auditing by and it just doesn't look like much. Actually, there was more wisdom in that discovery than there has been in the former fifty thousand years of thinking man, because it immediately and directly took out of the realm of inspection, worsening or improvement as a result of treatment. There's no opinion about it now. We don't have to depend on the auditor's opinion or the pc's opinion. There's no dependency on that at all. Did you get tone arm action of an adequate amount? All right, then that pc is going to feel good at the end of session and the pc is going to feel better the next day. You didn't get an adequate amount of tone arm action: The pc is not going to feel good at the end of session and not going to feel better the next day, no matter what the pc says.

Now, once in a blue moon you can turn off a somatic and the pc feels nice about the somatic going off without getting a great deal of tone arm action – without getting a great deal of tone arm action. But you watch that pc during the next forty-eight hours and exactly the same result will occur. I mean, we haven't stepped sideways from the basic data involved in it at all.

Now, that's interesting. That's interesting. Therefore, just on that little grounds alone, we must know something about the mind and be able to do something about the mind which is in excess of what has been done about the mind. Look at the tininess of what I am giving you here, you see? That's hardly anything, you see? But that truth will hold up – that truth will hold up. You say, "Well, it's a mechanic truth, it's an application truth, it's this kind of a truth." But nevertheless it'll hold up.

As you go along and audit, you will find out that that truth holds up. In fact, you're finding it out right now. You've sat there over a stuck tone arm for two and a half hours, you've looked at the end of session and the pc has been going groan and creak, and it hasn't been going too well. And if you cared to look at the pc a few hours later, you'd find the pc sort of caving in, in various spots. Pc will be nattery to you the next session and that sort of thing. By the time you've gone three sessions without any tone arm action, you will start wishing you had never started auditing this pc in the first place, because the reactions are going to be rather extreme. In other words, this will follow out a general observation.

So therefore, we must be dealing, where we're dealing with the pc, in certain principles of action. Those principles of action are also very elementary. They fall back immediately upon the *idée* fixe – the stable datum and the confusion. And it must mean that all confusions are there, and therefore all masses are there, because they are held in abeyance so far as observation is concerned, and will never as-is, by a stable datum. A stable datum, then, prevents observation of the environment or these masses and therefore accumulates masses. A

stable datum is a dam erected across the river, and with that stable datum firmly in place no water is going to flow.

Now, what is wrong with a mind? Well, it must be that a stable datum was adopted in lieu of inspection. A person ceased to inspect. For some reason or other he fell back from inspecting, fell back from living, fell back from being anywhere and just let everything go to pieces. "Oh," he says, "well, I'll put this stable datum there and the devil with it all. To hell with it. I'm..." He either said, "I'm incompetent" or "I'm bored with it" or "I want to be elsewhere," or something of the sort. He said something. But he still put a datum there to substitute for his own observation and his own coping with life and the situation at large.

And at that moment he started to get an accumulation of confusion. Because you can write "I eat pie" on a piece of paper and put it in the middle of a bakeshop and it won't do a thing. It won't bake any pies, it won't buy any pies, it won't sell any pies, it won't do a thing. You can put "bakeshop" over the door so that people will know that's where the bakeshop is, and start handing out pies and selling pies and doing things like that, and you have handled a confusion just to that degree. But the moment you put "bakeshop" in the middle of the place and take the baker out, you haven't got a bakeshop. See, it's pretty obvious.

Well, when the thetan did a bunk and left an idea where he was, after that no confusion gets as-ised, but on the contrary, rather develops at a high rate of speed. You get more and more confusions and less and less as-ising. And eventually this develops what we call mass – mental mass.

Once you shake up that stable datum – whether you find the exact stable datum or not – once you shake it up by finding a cousin datum to it or finding something in its perimeter, you have taken some bricks out of the dam that is lying across the river, and water is going to start to flow down that river. And as it flows it tends to wipe away more and more stable data. And true, as in any hydraulic works, you're going to get more flow and more widening of the hole the flow is going through, the more flow there is. You've got to start the flow flowing.

Now, how does the stable datum become so fixed? It becomes fixed by the very thing it's supposed to confront. It gets fixed by the confusion it's supposed to handle and doesn't. And the more it is in place to hold back the confusion, the more confusion batters at it, so the more accumulation of confusion you get around the vicinity of this stable datum.

It's something like twirling a bowl of taffy or something like that – twirling a fork in it. You're just going to get more and more taffy on the fork, don't you see? Because it is there. If it weren't there, you weren't going to get any. Now, it might be there to remedy the confusion. Actually, it accumulates confusions. And you get more and more accumulation of confusion and therefore more and more mass, and more and more this, and more and more that, and more and more eradication, and less and less ability to inspect and communicate on the part of the individual. And finally the whole house gets full of these things and the guy has got no place to move anymore and he sort of sits there and he himself is one of these things. And you can't find the pc because he's just another stable datum. He knows, see, and so on.

And man, man has gone the route. Man talks about the brain when he talks about the mind. And if you want a commentary – if you want a commentary on a state of mental technology – just look for the degree that the thinkingness or beingness of the man is considered

to be mass. And the more a being is considered to be mass, the lower the technology extant will be found to be. Why? They're just dramatizing the stable datum and the confusion.

So you look for modern science. Modern science says, "Man's an animal – ha-ha." See? "Man is an animal. And it's – he's a brain, and electronic impulses go this way and that way and that causes thought."

What have you got here? What have you got here? You've got a brain substituted for the being. And if all mental technology believes that, what kind of condition must those practitioners be in? They're in the condition which you see them in today. That's pretty grim. They're hard people to have anything to do with.

Now, you wonder why they are hard to train. And they are hard to train. And one of these fine days you'll be training them. Just remember that their whole orientation has already added up to a tremendous confusion which has used a brain as a stable datum.

So you'd run a process like "Tell me all about the brain." "What decisions have you made about the brain?" And you're going to get tone arm action. And all the charge of the former confusions which have been stopped by false data is going to flow by on your E-Meter tone arm. And the next thing you know, they have enough inspection ability to learn. And that's why they're hard to teach. That's all. Because all the knowledge you're handing them, they do this with it – You say, "Now, there is the idea of a – flows. And when a flow flows too long in one direction it tends to get stuck."

And this is the way they receive this datum: "Uh, let's see, a flow flows too long – brain. They're talking about blood. Uh, this is a discussion, then, of the causes of coronary thrombosis." So they write down "Coronary thrombosis, diagnosis of." Get the idea? What's holding this – what – how come? How come there's no inspection? Well, because they're even depending on their own brains to do their inspection for them. You imagine a thetan getting so lazy that the brain is going to inspect everything for him.

Well now, this, then, is actually just putting your attention on the limitations of beings to the recognition of truth or falsehood. And that recognition is limited in direct ratio to the amount of fixation upon a stable datum. And that's the degree of limitation. Very important principle.

How then can an individual who is totally boundaried and bound in and totally fixated – and he himself is a stable datum by this time; he's no longer a living being – how can he be expected to get anywhere? What can you do for him?

Well, you think, well, let's see, there's two approaches here. You could take a datum of enormous magnitude and you could hold a gun on him and you say, "If you don't believe this new stable datum, we will shoot you." I'm not now talking about an unused method, see? "You say 'Heil Hitler' or you'll at once be talking to the Schutzstaffel," see, that's a substitution of a datum for understanding. He'll be talking to the Schutzstaffel, promptly.

Patriotism rises on every hand. See, everybody says "Heil Hitler" all the time and eventually the nation goes down in defeat. Why does it become defeated? Well, there's nobody there stopping any confusion or handling anything at all except a stable datum known as "Heil Hitler."

Mussolini's empire went the route. One of his boys was always expected to call Rome if he had to make a decision. Now, when the Allies first went into Sicily they had to appoint some of these blokes back into civil positions. First they appointed a whole new batch and found out they'd appointed the Mafia into total control of everything. And they had to reverse this and get some of the old Fascist officials. And they said the only thing wrong with them was they couldn't think for themselves. They always had to call Rome to know what to do with a piece of paper or something of the sort, and the lines were real busy. But that empire too went down to defeat.

So this method of holding the pistol or the sword or the fist and saying, "Accept this stable datum or else," and so forth, has a level of workability. And it is used, but normally ends up in greater slavery and certainly less effectiveness. It can be counted on to wind up with less effectiveness – less IQ.

Now, we made a study in Johannesburg – inadvertently, but made a study down there – of a bunch of papers that came through from school children. And we had one school that was tested from one end to the other down there in the test department. It was quite interesting to see the deterioration of the IQ of the child. I think the highest IQ that we measured in Johannesburg was a seven-year-old boy, if I remember rightly. I may have this data wrong. But he had an IQ of about 200. And that was about the highest IQ we had around there.

But studying the school at large as they had progressed from class to class to class to class, you saw a deterioration of the IQ. Well, that was an interesting commentary on the school because the school was never asked to inspect anything, never asked to understand anything. But they had to accept this as a datum, never inspect it in any way, shape or form, and let it stand as a substitute for themselves. Of course, you got a deterioration of IQ. Right?

Now, there'd be a whole new level of education if you said to somebody, "Look this over very, very carefully and decide what is true about it and what is false about it and what is workable and what is unworkable." That's a whole new zone and area of education, and a very interesting zone and area of education. But you see at once what limits it: With everybody fixated on his own special idea by which he's going to tell rightness from wrongness, that, as a totality, can't exist. But it's another idea, you see?

Now, this would be another method of going about this, and that would be to free up people's ideas so their perimeter of inspection increased, and having increased, let them inspect the data which lies before them. Therefore, you have a sort of a cross of these two schools of thought. You lead them up with a certain disciplined action that finally shows them their *idée fixe* – inadvertently, not even intentionally, but just leads them right straight to that. That then, knocked out of the way, shows them a greater perimeter of understanding and you could lead them forward continuously to higher and higher levels of understanding and to total freedom. Because remember that the individual is trapped to the degree that his ideas are fixed.

You're actually leading any person who is not Clear, then, out of a morass of entrapment, not out of a morass of ignorance. And he's trapped to the degree that his ideas are fixed. Therefore, it is of the greatest importance to you to find, first and fastest, the idea on which he is the fixedest. That's very important, then. And that would give you the speed of processing.

That determines the speed that processing is done at. It's how fast can you find the *idée fixe* and free the individual for a broader perimeter of inspection.

Exteriorization, even the state of OT, depends upon bringing about greater states of freedom, not greater states of wisdom. This is an important differentiation because the wisdom will take place anyway. But by concentrating on the wisdom you are all too prone to fall over into the idea of the implanted stable datum. But if you think of it in terms of freeing his attention, you then lead to freeing the being.

The only thing that can trap a thetan is his attention. That is all that can trap a being; stone walls do not, definitely.

You have a situation here where an individual is totally untrappable; completely and utterly untrappable by anyone except himself. What traps a being is his unwillingness to confront things which are not interesting to him, or to back out of situations in which he has lost interest, or to move off and go his way but still, somehow or another, be responsible for where he was. Various combinations lead to this situation.

Well, we are studying, now, how does an individual fix his attention and then substitute for himself or for thinkingness or for something else some inanimate postulate? Joe was here, you see? Here he is as a thetan, able to contest, confront and handle any of the confusions in his direction, see? And actively doing so.

Now, he says, "I have an unconscious mind that does all that."

How has he trapped himself?

He says, "This is an unawareness area which is going to handle these confusions."

Steen-trillion-squillion years afterwards, Sigmund Freud comes along and finds the unconscious mind.

Well, actually, the unconscious mind would be that totality of stable data which are holding back that totality of confusion which the individual is no longer aware of but is still doing.

Well, so much for freedom and slavery. That's all it amounts to: it's freedom and slavery – of the individual's fixed attention and so forth.

Now, of course, the individual can go to extreme and extraordinary limits. They say, "Well, you are the auditor and I'm depending on you utterly as my auditor to free me. And therefore my idea is fixed on you, so therefore I ought to be able to go off and self-audit myself, and so forth, because it's very bad to have my attention fixed on you as an auditor." Well, that's strictly ding-ding-ding, here comes the wagon. You're not part of his stable data. You're part of his environment. There's a slight difference. You are freeing his attention, not entrapping it. There's a difference. Now, how does all that add up in our modern swing and quick look around on technology? I have just given you all the important data. I haven't given you the ramifications of this data or how it becomes fixed in this and how a thetan exactly does it. I haven't given you any of the mechanics of the situation. But I actually have given you the fundamental rationale which brings about aberration. And actually they're – you can name a lot of parts to all this, but you've got it right here in just what I've just got through telling you.

There's actually no more in the essence of the broad theory to the subject than just what I have told you. There's really no more to it.

Now, the technology of how you free up somebody's attention; the exact method of how it is entrapped; the exact comparisons that trap it; the exact things he does to form these entrapments and that sort of thing: That's a broader field of technology. But it nevertheless has a total dependency on the data which I've just now given you.

And when you are looking for the pc's service facsimile, therefore you are looking for that thing in present time on which his ideas are most fixated – his attention is most fixated in present time. That is what you're looking for when you have a service facsimile. If you find any cousins, sisters, aunts of the service facsimile kicking around and knock those out – any other stable data that are around – you're going to get tone arm flow. There's going to be flow and it's going to express itself on that tone arm.

"Horses sleep in beds": you inadvertently hit on "bedside tables." Oh, you get lots of flow, because "bedside tables" is part of the bed, don't you see? And you get flow, flow, flow, flow, flow – "bedside tables," you see? You don't ever expect that it's connected with beds, much less suspect it's connected with horses.

But you've got your paws on "bedside tables." Therefore, you're finding something which is at least a first cousin to his service facsimile.

Service facsimile by definition is the last oppterm or terminal that the individual has or is forming – has formed or is forming. It's the last pair of RIs in combination – it's that pair that makes it – last pair of RIs formed up at the top of the last GPM postulated. That's exactly what the service facsimile is. It isn't anything else. But you're going to find a lot of cousins sitting around in there. Of course, he's busy getting this one together, see? "Who opposes horses sleeping in beds, you see?" "A horse master," you see? So he's busy being a horse master, or something like this, and that's his beingness and stable datum for life, you see? And what he is opposing is horses sleeping in beds, but horses sleeping in beds he believes. You can get some kind of a ramification out of that. I'm not now trying to give you a neat picture of these last two items. That's beside the point, but just take it that they're there, see?

Now, sitting around in their vicinity you've got all kinds of things: you've got a horse master's hat, you see, so you've got a hat; you've got a whip; you've got boots; and you've got bed... or you've got posts, you see; or you've got sheets; or you see, you've got all of these little additional items, see? There are tremendous numbers of items scattered around here, completely aside, you see, from a horse master and a bed and a horse, see? There is much more stuff. You get your hands on any one of those little things and you're going to get some tone arm action.

Tone arm action actually depends on your getting your paws on one of those things. You can call any one of them, for just practical purposes, you can call them, "Well, I found a service fac," or something like that. I don't care whether you call it or not. That's not neat. That's not neat. You won't know whether it's a service fac or not until you've found the actual GPM and found its two top items. And then you'll know what the service fac really was. And your face is going to get somewhat red, see? It's "horses sleep in beds," you see, and it's something about horses in beds, you see? And man, you had it all figured out that it was bedside

tables and had to do with the second dynamic, you know? You had it taped. Didn't have anything to do with the second dynamic at all. It had to do with the fifth dynamic. Quite amusing. You'll nearly always find yourself that far off when you're just entering from the top with R3SC. So just expect to be. You'll be on the safe side.

The chances of your actually finding the service facsimile itself in a combination of two items is not merely rare – it's impossible. So get that well. It's impossible. Can't be done. It requires the illumination of knowing they are part of that bank before they are recognizable to the pc. Pc just won't recognize them, that's all. Even if you found them, the pc would reject them because they don't identify with the goal. You don't have the combination of the last goal (closest to PT, you see), and those two RIs and their relationship to that goal. And then, you've got to get those three things before you get a total "Hey! What do you know!" See? And then you get it, see? But before that, you could have actually had it on the list and it wouldn't have meant anything to the pc.

So you're not going to find the pc's service facsimile. Do you understand? But go ahead, try like mad [laughter] – because it's on that route that you're going to find the last GPM.

Every one of these little goofball things like "the bedside table," "a bedside lamp," "a chamber pot that sits under the bed" – any one of these things – you find these things, you know, and he adds them all up and that fits over there – and they don't fit any such place, but that's all right. He adds them all up. And you get tone arm action, tone arm action. You list for the thing. And he won't get any real relationship of how this relates with that. But he'll get some action. It does mean something in his environment – does have something to do with it.

By the way, tremendous subjects come into this. Somebody's suddenly going to cognite that we're dealing with, also, Freudian fetishism. This is Freudian fetishism. Some narrow perimeter of this would be fetishes. You know, the guy is absolutely fixated on getting ahold of women's dancing pumps, you know? He has closets full of them, you see? All of this sort of thing. That's a Freudian fetish. They went through all sorts of wild things along this particular direction. But they're simply objects associated on some distant perimeter with the service facsimile. And, of course, a person seldom is that fixated on any object. It actually is not common to all cases. But you will find these things around and it's rather fun to look at them. You'll find grandfather's pipe, or something like that, you see? Oh, you get lots of action on the thing, you see? Terrific, you see? Pc had an ally, and he'll figure it all out and he's got it all taped, and that sort of thing. And he won't have anything to do with it. When you finally get the service facsimile, service facsimile maybe has something about pipes in it, you know, "steam pipes" or something, not anything about smoking pipes.

But you got too close an identification, see? So all of these things get identified into the bundle because he is incapable of inspecting them very freely. They cross-associate and you can bleed charge.

Now, what has got the pc so restimulated that you can't get tone arm action? The two top RIs of the last GPM formed or being formed. That's what's got him so restimulated. That's what makes his present time so miserable. And that's what charges up his tone arm so it won't

move. It even cross-influences into auditing restimulation because his auditing is being monitored by these two top RIs.

So, when you get down to the – the final chips are in, you haven't got any choice but to find the pc's goal. Not the pc's backtrack goal "to be a giant," you see? That's a very nice goal, and we appreciate that he had that goal but that happens to be trillions-seventy ago. You can't even write trillions-seventy on this wall. You couldn't. Just writing along with normal-sized figures, just writing and writing and writing, you couldn't write them on this wall. That's a lot of time. And that's not present time!

You can, however, go skipping; by goal-oppose, goal-oppose, goal-oppose, goal-oppose, you can bring it on up to PT, see? When you get it up to PT, why, you'll see it ticking as the PT goal. And it ticks "yes" – you know, Ouija-boards your meter. "Is this the present time GPM?" you see? "Is this the goal you've last formed? This the goal closest to present time?" Tick, you see? All right, and whatever the goal says, "Is this a right goal?" Tick. "This a wrong goal?" No read. "Is it a wrongly worded goal?" No read. "Right goal?" Tick. "Present time goal?" Tick.

Then you look it over yourself and find out whether or not you think so. Like, it could be the goal "to be big," you see, or something like this. And that's a present time goal? Ha-ha-ha-ha. Look! Self-evident: The fellow's here on Earth. That isn't his present time goal – self-evident. And he probably would have made some part of it if he had, don't you see? It may look too high-toned a goal to you, in which case you do another goal-oppose on it. And the worst that will happen to you – the very worst that will happen to you – is that you just run into greater and greater quantities of tone arm action. You're doing a goal-oppose, but it is the present time goal, so you're peeling off the lower goals off of it.

Well, you'll eventually see you'll just run into more and more tone arm action, so you just ask it on the meter, "Is this the present time goal?" And you get a nice read, now, see? And there it is, and you list for its top oppterm, you know? "Who or what would be the latest item formed or the latest idea formed concerning this goal 'to catch catfish'?" – whatever it is. List it out, get a reasonable list, not 189 pages, listing the guy back and forth, up and through and back and forth through his GPM, and back and forth through his GPM, and back and forth through his GPM, eye sockets getting darker and darker and face getting blacker and blacker, and back and forth through his GPM... "Well, we actually haven't run all the tone arm action out of it yet, we've only got 189 pages of listing…"

No, I'm afraid that isn't quite the sensible way to go about it. You're listing to find the top oppterm. However you find the top oppterm is how you find the top oppterm, see? You want the top oppterm – you don't want a list. And when you do this reasonable length of list, you know, and you got a clean needle – listing to clean needle is very excellent – and you got a clean needle, why, there you've got it. And you null it down and you see one of them goes click, of one kind or another, nice little slash or a surge or something. Let the pc cognite on it for a while, prepcheck it and you'll see the most gorgeous rocket read you ever saw, and you needn't have seen a second, momentary, even-for-an-instant rocket read the whole way. And that's a discovery. Now, the way you've been finding goals is you get the goal and you lay it

out and you prepcheck it, and if it doesn't rocket read it isn't the goal, and so forth. And you have to prepcheck it until it rocket reads, and this thing is falling off the pin, and so forth.

Hey, what if this goal is "to be God," trillions-hundred. And you're prepchecking some pc at trillions-hundred while his top RI is "auditing." What do you think is liable to happen? The RI, the service fac in which he is sitting and that he's frozen in right here in present time, is "auditing." And that's an oppterm. And the terminal is "a screamer" or "an ARC breaky pc."

Found that on a list the other day, and the auditor tried to sell it to me as a terminal. It turned out to be an oppterm, fortunately.

But look-a-here: There he is up here in PT with all that restimulation, see, in his environment and everything else falling in on his head. Those RIs are all ready to pull in. You take him back to trillions-a-hundred to prepcheck a goal? You going to get there? You going to see an RR? You're going to see an ARC breaky pc. Going to be a little bit too much strain, isn't it?

So what's this add up to? This adds up to the difficulties in finding pc's goals was getting pc's goals to rocket read. That was the difficulty in finding pc's goals, not getting the pc to volunteer what his goal was, because pcs are always giving you a big sell on what their goal is. See, that's easy. You say to somebody – so forth and so on. You can finally get something to read in this direction, see? But to get it to rocket read, to get it all polished up and laid out and that sort of thing, that was our trouble.

Well, you can do this whole operation without any Prepchecking and bring it off with only ticks up to the point where you have prepchecked the top oppterm. And your first rocket read is after you've prepchecked – after you've given the pc the top oppterm and prepchecked it – and then, and only then, do you see your first rocket read. And it'll be gorgeous. You don't even have his GPM rocket reading. You don't even have the goal rocket reading. You're not doing anything with it at all. And that's the way to find a service fac. Slippery. Sneaky.

Now, I'll give you the exact way you go about this, because I've left you rather stonied and it is not quite complete. I haven't told you all the steps either! Now, the first thing you do is to find what you fondly hope is, and which the pc implicitly believes is, his service facsimile, which gives you enough tone arm action to act as an anchor to windward. This is Saint Hill method of finding – it's not just finding somebody's service facsimile but actually clearing the whole case to OT. Here's the way you go about it, See? You just hunt and punch around enough till you know you've got your paws on something that will bring about excellent tone arm action. And then you don't use it. Well, what do you want it for? Well, just for this reason: If you run a session totally without tone arm action, your pc is going to be pretty miserable and he's not going to get any gain from auditing and his morale is going to go down, he's going to feel bad the next day, and you're going to get into a no-auditing situation with great rapidity, see? So we take this – this thing called a service fac; we hunt and punch around until we find something that can produce tone arm action. We know it can. All we've got to do is prepcheck it or run right-wrong on it or domination. The pc is trying to cognite on it, you know, and that sort of thing, and trying to run this thing desperately and get tone arm action and all that sort of thing. And you politely – you've found it, see? And for some reason or other you don't do anything with it. It's going to produce tone arm action, though.

Now, therefore, you can afford half of your next session, if not two-thirds of it, to flounder around where the GPMs are growing, with no tone arm action at all. And if you haven't gotten any tone arm action in the first half or two-thirds of the session, and you haven't really got anyplace or got your hands on anything and you made a few bum steers, you can still cheerily, cheerily, cheerily say to the pc, "All right, now we're going to run your service facsimile."

"Why the hell weren't you doing it earlier?"

"Well, that's right. That's all right. It's all right," and so on, see?

So, *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*; get some TA action, TA action, TA action; the pc comes out of it feeling fine. He's got some auditing, right?

Next session he comes back in expecting to run "peanut boilers" or whatever it was; you start looking for GPMs, see? Half the session, two-thirds of the session goes by and you still haven't produced adequate tone arm action, you still got a service facsimile to run, see? So he gets a session, doesn't he? Everything's fine – his morale is staying up and everything is fine.

The next session – if you're going this long (you've just been a complete knucklehead up to this point, see?) – you do your other list, and you've ruled out a few things now and what you've tried isn't so good, and so forth.

Now, this one, about a third of the way through the session, you've found the goal "to be wonderful." And it went *tick!* And you said to the pc, "Is that your actual goal or is that an implant GPM?" And your search-out found it to tick every time you said "Is that an actual goal of yours?"

Well, we're not going to get that thing to rocket read because that is way back down the track. But we're going to go "What goal would oppose 'to be wonderful'?" And we're going to complete a list and we're going to find a goal and we're going to use this goal we find – it just ticked (the goal we find); just nice, healthy tick left in on the list, see? And we're going to ask about this goal. "This goal: Is that an actual GPM?" Don't you see? Going to go through the same routine as though we'd just found it, see, originally. "Is that an actual GPM? Is that," you know, "your own GPM?" and so forth. And "Is it... ?" so forth. And "Is it a present time goal?" And of course, naturally, it isn't, most of the time.

You got it all straight – don't prepcheck it or anything silly like that because we don't want it live, see? Now let's roll up our sleeves and do a new goal-oppose list, see, and it was "to be a schnook," see? So we say, "What goal would oppose 'to be a schnook'?" see? And we get "To be an evil being," or something like this, don't you see? That's pretty high-toned for present time. Do the same thing with it, sort it all out, don't you see? And we finally move him up. We don't care if we moved him through twenty of these things, see? We found this little tab out. There was one goal that he claimed was his goal, see, and we could get a tick every time we said "Is that your goal personally – not an implant goal?" He's always very interested in it.

You guys are very lucky. For instance, I can look right over here: Guy over there's got a goal "to understand," see? I can look over here; I know what goal you've got; just watching

your records, you understand? You know, because absorbed attention whenever you hit those implant goals, you know, boy! That ran, you know, boy, that was a – that was a good one. Got a big send out of this implant goal. Hell, naturally you got a big send out of the implant goal. It was your own goal, except that was the implant lock on it.

See, so you're rich. So anyway, you just take that goal – take that goal and say, "Is that your actual goal?" Tick, see? And so on. And do a goal-oppose list and move that thing by goal-oppose lists only, you see, up to PT. And you finally get something. "Is this your PT goal?" You're very suspicious of that because sometimes you can be three goals away from the PT GPM and it will still read "It's your PT goal." We just haven't discovered that other.

There's reasons for this, too, and I can give you the clue of what happens. When you've got the PT goal and you do a goal-oppose list against it, you don't land the guy up in the future with Buck Rogers, see? [laughter] So you just do your goal-oppose, your goal-oppose – a reasonable length of list, see? And you just list your needle clean, null the thing down – it ought to null easily – and you get your goal-oppose list item. And you've got a new goal; go through the same business with that. You could occasionally, you know, mess it up. You didn't get the right goal or you fell into an implant goal. But you'll sort all that out on a meter. So you just make sure that you got the pc's own goal and it's closer to PT than the goal you had last time, see?

All right. Now, when you finally get his PT goal you can still be suspicious of it and list "What goal would oppose it?" See? "To drown myself," see? That's a nice PT goal, see? "To drown myself." That's pretty real for PT.

All right. (Now, I don't say that'd be anybody's actual goal; that's why I'm paraphrasing it.) All right. So we list "What goal would oppose it?" and we can't make it. We can't do anything with this list because we keep developing more and more tone arm action.

We're not now developing less and less tone arm action, the way you do on a normal goal-oppose list, you see, if you're not up there. You're going to produce more and more tone arm action. This needle is going to get floppier and floppier and looser and looser. The pc isn't going to ARC break, mostly because you're listing toward what his ideas would be sometime in the future, don't you see? But you're actually unburdening this goal. And when you start running the PT goal, you just start running into more and more TA action, and more and more TA action, so you know better than to continue that list. When I'm saying "more and more TA action," I mean *TA action* – not .25 divisions every hour, or something like that. I'm talking about *TA action*, you know? You know, *TA action*. You know, it's *action*. You know? You know, action! Good action! Hot. And you start running and you find the further you run the hotter it gets. Now, you know you must be listing a goal-oppose against the PT goal, because there isn't anything there to list against, and all you can do is run out the PT goal.

You can also sometimes produce a blowdown. When you've picked up the pc's goal, you list against it, produce more tone arm action, you sometimes can produce a tremendous amount of blowdown by saying "Are there several of your own goals on this list?" *Pssssewwww!* See? You just picked up his goal out of thin air and started listing – it was the PT goal. Well, of course, you'll list backtrack goals off the thing. You won't find one of them. See, you'll just keep listing them. And you'll find out a lot of them will start reading little bits.

And the TA action is the thing to keep your eye on, though. You just – by listing against the PT goal, "What would oppose that goal?" – you just get more and more TA action, see? Becomes a fruitless task trying to find another goal.

Now you're real safe. The meter says that it's the PT goal, and the list and everything says the PT goal. Everybody knows it's the PT goal. All right. You want to list for the top oppterm. By this time, you no longer need this other service facsimile to windward, because you're producing so much TA action that you won't be able to record it anyway.

So the thing to do is to list for that top oppterm and get yourself a nice list for the top oppterm. Now, it isn't, probably, the top oppterm – the thing is truncated. So you really don't know and the pc doesn't know if he's started to oppose the goal yet or not. You can ask that on the meter and clarify it for the pc: "Have you started to oppose this goal yet? Or are you still on the side of trying to execute it?" One or the other will read, and you can tell the pc so he's got some kind of an idea of what to list for. But even that isn't totally reliable. But you could help a pc out to that degree.

You merely want the latest opposition terminal formed for this GPM or for this goal "to catch catfish" or "to drown myself" or whatever it is, see? And just have him list the thing.

All right, so he lists this and you get one. You null it down. You got to list it to clean needle – that's the main trick. And you list it down, you get a nice, clean needle and you null it. Don't have two rocket reading items on the list. All the listing directions apply here.

But I wouldn't worry too much about this or worry too much about whether it's the top oppterm, because – you know, I mean, don't beat the guy to death for fifteen sessions trying to find out if it's the top oppterm when it obviously is getting a hell of a lot of TA action – "Well, don't cognite yet. We don't know whether it's the top oppterm. Yes, shut up, now. Be very careful. We don't know whether it's – " so on and so on. When you actually hit the top oppterm the needle tends to go mad. I mean, if you hit the top oppterm and it went tick and you got no tone arm action, no cognition, I would think at that moment you probably didn't have the top oppterm.

This is the way to look at it. You know, the expected manifestation is that he's going to get a lot of action out of this thing.

All right, there you are, you've got the top oppterm now, and there it is. Let the pc cognite on it. One of the tricks of 3M2 is, after you've given the pc his item, you sit still. That's one of the tricks. You sit still and let him cognite for a while. When he kind of slows down on this whole thing, you put in your Prepcheck buttons – big mid ruds, just big mid ruds on this thing. Get as far as you can, or get as far as you can without annoying the pc. And call the item and you're going to see a gorgeous rocket read. And it's probably the first rocket read you will have seen in the whole operation.

See? That – real slippy. That's real fancy. That's cutting corners. That's driving with one hand at ninety miles an hour with your feet on the top of the windshield. You understand? That's going around every corner on two wheels. That's making sure of nothing.

Now, I did that whole operation I have just accounted to you – did the whole operation – in two hours and fifty minutes. I don't expect you to do it in two hours and fifty minutes, but I'm not talking a theoretical procedure which hasn't been done.

I didn't find the service fac as part of that two hours and fifty minutes. That took me closer to six hours. Something that would make the tone arm go *boom! boom! boom! boom!* see? So I could turn it on – unburdened the case enough so the case could run. But then, every part – other part of the operation I've told you, and (now listen carefully) the pc on no goals list had ever put the present time goal, including – including the operation I was conducting – had never put this goal on a goals list and didn't while I was straightening it out and checking it.

This was a goal that I had seen give half a rocket read four months ago. It went – . Just accidentally called it. It was in a channel of implant goals, and couldn't get the implant goal to run, and yet the thing went *pow!* see? I saw it do half a fire; couldn't get any – close to it. But ever afterwards, whenever you ticked it – called it – it ticked. Finally just said to the pc out of thin air, "Is that your own GPM?" Tick! And used it. It turned out to be the PT GPM. Interesting.

Now, that's what I mean by cutting around corners, because it's definitely against the law to give a pc a goal. Pc had never, at any time, had ever said that was the pc's goal. So that's definitely against the law and you shouldn't foist a goal off on the pc. And the only excuse I would have to do this is the pc did mention it at the time it went tick – you know, did half a rocket read. Pc speculated on it for just an instant, months ago, and it was seen to fire.

So there were several other goals in this category that had been presented up at one time or another, but none of those ticked as the pcs own goal.

You could call those off. "To disappear," see? "Now, is that your own actual goal?" – the deadest meter you ever saw, you see? To this, to that, you see? You know, "to be sexual," to be this, to be that, you know? Other kinds of goals that had from time to time been listed, you see? "Is that your own?" And all of them flunked; all of them flunked the test; none of them would read. And finally I remembered this other one goal that I had seen read and mentioned that and it went *ping!* And that was it. Never did see it rocket read beyond a half-slash four months ago.

So this is done fast and rapidly, just from knowing the pc or from examining the pc's record very carefully. Now, supposing you inherit a new pc? Well, he's mentioned goals and he's thought of goals and you look back through it again. And if you're real clever, you'll always draw a red-pencil box around any goal or an important datum of this kind so it's easily trackbackable to. See, that's very, very clever to do that on a pc's auditor reports, or print it big so that it's indicated well.

But in actual fact, I don't think the pc would have come up with this goal under interrogation. But there were several other goals, and on careful search I would have got one of those to read. Because when they were listed, laterly, they tried to do little quarter-inch RR slashes and they were the pc's actual GPMs.

In other words, here was a lot of points of interest. I'm just giving you the extreme case of an auditor, four months before, has seen a goal do a half-flash when the pc mentioned it – see, half a rocket read. And then the auditor just runs out of chances, just on an indifferent – you know, just shuffle out a few cards – the auditor says, "Well, I don't know. Let's see, what goals have I seen, what have I ever seen rocket read?" And pulls that goal out of the hat and calls it, says, "Is that your own GPM?" *Plang!* See? You get the idea? But this is just auditor observation of what has fired on the pc. Well, that's driving with one hand on the wheel and your feet on the top of the windshield on a curving road at ninety miles an hour. You recognize that? Because that's cutting it awful close.

All right, but what did one wind up with? One not only wound up with the pc's service facsimile, with this exact operation I've given you – not only wound up with the pc's actual service facsimile but in a position to run the pc all the way to OT. *Chugata-chugata-chugata-chugata.* See, twelve hours hence I will have that bank – the whole first GPM, every item found in it – all the way down and found back up to the top and cleaned up slick as a whistle, on the basis of an item every fifteen minutes, which is rather fast auditing but which can be done. That's one goal down.

But when you hit – when you hit that one RI, see, that first RI – when you really hit it right on the button – that makes all the sense there is to make. This accounts for all the present time restimulation. This accounts for everything. And if you're only looking for service facsimiles, that method I have just given you, I would very thoroughly recommend to you. Because it is safe to this degree: Supposing we had picked the wrong goal. Supposing on our goal-oppose lists we hadn't come anywhere near finding the next goal up. Supposing the many slips 'twixt cup and preclear had occurred. We could still turn around – put in the mid ruds for the session rather rapidly – turn around, get the pc some tone arm action before the end of the session. Pc would feel good, ready to go again, see? See, that's all to the good. See, you're working it both ends from the middle.

You finally wind up with it. And it tells you, then, that the reason we have not been able to find goals on pcs is because of the overburden of the top oppterm and the top terminal. Accumulating, as they do, all of the debris of present time, they therefore mask the top GPM or any other GPM we are looking for.

There sits the pc with the roof pulled in. And of course you can't get him to rocket read like that on his own actual goals. So his own actual goals have tended to stay a lost commodity. But we used to find them. Two or three years ago, we used to find them with a tick. Many a slip 'twixt cup and lip, man, but we still were able to find them with ticks. Now, if you find them and stack them in on an opposition – you know, "What goal would oppose (the goal you found)?" – and you're moving the guy on up to PT, moving him up to the PT GPM. You know now what it is. Now you list its top oppterm; you're going to find the pc's service facsimile. Ifs going to make all the difference in the world.

And all of that overburden is suddenly going to go *bluuhhh-floof!* And so, of course, at that moment you don't call the goal, even. Just ignore it. You just got the top oppterm. It's going to rocket read like mad. Well, anything that improved the rocket read to that degree,

you're certainly on the GPM line. You haven't got anything misworded. There aren't any mistakes here, man.

So you're going to oppose this thing; you're going to get the next one and you're going to oppose that; and you're going on to the next and going to oppose; next one, going to oppose; next one, going to oppose; and go on down to the bottom of the bank. And finally arrive at the bottom of it and you're going to clean that up. And you're going to list it right back on up to top again and you're going to see meter action, meter action, meter action, meter action, meter action.

Now he has a new problem. He has a new problem – brand-new problem now: He's against detectives, see – against detectives now. Can't read the newspapers without getting all restimulated – always coming into session restimulated. Terrible situation, you see? And we find that we've got a GPM something like that – "to be unlocated," or something, you see? We're running this and we handle it in the same way. Of course we've got it now. And by running it properly and running it on down you're going to be…

The only fault you have in actually running GPMs is not following a sensible routine. Overlisting, skipping banks, listing items backwards – these various traps and frailties and follies that you can run into; skip down over a whole GPM and start running the one below, leaving a whole GPM in place and then wonder why the pc is coming apart in the auditor's chair and not notice it.

But look, we have all of our lists – ARC Break Assessments. They're all data – assembly material now. You know what's going on. We got lots of things to prevent difficulties with, one way or the other. Used to do long, long, long, long, arduous, arduous, arduous, arduous – oh! terrible, aching, painful lists. A goal-oppose list of items to find a top oppterm, you see? Oh, my, my, my, my, on and on and on, a pc caving in. Everybody hated to do one of those things because it was too grim. Actually take the risk of asking the pc to do a "represent" on the top oppterm, see? "What might it be?" Do a list, you know? These things have simplified.

Doesn't say that you're not going to make mistakes doing it, see? Doesn't say that, because mistakes are there to be made. The picture I drew you yesterday is a picture of the bank and that's exactly what you're running. That way you not only find that datum which prevents observation in present time at any given instant, you also find the source of the datum, which is the goal, and all other data related to it and then all other lower goals on which it appends and all other actions of whatever kind. When you get to the other end of the line you got an OT. You're directly on your line.

That's how it is done. The only security measure that you take in it is to make sure that your goal responds as the pc's goal, and make sure before you start on a bunch of listings and fumblings around, of one kind or another, make sure – very, very sure – that you got an anchor to windward: can you produce tone arm action on this pc?

All right. There's a very neat package of clearing. That is based on the exact essentials, the construction of the human mind and on the truths I've given you in this lecture.

Wish you luck with it.

Thank you.

SERVICE FACSIMILES AND ROCK SLAMS

REFERENCE:

HCOB 5 Sep 78	Anatomy Of A Service Facsimile
HCOB 1 Sep 63	Scientology Three Clearing, Clearing, Clearing, Routine Three SC
HCOB 6 Sep 78 III	Urgent, Important, Routine Three SC-A, Full Service Facsimile Handling; Updated With New Era Dianetics
TAPE: 6308C27	SH SPEC 299 Rightness & Wrongness
TAPE: 6309C04	SH SPEC 302 How To Find a Service Facsimile
TAPE: 6309C03	SH SPEC 302A R3SC
TAPE: 6309C05	SH SPEC 303 Service Facsimile Assessment
TAPE: 6309C18	SH SPEC 308 St. Hill Service Fac Handling
HCOB 3 Sep 78	Definition Of A Rock Slam
HCOB 10 Aug 76R	R/Ses, What They Mean

———————————

A service facsimile is a brother to R/Ses and evil intentions.

This is easily seen when one understands the anatomy of the service fac and the right/wrong, dominate and survive computations that enter into it. And when one understands that an R/S always means a hidden, evil intention and that the total reason for an R/S is to make wrong. In order to get someone to succumb they have to be wrong.

Way back up there the idea preceding the service fac was right, really right. Then it came down a bit and was a method of survival and then it was a method of dominating and then it was a method of being right in order to make others wrong.

And in that contest one got enough overts so that the communication line took a switcheroo. What was right about it is now wrong about it and what was once wrong is now *right*. A=A=A enters into the situation where rightness becomes wrongness. All of his overts get piled up on one of these fixed ideas, or what we call a service facsimile.

It isn't actually a facsimile at all. It's the guy himself keeping facsimiles in restimulation because he "knows" what's best. The person himself is generating the fixed idea; it is not the bank.

It isn't what aberration the individual is dramatizing. It's what aberration does the individual *dredge up* in order to make somebody wrong. It isn't the accidental thing you think it is. It's *intended.*

The intention is to be right and make others wrong, to dominate others and escape domination oneself, to aid own survival and hinder the survival of others. That is the service fac – blood brother to the hidden, evil intention that is behind the rock slam.

This does not mean you will necessarily see R/Ses on every service fac you run. It does mean that **where a pc is R/Sing in an area you have an area of a heavy, a severe, service fac.**

Know when you see an R/S that the individual is in the grip of an evil intention which he himself is generating. He intends that area or subject on which he is R/Sing nothing but harm. Calculatingly, covertly, he will go to great lengths to carry his intentions out, at all times carefully concealing the fact.

The evil intention is not limited to terminals. He's not R/Sing on a terminal; he's R/Sing on the evil intention. The evil intention can associate with many terminals.

The R/S dominates the individual; it is the person. He has been overwhelmed by it. In that area he has no ability to reason; he has no freedom to choose. The evil intention is substituted for livingness. It is his safe solution to life, his service facsimile.

The service fac does not respond to ordinary auditing because in the course of ordinary auditing it does not get inspected. It, by its nature, forbids inspection. But when addressed at the right/wrong level the pc gives it up easily because in that area he has no power of choice.

MORE THAN ONE SERVICE FAC PER PC

We have had, for many years, service fac processing with which to handle these obsessions, and thus to handle the person who R/Ses.

But it is not just finding one service facsimile. You find many service facs which then add up to the big one. At Saint Hill in the mid-60s this was commonly associated with R/Ses.

It was what the pc had *done* with the service fac to make others wrong which was important, not just finding it. Early on, the tech included auditing them out with Dianetics. And you found many, many more than one on each pc. We used to get complete character changes with this.

The full tech on this has been submerged over the past several years. It is probably this omission of requiring several service facs to be run and then auditing them out with Dianetics that has resulted in so many R/Sers going on up undetected.

As of this writing the full tech has been exhumed and we have now New Era Dianetics tech to help strip these packages down and take them apart at their basics.

So we not only have a more thorough means of handling service facs than ever before – we also have a more reliable route to the handling of an R/Ser.

But it's more than one service fac per pc.

You may audit off one, two or three apparent service facsimiles that all answer up to the complete description of a service fac. And they will run. But all are actually leaning on the central service fac that is in restimulation in PT. As you take these lesser service facs off the central one comes to view.

On the first ones you find, the most you can hope for is you found something that blew the TA down and moved you closer to finding the main service fac. So you take them.

If you've found a service fac the needle will be looser and the TA in reasonable range. And it will run on the right/wrong, etc. brackets and the pc will get off automaticities. When you've finally found several and walked it all the way through to *the* service fac it's as if all the other service facs you've been peeling off are like the bands of trees and sod that lie up against the mountain peak. So you take the service facsimiles and run them as you find them. You unburden the cliffs before you pull the mountain out by the roots.

As you're running out the first service facs you're reversing the dwindling spiral, you're restoring the individual's ability to handle his environment because he's now seeing it, he's now beginning to confront it.

And by the time you've pulled the main one – the mountain – out by its roots you've returned him to sanity. He is now able to inspect; he no longer needs a "safe solution."

It is the most dangerous thing in the world to have a safe solution, because that is the hole out of which sanity drains.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:mf

Remimeo
Level IV Checksheets
Class IV Auditors
Supervisors
C/Ses

URGENT – IMPORTANT

ROUTINE THREE SC-A

FULL SERVICE FACSIMILE HANDLING UPDATED

WITH NEW ERA DIANETICS

REF: HCOB 22 JUL 63	YOU CAN BE RIGHT
HCOB 1 SEP 63	SCIENTOLOGY THREE CLEARING, CLEARING, CLEARING, ROUTINE THREE SC
HCOB 23 AUG 66	SERVICE FACSIMILE
HCOB 30 NOV 66	ASSESSMENT FOR SERVICE FACSIMILES
TAPE: 6309C04	SH SPEC 302 HOW TO FIND A SERVICE FACSIMILE
TAPE: 6309C05	SH SPEC 303 SERVICE FACSIMILE ASSESSMENT
TAPE: 6308C28	SH SPEC 300 THE TA AND SERVICE FAC
TAPE: 6309C12	SH SPEC 305 SERVICE FACS
HCOB 26 JUN 78 II	NED SERIES 6; ROUTINE 3RA, ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS
HCOB 18 JUN 78	NED SERIES 4; ASSESSMENT AND HOW TO GET THE ITEM
HCOB 5 SEP 78	ANATOMY OF A SERVICE FACSIMILE
HCOB 6 SEP 78 II	SERVICE FACSIMILES AND ROCK SLAMS

––––––––––––––––

Note: Dianetic Clears may be run on service facs but only with any Dianetics steps deleted, as they are not to be run on Dianetics.

––––––––––––––––

We are into a new echelon of service facsimile running.

At Saint Hill in the mid-60s many, many service facs were found on each pc and the earliest service fac running included the use of Dianetics.

This was later omitted from service fac procedure and service facs were handled solely with Scientology tech by running off the automaticities on the computation to cognition, F/N and VGIs in the pc.

Phenomenal gains and case changes were made on pcs with that tech alone – all of them valid. That tech has been retained as a vital action to service fac handling.

Now, with the advent of New Era Dianetics, service fac handling has been restored to its full technology.

New Era Dianetics has opened the door to a more complete and finite handling of a service fac, with precision and exactness, than we have had heretofore. We no longer just find a service fac, audit off the automaticities, key it out and forget it. We audit it out fully and terminatedly, using New Era Dianetics to take it down to its basics and erase those.

This in no way contradicts the fact that there were many pcs who, with a service fac found and the automaticities taken off, were able to actually then blow the service fac computation upon inspection.

What it does make possible is the actual erasure of a service fac and its residuals on every pc, one for one. And not just one service facsimile per pc, but many.

An auditor who has been trained on service fac running prior to this bulletin will need the tech he already has plus an excellent command of New Era Dianetics tech. If he has not done the New Era Dianetics Course it will be required before attempting to run Routine 3SC-A. A Class IV auditor who has already done the New Era Dianetics Course need only review it in order to be able to handle all the steps of the new, full service fac procedure.

SERVICE FACSIMILE HANDLING REVISED BY STEPS

Before you can run flows on a service facsimile you must first find it. You want the *pc's* service facsimile. You don't find a service facsimile by listing for it on flows. You find the *pc's* service facsimile and run it on the flows.

The sequence is: You list for the pc's service fac, find it, run the automaticities off it; then you run the service fac itself on R3RA, engram running by chains. It is run to basic and full Dianetic end phenomena.

You don't leave a service fac until you have taken it apart and blown it at its very roots.

Then you list for another service fac, using a different listing question, and handle it fully. And another, and another. A pc can have many, many service facsimiles. You peel them off until you find *the* main service fac at the core of the case. And you handle that one fully, as you do the others, per the steps above.

Needless to say, you are going to see some remarkable results.

FULL SERVICE FACSIMILE PROCEDURE

Preliminary Steps:

0a. Put in the R (Reality) Factor with the pc, telling him briefly what is going to be done in the session.

0b. Clear "computation" very thoroughly with the pc. Use the Tech Dictionary, HCOB 23 Aug 66, SERVICE FACSIMILE, and any other reference you feel the pc may need. Have him demo it until you are certain *he fully* understands it.

0c. Clear the bracket commands (right/wrong, dominate, survival) first, using "Birds fly" as a sample service facsimile. Clearing the bracket commands is done at this point so you will be able to use these questions immediately when the service fac is found without putting stops on the pc's first rush of automaticities coming off.

0d. Then, clear the listing question.

Steps of the Procedure:

A. List and null for the pc's service fac, using the question:

"In this lifetime, what do you use to make others wrong?"

You want a BD F/N item that is a *computation (not* a doingness, beingness or having-ness).

When you get it, indicate the item. Then indicate the F/N. Then, despite the BD F/N, go on to the next step of the handling.

B. Run the service fac found in 1 on the brackets:

    1. In this lifetime, how would (service fac) make you right?

    2. In this lifetime, how would (service fac) make others wrong?

    3. In this lifetime, how would (service fac) help you escape domination?

    4. In this lifetime, how would (service fac) help you to dominate others?

    5. In this lifetime, how would (service fac) aid your survival?

    6. In this lifetime, how would (service fac) hinder the survival of others?

These are run as follows:

Give the pc the first question, "In this lifetime, how would (service fac) make you right?" and let him run with it. He will have a rush of answers, answers coming too fast to be said easily, at this stage. Don't repeat the question unless the pc needs it. Just let him answer 1-1-1-1-1-1-1 (he may give you as many as 50 answers) until he comes to a cognition or runs out of answers or inadvertently answers Question 2.

Then switch to Question 2: "In this lifetime how would (service fac) make others wrong?" Treat this the same way, i.e. let him answer 2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2 until he cognites or runs out of answers or starts to answer Question 1. Then switch back to Question 1, same handling, back to Question 2, same handling, as long as pc has answers coming easily. Upon cognition and F/N, acknowledge, indicate the F/N and end off on 1 and 2.

Now give him Question 3: "In this lifetime how would (service fac) help you escape domination?" and let it run by the same method as above. When this seems cooled off, use Question 4: "In this lifetime, how would (service fac) help you to dominate others?" Use Questions 3 and 4 as above, as long as pc has answers coming easily. Upon cognition and F/N, acknowledge, indicate the F/N and go on to the next bracket.

Using the same method as above, give him Question 5: "In this lifetime, how would (service fac) aid your survival?" When he's run out on 5-5-5-5-5-5, switch to Question 6: "In this lifetime, how would (service fac) hinder the survival of others?" Use Questions 5 and 6 as above as long as pc has answers coming easily. Let him get off all the automaticities and come to a cognition and F/N. Acknowledge and indicate the F/N.

At this point it is safe to end off on running the brackets. The idea is not to beat the process to death. The pc will have automaticities coming off thick and fast early in the run. These must be gone and the pc bright, F/Ning and VGIs when you end off. You are only trying to end the compulsive character of the service facsimile found and get it off automatic and get the pc to see it better at this stage, not to bleed the process of every bit of TA action.

Running the service fac in the brackets will result in a major cognition, which could occur at any point during this running. When it does occur it is the EP of this step of the service fac handling. End off and go onto the R3RA step.

Note: In running a Dianetic Clear on service facs, you would end off running *this* service fac at this point, when the pc had reached a good cognition, F/N and VGIs. Do NOT run the Dianetic actions of service fac handling on a Dianetic Clear, as these pcs are not to be run on Dianetics. When you have completed one service fac on Steps A and B. you can then list for another service fac and repeat the procedure.

(**Note:** If the service fac found on any pc did not run on the brackets, it would need to be prepchecked. See sections "When Running Off The Automaticity" and "When To Prepcheck" below.)

C. Run the service fac R3RA Quad, each flow to EP. It is not run narrative and it is not preassessed; otherwise full New Era Dianetics tech is used, per HCOB 26 June 78R II, NEW ERA DIANETICS SERIES 6, ROUTINE 3RA, ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS.

The service fac phrase itself is used as the running item.

The commands for running a service fac on R3RA Quad Flows are:

Flow 1: "Locate a time when you used (service fac)."

(Example: "Locate a time when you used *all horses sleep in beds.* ")

Flow 2: "Locate an incident of your causing another to use (service fac)."

Flow 3: "Locate an incident of others causing others to use <u>(service fac).</u>"

Flow 0: "Locate an incident of you causing yourself to use <u>(service fac).</u>"

Take each flow down its chain of incidents to the basic and full Dianetic EP: F/N, postulate (postulate off = erasure), and VGIs.

That will be the end of all vestiges of that service fac.

D.   List for another service fac on the pc, using the listing question:

"In this lifetime, what do you use to dominate others?"

When you have the service fac, repeat Steps B and C above.

E.   Find another service fac on the pc with the listing question:

"In this lifetime, what do you use to aid your own survival?"

Handle the service fac per Steps B and C above.

F.   Continue to find and handle service facs on the pc, using, in order, the following listing questions:

     1.   "In this lifetime, what do you use to make yourself right?"

     2.   "In this lifetime, what do you use to escape domination?"

     3.   "In this lifetime, what do you use to hinder the survival of others?"

Further listing questions which can be used are given on HCOB 30 Nov 66, ASSESSMENT FOR SERVICE FACSIMILES.

You will need to find and handle several service facsimiles on the pc which will then add up to the big one.

WHEN LISTING FOR THE SERVICE FACSIMILE

You are listing for a BD F/N item. Write down each computation the pc gives you exactly as he states it, **verbatim**, with its read, no matter how improbable, non sequitur or inane it may sound.

The service fac operates like a magnet as you're listing. You've given the pc the question and as the question is in the vicinity of the service fac you've already ticked it. It draws the pc's attention to it. He's listing along and suddenly he'll put a non sequitur item on the list. It doesn't make sense. It doesn't even answer the question, but there it is. Because his attention is being pulled to this inevitably. You're asking him for answers and he gives you the rightest answer he knows – "People always jump off the Empire State Building." That's the solution. That solves everything. It blows the TA down. That's the service fac.

Indicate the item to the pc; then indicate the F/N.

You're now ready to run it in the brackets.

WHEN RUNNING OFF THE AUTOMATICITY

If you've found a service fac the pc won't be able to stay out of it, I guarantee you.

The first question is always how would it make him right. (Never how would it make him wrong. Never, never, never.) The automaticities should start with the first question. If not, ask him how it would make others wrong. You almost always enter it at the level of right/wrong. But don't make the blunder of thinking it can't be a service fac if it doesn't enter at that level. Try it on the other levels. It can enter at the level of dominate; it might enter at the level of survival.

But if – on one of those – the pc doesn't immediately jump in and swim into the whirl-pool, it's not it. If he tells you, "Well, let's see… make me right, no, hmmmm…" or "… escape domination… no, doesn't make sense," that's not it.

If he says that isn't it, then that isn't it. Don't hang him with a wrong service fac because it's too easy to find a right one. They abound.

If he hasn't jumped in and swum madly to the center of the whirlpool and gotten embroiled in this thing, it's not it. Because that's the first thing they want to do with a service fac – drown.

When you have the right one you'll get the automaticities coming off thick and fast. Don't stop the avalanche with acknowledgements. Don't stop it with a new question. Let it run out.

It's not one auditing question for one answer. It's one auditing question for one water-fall.

WHEN TO PREPCHECK

When the item found as a service fac won't run on any of the brackets you prepcheck it to EP (F/N, cog, VGIs). Ref: HCOB 14 March 71R, F/N Everything.

A rightness/wrongness computation doesn't surrender to normal auditing because it is a service fac. The pc has a vested interest in holding onto it. He won't be able to itsa it on a Prepcheck. Thus, a service fac, if present, will turn on mass on a Prepcheck.

The Prepcheck is a series of types of decisions thetans make about things. So if it doesn't prepcheck the Prepcheck must be in conflict with the rightness and wrongness.

Reversely, if it's not a service fac it *will* prepcheck, and you polish it off by that method to EP.

Then go back to the list and find a service fac that will run.

COMPLETING SERVICE FACSIMILE HANDLING WITH R3RA

Even when the pc has gotten off the automaticities, has cognited and is comparatively free of the compulsive character of the service facsimile, there is more to be handled.

Running the service fac using R3RA enables him to run out what he has *done* with it to make others wrong, etc. These will be the actual most charged incidents in which he's used it, which will have accumulated in his wake as he went along substituting the service fac for himself and never inspecting the consequences. He will now be free to inspect those parts of the track as himself, and to inspect as well the effects of the service fac on the other flows.

Finally, the use of R3RA, engram running by chains, enables him to fully erase the somatics and engram chains which have their roots in the service fac, or vice versa – as well as the postulates underlying them.

ENDING SERVICE FAC RUNNING

Service fac running can be ended off when you have fully run many service facs (which will lead to the main service fac). When the main service fac has been run to full EP, service fac handling is complete.

Note: It might happen (rarely) that you get the main service fac on the pc on your first listing and nulling. It will be rare because the main one does not usually come to view until the others have been taken off. You run it, of course. Any service fac, run, produces change, but on this one you will see the pc changing character before your eyes. The results are quite astounding.

But realize that he does have other, lesser service facs which do not simply dissolve because the main core service fac is now gone, even though they have been leaning upon it. You will need to L&N for these and completely clean the pc of service facs.

The main core service facsimile will be the one the pc has used as a solution to *all* of life. When found and run it will be unmistakable to both the pc and the auditor. When this one has been completed on all the steps above, as well as the lesser service facs surrounding it, you will have attained the EP on service fac running.

You will have brought about a complete character change in the individual, returned his freedom of choice and his freedom to inspect and enabled him to be truly right.

And that is the stuff of which sanity is made.

This level is actually the sanity level.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:dr

0-IV EXPANDED GRADE PROCESSES — QUADS
PART F
GRADE 4 PROCESSES

based on BTB 15 Nov 76 VI

Revised 22 Mar 2008 according to Qual Board Recommendation Bulletin of same date.
In process 1 and 7 the flows were deleted as they changed the meaning of the process.
Revised 3 Jan 2013 to include the running of Service Facsimiles with R3RA.

This BTB gives a checklist of the Expanded Quad Grade Process commands. It is not all the possible processes for this level. If more are needed to attain full EP for this level additional processes can be found in LRH Bulletins, Books, Tapes, PABs and other issues.

Each process is run to its full end phenomena of F/N, Cog, VGIs. Any processes previously run are rehabbed or completed and any missing flows run. A copy of this checklist is placed in the folder of a pc being run on Expanded Grades and the processes checked off with the date each is run to EP. On any of these processes where the pc answers only yes or that he did it find out what it was by asking "What was it?" This keeps in the itsa line from the pc to auditor. (Ref: 30 June 62 HCOB)

This BTB does *not* replace the original source materials.

1.   R2-44 MUST AND MUST NOT HAPPEN
Ref: Creation of Human Ability, R2-44.

"A preclear is stuck on the track where motionlessness occurs. Thus it is of interest in the case to undo these stuck points in the preclear." LRH

"Tell me some things you wouldn't want to have happen again."
"Tell me some things you would want to have happen again."   To EP   _____

2.   OVERT-JUSTIFICATION'S PROCESS
Ref: HCOB 7.7.64 Justifications

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.

F1.   1. In this lifetime what overt has another committed on you?
         2. How has he justified it?
                                                                      To EP   _____
F2.   1. In this lifetime what overt have you committed on another or others?
         2. How have you justified it?
                                                                      To EP   _____
F3.   1. In this lifetime what overt have others committed on others?
         2. How have they justified it?
                                                                      To EP   _____
F0.   1. In this lifetime what overt have you committed on yourself?
         2. How have you justified it?
                                                                      To EP   _____

3.   RISING SCALE PROCESSING

Ref: Scientology 8-8008, Chapter on Differentiation, Association and Identification
Creation of Human Ability, R2-51
HCOB 11.6.57 Trainings and CCH Processes, CCH 15
BTB 1.12.71 Rising Scale Processing
Chart of Attitude

Use the scale of the Chart of Attitudes as given here in the commands that follow the scale.

3.A	SURVIVE DEAD	**3.B**	RIGHT WRONG	**3.C**	FULLY RESPONSIBLE NO RESPONSIBILITY	**3.D**	OWNS ALL OWNS NOTHING
3.E	EVERYONE NOBODY	**3.F**	ALWAYS NEVER	**3.G**	MOTION SOURCE STOPPED	**3.H**	TRUTH HALLUCINATION
3.I	FAITH DISTRUST	**3.J**	I KNOW I KNOW NOT	**3.K**	CAUSE EFFECT	**3.L**	I AM I AM NOT

The commands are:

1. Get the idea of (bottom of scale. e.g. dead.)

2. Do you have that idea?

3. All right.

4. Now change that idea as nearly as you can to (top of scale. e.g. survive).

5. OK. How close did you come?

6. Thank you.

Run each pair separately; 1,2,3,4,5,6 - 1,2,3,4,5,6 etc, until pc has a certainty that he can maintain the upper scale idea and has an F/N, Cog, VGIs. Then go to the next pair. Each pair is run to EP.

To EP   _____

4.   EFFORT PROCESSING
Ref: Advanced Procedure and Axioms
BTB 1 Dec 71 Iss IV Effort Processing)

Ask pc what physical disabilities he has; note them down with the reads each disability has when pc said it. Take largest reading disability first and run in the commands below:

Get the (disability) effort.

Get the (disability) counter-effort.

These commands are run alternate-repetitively (effort, counter-effort, effort, counter-effort, etc.) until: (a) the emotion concerning the disability is voiced by the pc, (b) the consideration is voiced by the pc. The process is continued on the disability being run until both the emotion and consideration are voiced by the pc. This is the EP of the item being run. It is always accompanied by F/N and VGIs.

Then take next largest reading disability and run to EP. All reading items are run.

To EP   _____

5.   R2-66 ELECTING CAUSE

Ref: Creation of Human Ability R2-66

Point out some things which are causing things.
Point out some more things which are causing things.

To EP   _____

6.   LEVEL FOUR SERVICE FACSIMILE
(Ref: Tape 6309C05 SH Spec 303 Service Facsimile Assessment
           HCOB 1 Sep 63 R3SC
           HCOB 6 Dec 78 II R3SC-A

Listing Question Number 1: List to BD F/N item:

In this lifetime, what do you use to make others wrong?

Give the pc the first question, "In this lifetime, how would (service fac) make you right?" and let him run with it. He will have a rush of answers, answers coming too fast to be said easily, at this stage. Don't repeat the question unless the pc needs it. Just let him answer 1-1-1-1-1-1-1 (he may give you as many as 50 answers) until he comes to a cognition or runs out of answers or inadvertently answers Question 2.

Then switch to Question 2: "In this lifetime how would (service fac) make others wrong?" Treat this the same way, i.e. let him answer 2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2 until he cognites or runs out of answers or starts to answer Question 1. Then switch back to Question 1, same handling, back to Question 2, same handling, as long as pc has answers coming easily. Upon cognition and F/N, acknowledge, indicate the F/N and end off on 1 and 2.

1.   In this lifetime, how would (service fac) make you right?
2.   In this lifetime how would (service fac) make others wrong?

To EP   _____

3.   In this lifetime how would (service fac) help you escape domination?
4.   In this lifetime, how would (service fac) help you to dominate others?

To EP   _____

5.   In this lifetime, how would (service fac) aid your survival?
6   In this lifetime, how would (service fac) hinder the survival of others?

To EP   _____

NOTE: If you run a Dn Clear on service facsimiles, you would cease running this ser fac at that point, if the pc had achieved a good cognition, F/N and VGIs. Do **not** run the Dianetics steps of the service facsimile handling on a Dn Clear as these pcs may not be audited on Dianetics. If you have completed a service facsimile with the above steps you can list for another service facsimile and repeat the procedure.

Run the service facsimile R3RA Quad, each flow to EP. It is not run narratively and it is not preassessed. Apart from that the full New Era Dianetics technology is used, as per HCOB 26 JUNE 1978R II, NEW ERA DIANETICS SERIES 6, ROUTINE 3RA, ENGRAM RUNNING IN CHAINS. The wording of the service facsimile itself is used as running item. The commands for running a service facsimile on R3RA Quad Flows are:

     F1:   "Locate a time when you used (ser fac)."
         (Example: "Find time when you used 'all horses sleep in beds'")

     F2:   "Locate an incident of your causing another using (ser fac)."
                  to EP

     F3:   "Locate an incident of others causing others using (ser fac)."
                  to EP

     F0:   "Locate an incident of you causing yourself using (ser fac)."
                  to EP

Follow each flow down its chain of incidents to basic and to full Dianetic EP: F/N, postulate (postulate off equals erasure) and VGIs.

Listing Question Number 2: List to BD F/N item:

    In this lifetime, what do you use to dominate others?

    Put the found service facsimile into the six commands above and run to EP

Listing Question Number 3: List to BD F/N item:

    In this lifetime, what do you use to aid your own survival?

    Put the found service facsimile into the six commands above and run to EP

Listing Question Number 4: List to BD F/N item:

    In this lifetime, what do you use to make yourself right?

    Put the found service facsimile into the six commands above and run to EP

Listing Question Number 5: List to BD F/N item:

    In this lifetime, what do you use to escape domination?

    Put the found service facsimile into the six commands above and run to EP

Listing Question Number 6: List to BD F/N item:

    In this lifetime, what do you use to hinder the survival of others?

    Put the found service facsimile into the six commands above and run to EP

NOTE:
    Ref: Tape 6309C05 SH Spec 303 Ser Fac Assessment

    "That which doesn't run on 'Right-Wrong' you prepcheck to EP."

7.   HAVINGNESS

Tell me a flow you know something about.

To EP _____

Revised by the QUAL BOARD of the
RON'S ORG COMMITTEE

As assisted by the

TECH EXAMINATION BOARD
I/C: Max Hauri
2nd: Otfried Krumpholz,
        Dominic O'Brien

BDCS:DM:ROC QB:TEB:MH:ok