

The
Technical Bulletins
of
Dianetics and Scientology

by
L. Ron Hubbard


FOUNDER OF DIANETICS AND SCIENTOLOGY

Volume
IV
1960-1961

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

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

L. RON HUBBARD



L. Ron Hubbard
Founder of Dianetics and Scientology

EDITORS' NOTE

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

—L. Ron Hubbard

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

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

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

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

TECHNICAL BULLETINS 1960-1961

CONTENTS

1960

	Jan.	Administrative Procedure for Reducing Overters (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—514</i>
2	Jan.	HAS Certificates	
	Jan.	<i>State of Man Congress Lectures (1 Jan.—3 Jan.)</i>	
3	Jan.	A Third Dynamic for Scientology	2
4	Jan.	<i>Hubbard Clearing Scientologist Course Lectures (4 Jan.—8 Jan.)</i>	3
7	Jan.	The Unmoving Case	4
8	Jan.	OT Procedures for HCS/BScn Courses	6
14	Jan.	The Black Case	9
19	Jan.	Tapes for Sale	10
19	Jan.	Casualties	11
21	Jan.	Justification	12
21	Jan.	Responsibility	14
24	Jan.	OT Procedure	15
25	Jan.	OT-3 Procedure—HGC Allowed Processes	16
28	Jan.	The Key to All Cases—Responsibility	18
2	Feb.	The Co-Audit Team	21
3	Feb.	Security Check	23
4	Feb.	Theory of Responsibility Processing	24
4	Feb.	Overt Manifestations on a Low Toned Case	26
8	Feb.	Honest People Have Rights, Too	27
8	Feb.	The Reputation of Saint Hill	29
8	Feb.	Security Checks	30
9	Feb.	Cancellation of Certificates	30
9	Feb.	Research Advances	31
10	Feb.	British E-Meter Operation	32
10	Feb.	Restoration of Certificates	34
11	Feb.	Create and Confront	35
18	Feb.	How to Run O/W and Responsibility	37
23	Feb.	HPA Course Change Proposal to London	40
25	Feb.	The Model Session	41
25	Feb.	Scientology Can Have a Group Win	45
	Mar.	<i>Have You Lived Before This Life?</i>	47
	Mar.	HPA Course Change Proposal to London	<i>see— 40</i>

1960 (cont.)

3	Mar.	OT-3A Procedure—HGC Allowed Processes (<i>cancelled—see 325</i>)	48
9	Mar.	Expansion of OT-3A Procedure, Step Two—HGC Allowed Processes	51
17	Mar.	Standardized Sessions	53
21	Mar.	Research Project	55
24	Mar.	Goals in the Rudiments	56
30	Mar.	Interrogation	59
31	Mar.	The Present Time Problem	61
7	Apr.	A New Summary of Auditing	64
7	Apr.	Check Sheet for HGC	68
11	Apr.	New Training Schedule	69
14	Apr.	New PE Data	70
21	Apr.	Pre-session Processes	72
24	Apr.	Concerning the Campaign for Presidency	76
25	Apr.	Send Your Clipping Files	77
28	Apr.	Books Are Dissemination	78
29	Apr.	The Scientific Treatment of the Insane	82
4	May	Association Secretary Letter—Tapes	84
5	May	Help	85
10	May	Our Technical Programme	89
12	May	Help Processing	92
19	May	How Help Became Betrayal	94
22	May	De-certification, How You Should Support It	96
26	May	Security Checks	97
27	May	Dear Scientologist	99
28	May	By Their Actions	101
9	June	The Basic Assumptions of Scientology Versus Overts	102
10	June	What We Expect of a Scientologist	106
10	June	HGC Preclear Assessment	108
16	June	Hints on Running Cases with Help	109
23	June	Special Zone Plan—The Scientologist’s Role in Life	111
23	June	<i>London Open Evening Lectures (23 June—7 July)</i>	115
30	June	Create Again	116
6	July	Making Clears and Picking Up HGC Quality	117
7	July	The Assessment of Help	119
14	July	Current Rundown—Concept Help	121
21	July	Some Help Terminals	124
27	July	Double Action Cycles	126
4	Aug.	Regimen 1	128
7	Aug.	<i>London Congress on Dissemination and Help Lectures (6 Aug.—7 Aug.)</i>	130
11	Aug.	The Laws of Assessment	131

1960 (cont.)

18	Aug.	Vital Information	133
25	Aug.	Powerful Pre-session Additions	134
25	Aug.	New Definition of Psychosis	136
26	Aug.	Regimen Two	137
29	Aug.	<i>1st Saint Hill Advanced Clinical Course Lectures (8 Aug.—16 Sept.)</i>	138
	Sept.	Pre-session Two	139
8	Sept.	The Pre-sessions of the 1st Saint Hill ACC	142
15	Sept.	The Tone Arm	144
17	Sept.	Giving the Pc Full Hours (HCO PL)	145
19	Sept.	Captive Brains	146
19	Sept.	ACC Lecture Tapes	149
22	Sept.	Announcing New Technology	150
23	Sept.	Order of Test of Havingness and Confront Commands	151
28	Sept.	Tips on How to Crack an HGC Case	154
29	Sept.	Havingness and Duplication	155
6	Oct.	Thirty-Six New Pre-sessions (revised 8 May 1974)	156
10	Oct.	Current News	161
13	Oct.	Script of a Model Session (<i>cancelled—see 220</i>)	163
18	Oct.	Terminal Stable Data	165
20	Oct.	Theory 67	166
27	Oct.	Revised Case Entrance	167
3	Nov.	Failed Help	170
10	Nov.	Formula 13	171
11	Nov.	Change on Model Session	172
12	Nov.	Clearing Routine	173
17	Nov.	Starting Cases	175
18	Nov.	Preclear Assessment Sheet	<i>see footnote—401</i>
19	Nov.	Pc Scheduling (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—117</i>
20	Nov.	HAS Co-Audit Ended	176
24	Nov.	The Unmoving Case	178
	Dec.	New Formulas	179
8	Dec.	Clearing Routine	<i>see—173</i>
15	Dec.	Pre-session 37	180
19	Dec.	PE Change	182
21	Dec.	Curriculum for ACCs (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—355</i>
22	Dec.	HAS Co-Audit Resumed	185
22	Dec.	O-W A Limited Theory	186
29	Dec.	The New PE and the New HAS Co-Audit	188
31	Dec.	<i>Anatomy of the Human Mind Congress Lectures (31 Dec.—1 Jan. 1961)</i>	190

1961

2	Jan.	22nd American Advanced Clinical Course Lectures (2 Jan.—10 Feb.)	190
5	Jan.	O-W A Limited Theory	<i>see—186</i>
10	Jan.	A Brief Outline of an HGC as Currently Done (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—518</i>
12	Jan.	New Help Data	191
19	Jan.	Additional HAS Processes	192
21	Jan.	<i>Anatomy Congress—South Africa Lectures (21 Jan.—22 Jan.)</i>	<i>193</i>
23	Jan.	<i>3rd South African Advanced Clinical Course Lectures 23 Jan.—17 Feb.)</i>	<i>193</i>
25	Jan.	Handling of Rudiments	194
26	Jan.	The “Ultimate” Processes	195
28	Jan.	New Assessment Scale	197
30	Jan.	Case Files (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—117</i>
2	Feb.	Command Sheet—Pre-Havingness Scale	199
2	Feb.	UK Cases Different	202
ca.	Feb.	Personal Integrity (Ability 125)	203
9	Feb.	New Pre-session Data and Script Change	204
16	Feb.	Formula 19	205
18	Feb.	S.O.P. Goals—Marvellous New Breakthrough—Be-Do-Have Coordinated	206
20	Feb.	Important Data on Goals S.O.P.	209
23	Feb.	PT Problem and Goals	210
2	Mar.	New Pre-Hav Command	211
2	Mar.	Use of S.O.P. Goals Procedure	212
2	Mar.	Formula 20	213
9	Mar.	New Assessment Scale	<i>see—197</i>
9	Mar.	Command Sheet—Pre-Havingness Scale	<i>see—199</i>
20	Mar.	Basic Staff Auditor’s Hat (HCO PL)	214
21	Mar.	Script of a Model Session (<i>cancelled—see 453</i>)	220
23	Mar.	S.O.P. Goals	224
24	Mar.	HGC Admin Partial Hat—Staff Auditor Assignment (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—118</i>
31	Mar.	S.O.P. Goals Modified	227
31	Mar.	The Director of Processing’s Case Checking Hat (HCO PL) 228	
5	Apr.	HCA/HPA Rundown or Practical Course Rundown for Academies (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—285</i>
5	Apr.	S.O.P. Goals Goofs (HCO PL)	234
6	Apr.	S.O.P. Goals—Goals Assessment Problems Sorted Out	236
6	Apr.	S.O.P. Goals—Repairing a Case	238
7	Apr.	Assessing for Goals and Terminals or Elimination	239
7	Apr.	S.O.P. Goals—Modification I	241
7	Apr.	Johannesburg Security Check (HCO PL)(<i>revised—see Vol. VIII, 419</i>)	242
11	Apr.	S.O.P. Goals—Errors	246

1961 (cont.)

12	Apr.	Training Drills	247
17	Apr.	Training Drills Modernized (reissued 5 Jan. 1971) <i>(cancelled—see Vol. VII, 348)</i>	249
23	Apr.	Change Processes	253
25	Apr.	D of P Form—Check Type One (HCO PL)	254
27	Apr.	Change Processes	256
30	Apr.	Change Brackets and Commands (reissued 19 Sept. 1974)	258
	May	<i>E-Meter Essentials</i>	260
4	May	Process Levels—Necessity for Training	261
7	May	<i>Saint Hill Special Briefing Course Lectures (7 May—13 Dec. 1966)</i>	263
10	May	Staff Auditors (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—534</i>
11	May	E-Meter Horror	264
11	May	Assessment by Elimination—S.O.P. Goals	265
13	May	Assessing for S.O.P. Goals Improved	270
19	May	Assessment Data	273
22	May	The Only Valid Security Check (HCO PL)	275
23	May	Pre-Hav Scale Revised	282
ca.	May	Secondary Scale	286
24	May	S.O.P. Goals Assessments (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—535</i>
25	May	Releasing and Preparing a Case for S.O.P. Goals	317
26	May	Basic Staff Auditor’s Hat (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—536</i>
26	May	Modification of HPA/HCA, BScn/HCS Schedule (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—296</i>
29	May	Clarification of “Change Processing”	320
	June	The Sad Tail of PDH (Ability 129)	321
1	June	Assessing	324
5	June	Processes Allowed	325
7	June	Academy Schedule, Clarification of	329
8	June	E-Meter Watching	331
12	June	The Rising Needle: Skip It!	333
16	June	CCHs and Routine 1	334
17	June	Primary Scale Amended	335
19	June	Sec Check Whole Track	337
23	June	Running CCHs	347
27	June	Routine One	348
29	June	Scientology Students’ Security Check (HCO PL)	349
6	July	Routine 1A	354
7	July	HGC Auditor’s Sec Check (HCO PL)	356
10	July	Metering Rudiments	363
13	July	Change Processing and CCHs	<i>see footnote—320</i>

1961 (cont.)

10	Aug.	Information on Clears	364
23	Aug.	New Clearing Breakthrough!	367
24	Aug.	Valences Key to Clearing	368
24	Aug.	HGC Allowed Processes (HCO PL) (<i>cancelled—see 385</i>)	369
31	Aug.	Advances in Technology	370
7	Sept.	New Facts of Life	372
12	Sept.	Curriculum for Clearing Courses (HCO PL)	374
13	Sept.	HCO WW Security Form 7A (HCO PL)	<i>see—381</i>
14	Sept.	New Rudiments Commands	377
18	Sept.	HCO WW Security Form 7B (HCO PL)	<i>see—381</i>
21	Sept.	Security Check Children	378
28	Sept.	HCO WW Security Forms 7A and 7B	381
29	Sept.	HGC Allowed Processes (HCO PL)	385
5	Oct.	Clean Hands Make a Happy Life	387
6	Oct.	Training of Staff Auditors	389
9	Oct.	Rudiments, Change in	391
9	Oct.	Academy Training (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—302</i>
9	Oct.	HPA/HCA Rundown Change (HCO PL)	<i>see footnote—330</i>
10	Oct.	Problems Intensive for Staff Clearing (HCO PL)	392
12	Oct.	Student Practice Check	400
17	Oct.	Problems Intensives	401
19	Oct.	Security Questions Must Be Nulled	402
23	Oct.	HGC Pre-Processing Security Check (HCO PL)	403
26	Oct.	Safe Auditing Table	406
	Nov.	HCOWW Security Form 5A (HCO PL)	407
2	Nov.	The Prior Confusion	409
2	Nov.	Rudiments and Clearing	410
7	Nov.	Routine 3A	412
9	Nov.	The Problems Intensive—Use of the Prior Confusion	414
14	Nov.	Routine 3D (HCO Info. Ltr.)	416
16	Nov.	Sec Checking—Generalities Won't Do	424
20	Nov.	Routine 3 D Commands	426
22	Nov.	Training Course Rules and Regulations (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—152</i>
23	Nov.	Meter Reading	432
23	Nov.	Auxiliary Pre-Have 3D Scale	434
27	Nov.	Routine 3D Command Sheet	437
28	Nov.	Routine 3D Improved Commands of 28 Nov. 61	438
29	Nov.	Class of Auditors (HCO PL)	439
30	Nov.	Routine 3D Improved Commands of November 30,1961	441
30	Nov.	ARC Process 1961	442

1961 (cont.)

3	Dec.	Running 3D Levels	443
7	Dec.	Sec Checks Vital	445
7	Dec.	Command Sheet for Routine 3D	447
13	Dec.	Varying Sec Check Questions	449
14	Dec.	Rudiments Modernized	450
20	Dec.	Student E-Metering (HCO PL)	<i>OEC Vol. 4—307</i>
21	Dec.	Model Session Script, Revised (<i>cancelled—see Vol. V, 85</i>)	453
26	Dec.	Command Sheet Routine 3 D	457
28	Dec.	E-Meter Electrodes—A Dissertation on Soup Cans	459
28	Dec.	3-D Rules of Thumb	462
30	Dec.	<i>Clean Hands Congress Lectures r30 Dec.—1 Jan. 1962</i>)	463
		Subject Index	465
		Alphabetical List of Titles	491

PERIODICALS BY ISSUE NUMBER

Ability Magazines

125	Feb. 61	Personal Integrity	203
129	June 61	The Sad Tail of PDH	321

LONG CONTENTS

HCO B 2 Jan. 1960 HAS CERTIFICATES, 1

HCO B 3 Jan. 1960 A THIRD DYNAMIC FOR SCIENTOLOGY, 2

HCO B 7 Jan. 1960 THE UNMOVING CASE, 4

Symptoms of case with overts and withholds, 4
Failed case can't confront overts, 5

HCO B 8 Jan. 1960 OT PROCEDURES FOR HCS/BSCN COURSES, 6

Session data, 6
Auditing attitude, 6
First stage actions, 6
Second stage actions, 7
Scale of increasing confidence, 8

HCO B 14 Jan. 1960 THE BLACK CASE, 9

Formula to handle Black Case, 9

HCO B 19 Jan. 1960 TAPES FOR SALE, 10

HCO B 19 Jan. 1960 CASUALTIES, 11

Blows from Scientology orgs, 11

HCO B 21 Jan. 1960 JUSTIFICATION, 12

Mechanisms of justification, 12
Churches used mechanism of confession, 12
Mechanism of the effort to lessen the size and pressure of the overt, 12
Mechanism of punishment, 13

HCO B 21 Jan. 1960 RESPONSIBILITY, 14

HCO B 24 Jan. 1960 OT PROCEDURE, 15

HCO B 25 Jan. 1960 OT-3 PROCEDURE—HGC ALLOWED PROCESSES, 16

Step one: Rudiments, 16
Step two: Scout for present life overts and withholds, 16
Step three: Clear the pc's field with Responsibility, 16
Step four: Run "What about a victim could you be responsible for?", 16
Step five: Explore the immediate past lifetime or lifetimes of the pc, 17
Step six: Run down any famous or enduring identities of the pc on the whole track, 17
Step seven: Do a Dynamic Assessment on the pc, 17
Step eight: Chronic somatic, 17
Step nine: Flatten once more Responsibility on a victim, 17
Step ten: Rehabilitate the pc's ability to withhold, 17

HCO B 28 Jan. 1960 THE KEY TO ALL CASES—RESPONSIBILITY, 18

Tone arm, rather than the needle, is foremost in analyzing the case, 18
Anatomy of responsibility, 18
Relationship of responsibility and cause/withhold, 19

HCO B 2 Feb. 1960 THE CO-AUDIT TEAM, 21

Co-audit teams should run O/W, 21

HCO B 3 Feb. 1960 SECURITY CHECK, 23

HCO B 4 Feb. 1960 THEORY OF RESPONSIBILITY PROCESSING, 24

Power of choice is senior to responsibility, 24
Unwillingness to do, 24
Rehabilitation of willingness to do, 25

HCO B 4 Feb. 1960 OVERT MANIFESTATIONS ON A LOW TONED CASE, 2

How to recognize low toned case, 26
Overt/Withhold Process on terminal representing dynamic, 26

HCO B 8 Feb. 1960 HONEST PEOPLE HAVE RIGHTS, TOO, 27

Freedom is for honest people, 27
What freedom means, 27

HCO B 8 Feb. 1960 THE REPUTATION OF SAINT HILL, 29

HCO B 8 Feb. 1960 SECURITY CHECKS, 30

HCO B 9 Feb. 1960 CANCELLATION OF CERTIFICATES, 30

HCO B 9 Feb. 1960 RESEARCH ADVANCES, 31

HCO B 10 Feb. 1960 BRITISH E-METER OPERATION, 32

Instructions on how to set up and use E-Meter, 32
Diagram of E-Meter face, 33

HCO B 10 Feb. 1960 RESTORATION OF CERTIFICATES, 34

HCO B 11 Feb. 1960 CREATE AND CONFRONT, 35

Cycle of action, 35
Create Processes are limited, 35
Responsibility Processes, Havingness, Confront, O/W, Responsibility, 35

HCO B 18 Feb. 1960 HOW TO RUN O/W AND RESPONSIBILITY, 37

Overts and withholds are the same as irresponsibility, 37
Run Responsibility Process after O/W, 37
Aberration is made and held active by person himself, 38

HCO B 23 Feb. 1960 HPA COURSE CHANGE PROPOSAL TO LONDON, 40

HCO B 25 Feb. 1960 THE MODEL SESSION, 41

How to start a session, 41
Rudiments, 41
Starting a process, 42
Ending a process, 42
Repeated commands, 42
Cognitions, 42
Keep the pc in session, 43
Take full responsibility for the session, 43
A restless or ARC breaky pc, 43
Ending a session, 43
End rudiments, 43
Final commands of session, 43
Warnings, 44

HCO B 25 Feb. 1960 SCIENTOLOGY CAN HAVE A GROUP WIN, 45

Overts and withholds cause social aberration, 45
Clearing of one's transgressions, 46

HCO B 3 Mar. 1960 OT-3A PROCEDURE—HGC ALLOWED PROCESSES, 48
[CANCELLED]

Step one: Rudiments, 48
Step two: Run Cause ARC Straight Wire to give pc a win on getting audited, 48
Step three: S-C-S, 48
Step four: Scout for present life overts and withholds, 48
Step five: Clear the pc's field with responsibility, 49
Step six: "What about a victim could you be responsible for?", 49
Step seven: Explore the immediate past lifetime or lifetimes of the pc, 49
Step eight: Run down any famous or enduring identities of the pc on the whole track, 49
Step nine: Do a Dynamic Assessment on the pc, 49
Step ten: Do a survey of case, 49
Step eleven: Find anything pc has created arduously for a long time, 50
Step twelve: Run Responsibility on matter, energy, space, time, motion and thought, 50

HCO B 9 Mar. 1960 EXPANSION OF OT-3A PROCEDURE, STEP TWO
—HGC ALLOWED PROCESSES, 51

Cause ARC Straight Wire, 51
Ending Cause ARC Straight Wire, 51
Two further cyclic processes, 52

HCO B 17 Mar. 1960 STANDARDIZED SESSIONS, 53

Why sessions should be standardized, 53
"Necessity for havingness", 53
Problem and Solution Processes, 54

HCO B 21 Mar. 1960 RESEARCH PROJECT, 55

Past deaths, "Where Are You Buried?" project, 55

HCO B 24 Mar. 1960 GOALS IN THE RUDIMENTS, 56

Parts of modern rudiments, 56
Reason for session goals, 56
Three basic types of goals: improvement goal, no-change goal, deterioration goal, 57

HCO B 30 Mar. 1960 INTERROGATION, 59

How to read an E-Meter on a silent subject, 59

HCO B 31 Mar. 1960 THE PRESENT TIME PROBLEM, 61

What is a PTP, 61
Processes on PTPs, 61
Confusion and the stable datum, 62
The dual universe, 62
Reasons for pc out of session, 62

HCO B 7 Apr. 1960 A NEW SUMMARY OF AUDITING, 64

What auditing results depend on, 64
Processes were developed to facilitate application, 64
First rule of auditing, 65 Use a gradient approach to bank, 65
What session depends on, 66
Points which should be in before starting session, 67

HCO B 7 Apr. 1960 CHECK SHEET FOR HGC, 68

HCO B 11 Apr. 1960 NEW TRAINING SCHEDULE, 69

"We don't treat wrongness. We treat people", 69

HCO B 14 Apr. 1960 NEW PE DATA, 70

Supervising PE Co-audit, 70
PE Co-audit assessment, 70
PE Co-audit processes, 70
PE procurement, 70
HAS certificates, 71

HCO B 21 Apr. 1960 PRE-SESSION PROCESSES, 72

What a pre-session process is used for, 72
Pre-session processes handle: help factor, control factor, pc communication factor, interest factor, 72
Use of pre-sessions for dissemination, 73
Pre-session processes, 74

HCO B 24 Apr. 1960 CONCERNING THE CAMPAIGN FOR PRESIDENCY, 76

Richard M. Nixon, a citizen aspiring to the Presidency of the United States, 76

HCO B 25 Apr. 1960 SEND YOUR CLIPPING FILES, 77

HCO B 28 Apr. 1960 BOOKS ARE DISSEMINATION, 78

Dissemination fails without books distributed, 78
Why *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* was written, 78
What to do for person after pre-session processes, 79
DMSMH handles public arguments concerning the mind, 81

HCO B 29 Apr. 1960 THE SCIENTIFIC TREATMENT OF THE INSANE, 82

South Africa insanity rate, 82
Keynote of insanity, 82
Cure of insanity, 83

HCO B 4 May 1960 ASSOCIATION SECRETARY LETTER, 84

HCO B 5 May 1960 HELP, 85

Help is the make-break point between sanity and insanity, 85
Help is always betrayal to a thoroughly aberrated person, 85
Clearing Help, 86
Insane regard help as betrayal, 88

HCO B 10 May 1960 OUR TECHNICAL PROGRAMME, 89

Confessional pre-pre-session stage, 89
Sequence of processes, 90
Groups need time to assimilate new concept, 91

HCO B 12 May 1960 HELP PROCESSING, 92

Overt/withhold theory, 92
Ways Help could be run, 92

HCO B 19 May 1960 HOW HELP BECAME BETRAYAL, 94

“Help-is-injury” mechanism, 94
Aberration on help is a barrier to Scientology, 95

HCO B 22 May 1960 DE-CERTIFICATION, HOW YOU SHOULD SUPPORT IT, 96

Reason for cancellation of auditor’s certificates, 96

HCO B 26 May 1960 SECURITY CHECKS, 97

How to do a security check, 97
Use of E-Meter in security check, 97

HCO B 27 May 1960 DEAR SCIENTOLOGIST, 99

Ron wearing Ethics hat, 99
Overt-Withhold and Help can handle out-ethics, 99
Get Scientologists audited, 99

HCO B 28 May 1960 BY THEIR ACTIONS . . . , 101

Judge people from what they think of help, 101

**HCO B 9 June 1960 THE BASIC ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTOLOGY
VERSUS OVERTS, 102**

Secret of all overt-withhold mechanisms is valences, 102
Assumption points of sciences, 102
Psychiatry's basic assumption: shock cures aberration, 103
Scientology results verify its basic assumption, 104
Freeing of valences remedies pain and aberration, 105

HCO B 10 June 1960 WHAT WE EXPECT OF A SCIENTOLOGIST, 106

Professional Scientologist is one who expertly uses Scientology on any area or level of the society, 106
Scientologists also belong out in society, 107

HCO B 10 June 1960 HGC PRECLEAR ASSESSMENT, 108

Start case on first terminal ever run, 108
HGC auditing should convert earlier auditing losses to wins, 108

HCO B 16 June 1960 HINTS ON RUNNING CASES WITH HELP, 109

Flatten the terminals, 109
Help as valence problem, 109
Finishing off a difficult terminal, 110
General processes which assist Help, 110

**HCO B 23 June 1960 SPECIAL ZONE PLAN
—THE SCIENTOLOGIST'S ROLE IN LIFE, 111**

Development of knowledge on dynamics, 111
What our third dynamic organization should do, 113
Examples of Scientology applied to third dynamic, 114
Sell Scientology by action, 115

HCO B 30 June 1960 CREATE AGAIN, 116

Basis of reactive mind, 116
How to handle the subject of create, 116

HCO B 6 July 1960 MAKING CLEARS AND PICKING UP HGC QUALITY, 117

Regimen 1, 117
Instruction points to follow, 118

HCO B 7 July 1960 THE ASSESSMENT OF HELP, 119

Help is a restimulative process, 119
Why general terminals run better than specific, 119

HCO B 14 July 1960 CURRENT RUNDOWN—CONCEPT HELP, 121

Alternate Confront, 121
Aberration consists of wrong-way assistance, 122
Identification, 122

HCO B 21 July 1960 SOME HELP TERMINALS, 124

Assessments, 124
Terminals by profession, 124
Assessment by goals, 124 Recovery of past skills, 125
Help terminals, 125

HCO B 27 July 1960 DOUBLE ACTION CYCLES, 126

Policy on new data, 126
Old action cycles, 126
Double cycles, 126

HCO B 4 Aug. 1960 REGIMEN 1, 128

Steps of Regimen 1, 128
General requirements of sessions, 129
Auditor's reality vs. pc's reality, 129

HCO B 11 Aug. 1960 THE LAWS OF ASSESSMENT, 131

Law I, 131
Scale of pc reality on terminals, 131
Law II, 132
Law III, 132

HCO B 18 Aug. 1960 VITAL INFORMATION, 133

Process package which makes mest clears, theta clears and OTs, 133
Help is run on motion, 133

HCO B 25 Aug. 1960 POWERFUL PRESESSION ADDITIONS, 134

Altitude is the factor that makes a pc receive and execute an auditing command, 134
Pre-session Control Processing, 134
Pre-session commands for interest, help, control, communication, 134

HCO B 25 Aug. 1960 NEW DEFINITION OF PSYCHOSIS, 136

Persons who refuse orders, 136

HCO B 26 Aug. 1960 REGIMEN TWO, 137

Model Session, 137
Assessment, 137
Clear indication, 137
Steps of Regimen Two, 137

HCO B 1 Sept. 1960 PRESESSION TWO, 139

No significance process moves a low graph case, 139
Steps of Pre-session Two, 139
Commands of Alternate Confront, 140
An auditing pre-session, 141

HCO B 8 Sept. 1960 THE PRESESSIONS OF THE 1ST SAINT HILL ACC, 142

Commands for Pre-sessions II—X, Havingness and Confront, 142

HCO B 15 Sept. 1960 THE TONE ARM, 144

What the tone arm tells you, 144

HCO PL 17 Sept. 1960 GIVING THE PC FULL HOURS, 145

Auditing breaks are not counted as auditing time, 145
Havingness injunction, 145

HCO B 19 Sept. 1960 CAPTIVE BRAINS, 146

Scientists as slaves, 146
Slavery of thought, 147

HCO B 19 Sept. 1960 ACC LECTURE TAPES, 149

To whom tapes are played, 149

HCO B 22 Sept. 1960 ANNOUNCING NEW TECHNOLOGY, 150

First Saint Hill ACC, 150

**HCO B 23 Sept. 1960 ORDER OF TEST OF HAVINGNESS
AND CONFRONT COMMANDS, 151**

Havingness commands in order of test for pcs, 152
Confront commands in order of test for pcs, 152

HCO B 28 Sept. 1960 TIPS ON HOW TO CRACK AN HGC CASE, 154

New experimental Havingness Processes, 154
Confront Processes, 154

HCO B 29 Sept. 1960 HAVINGNESS AND DUPLICATION, 155

Precise mechanics of havingness, 155
Remedy of objective havingness determines entrance point of the case, 155

HCO B 6 Oct. 1960 THIRTY-SIX NEW PRESESSIONS, 156

HCO B 10 Oct. 1960 CURRENT NEWS, 161

Scientology's situation in South Africa, 161
The problem of South Africa, 161

HCO B 13 Oct. 1960 SCRIPT OF A MODEL SESSION, 163 [CANCELLED]

To start session, 163
Rudiments, 163
Starting a process, 163
Ending a process, 164
Repeated commands, 164
Cognition, 164
End rudiments, 164
Final commands of session, 164

HCO B 18 Oct. 1960 TERMINAL STABLE DATA, 165

HCO B 20 Oct. 1960 THEORY 67, 166

Taking the sixth dynamic off the seventh, 166
How to make a theta clear, 166
Target of Theory 67 is mest, 166

HCO B 27 Oct. 1960 REVISED CASE ENTRANCE, 167

Check for the Havingness Process, 167
O/W is needed to make a Havingness Process work, 167

Failed Help lowest verbal entrance point, 168
Processes for average cases, 168
Processes for poor cases, 168
Processes for low cases, 169

HCO B 3 Nov. 1960 FAILED HELP, 170

How to run Failed Help, 170

HCO B 10 Nov. 1960 FORMULA 13, 171

Run Failed Help as the Confront Process, 171
Run O/W as the Havingness Process, 171

HCO B 11 Nov. 1960 CHANGE ON MODEL SESSION, 172

HCO B 12 Nov. 1960 CLEARING ROUTINE, 173

Steps of clearing routine, 173

HCO B 17 Nov. 1960 STARTING CASES, 175

The key to fast, high results is “pc in session”, 175
Degrees of being out of session, 175
How to get pc in session, 175

HCO B 20 Nov. 1960 HAS CO-AUDIT ENDED, 176

Why HAS Co-Audits are suspended, 176

HCO B 24 Nov. 1960 THE UNMOVING CASE, 178

The hyper-critical case, 178
The big withhold case, 178
The case that wants no processing, 178

HCO B 1 Dec. 1960 NEW FORMULAS, 179

Formula 13, 179
Formula 14, 179
Formula 15, 179
Regimen 3, 179
Regimen 8, 179

HCO B 15 Dec. 1960 PRESESSION 37, 180

Pre-session 37 is a method of getting off withholds, 180
Formula 16, 180
Formula 17, 181

HCO B 19 Dec. 1960 PE CHANGE, 182

PE test section, 182
PE becomes a dissertation in Scientology and a Comm Course, 182
PE personnel and admin, 183

HCO B 22 Dec. 1960 HAS CO-AUDIT RESUMED, 185

How Co-Audit stalled cases, 185

HCO B 22 Dec. 1960 O-W A LIMITED THEORY, 186

When O-W sets in, 186
Cycle of deterioration, 186
Why O-W is run, 186
Worry Process, 187

HCO B 29 Dec. 1960 THE NEW PE AND THE NEW HAS CO-AUDIT, 188

PE Course, 188
HAS Co-Audit, 188
HAS Co-Audit Process I, 189
HAS Co-Audit Process II, 189

HCO B 12 Jan. 1961 NEW HELP DATA, 191

Failures to help can bring about confusion of identities, 191
O/W and individuation, 191
Help on a pan-determined basis, 191

HCO B 19 Jan. 1961 ADDITIONAL HAS PROCESSES, 192

HAS Processes III—VIII, 192

HCO B 25 Jan. 1961 HANDLING OF RUDIMENTS, 194

The auditor accepts and acknowledges any and all goals the pc has for the session and for life and livingness, 194
Handling the environment, 194
Auditor clearance, 194
Handling present time problem, 194

HCO B 26 Jan. 1961 THE “ULTIMATE” PROCESSES, 195

Ultimate 1—6, 195

HCO B 28 Jan. 1961 NEW ASSESSMENT SCALE, 197

The Pre-Havingness Scale, 197
Use of Pre-Hav Scale, 198

HCO B 2 Feb. 1961 COMMAND SHEET—PRE-HAVINGNESS SCALE, 199

HCO B 2 Feb. 1961 UK CASES DIFFERENT, 202

Control is more easily inverted on UK case, 202
S-C-S “stand still” step, 202

Ability Issue 125, ca. Feb. 1961 PERSONAL INTEGRITY, 203

HCO B 9 Feb. 1961 NEW PRESESSION DATA AND SCRIPT CHANGE, 204

Pre-sessions, 204
Model Session script change, 204

HCO B 16 Feb. 1961 FORMULA 19, 205

Formula 19 theory and commands, 205

**HCO B 18 Feb. 1961 S.O.P. GOALS—MARVELLOUS NEW BREAKTHROUGH
BE—DO—HAVE COORDINATED, 206**

S.O.P. Goals intensives, 206
Pre-Hav Scale assessment, 207
S.O.P. Goals session example, 208

HCO B 20 Feb. 1961 IMPORTANT DATA ON GOALS S.O.P., 209

Cases may slump between sessions until Pre-Hav Scale is flat, 209
Flatten terminals, 209
When is a goals terminal flat, 209

HCO B 23 Feb. 1961 PT PROBLEM AND GOALS, 210

Handling of PTPs that exist as goals, 210

HCO B 2 Mar. 1961 NEW PRE-HAV COMMAND, 211

Command for Communication on the Pre-Hav Scale, 211

HCO B 2 Mar. 1961 USE OF S.O.P. GOALS PROCEDURE, 212

HCO B 2 Mar. 1961 FORMULA 20, 213

HCO PL 20 Mar. 1961 BASIC STAFF AUDITOR'S HAT, 214

Case Assessment, 214
First auditing, 214
Second session, 215
Third session, 215
Fourth session, 215
Fifth session, 215
Pre-Hav Scale, when the first terminal is flat, 216
Pcs priorly audited, 216
Clearing by S.O.P. Goals, 217
Things that prevent clearing, 217
Causes for pc blows, 217
Auditing maxims, 217
Newcomers, 2 18
Cases not on S.O.P. Goals, 218
Stopping processes, 218
Handling of unchanging pc, 219
End of intensives, 219
A completed pc, 219
Additional staff auditor duties, 219
Staff auditor reports, 219

HCO B 21 Mar. 1961 SCRIPT OF A MODEL SESSION, 220 [CANCELLED]

Start of session, 220
Rudiments, 220
Start of process, 221
End of process, 221
Repeated commands, 222
Cognition, 222
End rudiments, 222
End of session, 223

HCO B 23 Mar. 1961 S.O.P. GOALS, 224

S.O.P. Goals intensives, 224
S.O.P. Goals session example, 226

HCO B 31 Mar. 1961 S.O.P. GOALS MODIFIED, 227

**HCO PL 31 Mar. 1961 THE DIRECTOR OF PROCESSING'S
CASE CHECKING HAT, 228**

Role of D of P, 228
HCO WW Form CT1: Pre-Intensive Interview and pre-Goals Assessment Check, 228
HCO WW Form CT2: Assessment Confirmation, 229
HCO WW Form CT3: General Check-up on a Session, 230
HCO WW Form CT4: Rudiments Check, 231

HCO WW Form CT5: Flat Check, 232
HCO WW Form CT6: Bog Check, 232
HCO WW Form CT7: A "Release" Check Sheet, 233
HCO WW Form CT8: Clear Check, 233

HCO PL 5 Apr. 1961 S.O.P. GOALS GOOFS, 234

**HCO B 6 Apr. 1961 S.O.P. GOALS
—GOALS ASSESSMENT PROBLEMS SORTED OUT, 236**

How to assess a goals list, 236
Preliminary goal, 236
Principal goal, 237

HCO B 6 Apr. 1961 S.O.P. GOALS—REPAIRING A CASE, 238

TA behavior on Pre-Hav levels, 238

**HCO B 7 Apr. 1961 ASSESSING FOR GOALS AND TERMINALS OR
ELIMINATION; 239**

Assessing goals list by elimination, 239
Assessing terminal list by elimination, 240
Five-way bracket, 240

HCO B 7 Apr. 1961 S.O.P. GOALS—MODIFICATION I, 241

S.O.P. Goals intensives, 241

HCO PL 7 Apr. 1961 JOHANNESBURG SECURITY CHECK, 242 [REVISED]

HCO Security Form 2, 242

HCO B 11 Apr. 1961 S.O.P. GOALS—ERRORS, 246

Primary sources of wasted time on S.O.P. Goals, 246
Things to be stressed in training, 246

HCO B 12 Apr. 1961 TRAINING DRILLS, 247

TR 0, Confronting Preclear, 247
TR 1, Dear Alice, 247
TR 2, Acknowledgements, 247
TR 3, Duplicative Question, 248
TR 4, Preclear Originations, 248
TR 5, Hand Mimicry, 248

HCO B 17 Apr. 1961 TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED, 249 [CANCELLED]

TR 0, Confronting Preclear, 249
TR 1, Dear Alice, 250
TR 2, Acknowledgements, 250
TR 3, Duplicative Question, 251
TR 4, Preclear Originations, 252

HCO B 23 Apr. 1961 CHANGE PROCESSES, 253

Change Processes are to be run before S.O.P. Goals, 253

HCO PL 25 Apr. 1961 D OF P FORM—CHECK TYPE ONE, 254

Pre-Intensive interview and Pre-Goals Assessment Check, 254

HCO B 27 Apr. 1961 CHANGE PROCESSES, 256

Resisted change discovery, 256
Safe rules for Change Process, 256
Commands of Change Processes, 256

HCO B 30 Apr. 1961R CHANGE BRACKETS AND COMMANDS, 258

Basic curve of change compares to the cycle of action, 258
Change 5-way bracket, 258
Change 15-way bracket, 259

HCO B 4 May 1961 PROCESS LEVELS—NECESSITY FOR TRAINING, 261

HCA/HPA level, 261
B.Scen./HCS, 261
D.Scen./HGA, 262

HCO B 11 May 1961 E-METER HORROR, 264

Students didn't know *E-Meter Essentials*, 264

HCO B 11 May 1961 ASSESSMENT BY ELIMINATION—S.O.P. GOALS, 265

Right way to do an assessment, 265
Assessment by Elimination steps, 265
Do a full list of goals on the pc, 265
Select the goal, 266
Prove up the goal, 267
Do a terminals list, 267
Assess for the terminal by elimination, 267
Prove the terminal, 268
Assess for Pre-Hav level, 268
Choose a command, 269
Audit the pc's terminal and level, 269
Null all Pre-Hav levels that react on assessment on the first terminal, 269
Find new terminals, 269
Find new goals, 269

HCO B 13 May 1961 ASSESSING FOR S.O.P. GOALS IMPROVED, 270

Joburg Sec Check as preparation for assessment, 270
Complete goals list, 270
Eliminate nulled goals, 270
Always recheck goals list, 270
Importance of accurate assessment, 270
Two types of terminals to assess, 270
Eliminate null terminals, 271
Always recheck terminals list, 271
Perfect assessment, 271
Needle manifestations, 271
Use Model Session, clean rudiments, 271
Long duration PTPs, 271
You can redo assessments any time, 272
Beware sticking a tone arm, 272
Rock slams different, 272

HCO B 19 May 1961 ASSESSMENT DATA, 273

S.O.P. Goals assessments mistakes, 273
Assess with sensitivity set for one-third of a dial drop on can squeeze, 273
Assessment on Pre-Hav Scale is not by elimination, 273
Rising needles are disregarded, 274

HCO PL 22 May 1961 THE ONLY VALID SECURITY CHECK, 275

HCO Sec Form 3, 275
Joburg Sec Check, 275
When a person is flunked on a Sec Check, 275

HCO B 23 May 1961 PRE-HAV SCALE REVISED, 282

Pre-Havingness Primary and Secondary Scale, 282
Use of Pre-Hav Scale, 282
General run assessment example, 282
Example for assessing a goals terminal, 283
Handling Pre-Hav level rock slams, 283
Pre-Havingness Scale—Primary Scale, 285
Pre-Havingness Secondary Scale, 286

**HCO B 25 May 1961 RELEASING AND PREPARING A CASE FOR
S.O.P. GOALS, 317**

Preparatory steps of S.O.P. Goals, 317
Joburg Security Check, 317
General runs on Pre-Hav Scale, 317
Release, 318
Mistakes, 318

HCO B 29 May 1961 CLARIFICATION OF “CHANGE PROCESSING”, 320

Change belongs at “Inverted Control” on Pre-Hav Scale, 320

Ability Issue 129, June 1961 THE SAD TAIL OF PDH, 321

False E-Meter reactions, 321
Compartmenting the question, 322

HCO B 1 June 1961 ASSESSING, 324

How to do assessment on the Pre-Hav Scale, Primary and Secondary, 324

HCO B 5 June 1961 PROCESSES ALLOWED, 325

Routine One, 325
CCHs, 325
Johannesburg Processing Check, 325
Routine Two, 326
Routine Three, 326
Mistakes in running Pre-Hav levels, 327

HCO B 7 June 1961 ACADEMY SCHEDULE, CLARIFICATION OF, 329

Use checksheets, 329
Train individuals, not a class, 329
Academy unit one and two, 330

HCO B 8 June 1961 E-METER WATCHING, 331

Reactive mind responds instantly, 331
Pc response, analytical vs. reactive, 331
E-Meter responds instantly, 332
How to assess Pre-Hav Scale, 332

HCO B 12 June 1961 THE RISING NEEDLE: SKIP IT!, 333

Needle reactions, 333
Rising needle means pc can't confront it, 333

HCO B 16 June 1961 CCHs AND ROUTINE 1, 334

Criteria on Routine I, 334
Pcs D of P may refuse to audit, 334

HCO B 17 June 1961 PRIMARY SCALE AMENDED, 335

Pre-Havingness Scale—Primary Scale (amended), 336

HCO B 19 June 1961 SEC CHECK WHOLE TRACK, 337

HCO WW Sec Form 4, 337

HCO B 23 June 1961 RUNNING CCHs, 347

Correct way to run CCHs, 347

HCO B 27 June 1961 ROUTINE ONE, 348

CCHs and Joburg Sec Check, 348

HCO PL 29 June 1961 SCIENTOLOGY STUDENTS' SECURITY CHECK, 349

HCO WW Sec Form 5, 349

HCO B 6 July 1961 ROUTINE 1A, 354

Problems and alter-is, 354
Routine 1A steps, 354
Problem Process, 354
Security Check, 355
Ratio between Problem and Sec Check, 355
Value of Routine 1A, 355

HCO PL 7 July 1961 HGC AUDITOR'S SEC CHECK, 356

HCO WW Sec Form 6, 356

HCO B 10 July 1961 METERING RUDIMENTS, 363

Difference between needle fall and change of needle pattern, 363

HCO B 10 Aug. 1961 INFORMATION ON CLEARS, 364

Clears in South Africa, 364
HGC clear, 364
An HGC clear, 365
A post-clear auditing session, 365

HCO B 23 Aug. 1961 NEW CLEARING BREAKTHROUGH!, 367

HCO B 24 Aug. 1961 VALENCES KEY TO CLEARING, 368

Goals as escape, 368
Improve the pc, not the valence, 368

HCO PL 24 Aug. 1961 HGC ALLOWED PROCESSES, 369 [CANCELLED]

Routine 1, Routine 1A, Routine 3, 369
Flatten Routine 1 A before starting or continuing goals, 369

HCO B 31 Aug. 1961 ADVANCES IN TECHNOLOGY, 370

Materials used for clearing, 370

HCO B 7 Sept. 1961 NEW FACTS OF LIFE, 372

Security Checks, 372
Not Know version of Security Checking, 372
Engram running using “unknown”, 372
ARC break prevention, 373
Pc permitted to be responsible for session will ARC break, 373

HCO PL 12 Sept. 1961 CURRICULUM FOR CLEARING COURSES, 374

Out rudiments bury goal, 374
Clearing lies in confronting, not escaping, 374
“Unknown” used on pictures, 374
Pre-Hav Primary Scale amended, 375

HCO B 14 Sept. 1961 NEW RUDIMENTS COMMANDS, 377

Room, 377
Auditor, 377
PT problem, 377
Withholds, 377
ARC break, 377

HCO B 21 Sept. 1961 SECURITY CHECK CHILDREN, 378

HCO WW Security Form 8, 378
Children’s Security Check, ages 6—12, 378

HCO B 28 Sept. 1961 HCO WW SECURITY FORMS 7A AND 7B, 381

HCO WW Security Form 7A (for staff applicants), 381
HCO WW Security Form 7B (for persons now employed), 383

HCO PL 29 Sept. 1961 HGC ALLOWED PROCESSES, 385

Class One auditor, 385
Class Two auditor, 385
Class Three auditor, 385
Class Four auditor, 386

HCO B 5 Oct. 1961 CLEAN HANDS MAKE A HAPPY LIFE, 387

Transgressions against the mores of one’s race, group, family cause unhappiness, 387
Mutual action is the key to all our overt acts, 387
Overt-motivator sequence, 388

HCO B 6 Oct. 1961 TRAINING OF STAFF AUDITORS, 389

Sec Checking against a chronic somatic, 389
Security Checking includes the ability to locate the area of prior confusion, 390

HCO B 9 Oct. 1961 RUDIMENTS, CHANGE IN, 391

Withholds, half truths and untruths, 391

HCO PL 10 Oct. 1961 PROBLEMS INTENSIVE FOR STAFF CLEARING, 392

Preclear Assessment Sheet, 392

HCO B 12 Oct. 1961 STUDENT PRACTICE CHECK, 400

HCO B 17 Oct. 1961 PROBLEMS INTENSIVES, 401

Turning points, or changes, in the preclear’s life, 401
Prior confusion, 401

HCO B 19 Oct. 1961 SECURITY QUESTIONS MUST BE NULLED, 402

Prevention of Security Check being left unflat, 402

HCO PL 23 Oct. 1961 HGC PRE-PROCESSING SECURITY CHECK, 403

HCO WW Sec Form 8 (for pcs beginning intensives), 403

HCO B 26 Oct. 1961 SAFE AUDITING TABLE, 406

Safe processes, 406

HCO PL 1 Nov. 1961 HCO WW SECURITY FORM 5A, 407

For all HPC/HCA and above students before acceptance on courses, 407

HCO B 2 Nov. 1961 THE PRIOR CONFUSION, 409

All problems are preceded by a prior confusion, 409

Hidden standards are the result of a prior confusion, 409

HCO B 2 Nov. 1961 RUDIMENTS AND CLEARING, 410

Example of out rudiments preventing clearing, 410

HCO B 7 Nov. 1961 ROUTINE 3A, 412

Routine 3A steps, 412

Goal and modifier, 413

**HCO B 9 Nov. 1961 THE PROBLEMS INTENSIVE
—USE OF THE PRIOR CONFUSION, 414**

Why problems hang and float in time, 414

The Problems Intensive, 414

Complete change list, 414

Assess change list, 414

Obtain problem, 414

Date the problem, 415

Find prior confusion, 415

Compose Sec Check, 415

Sec check confused area, 415

Test for problem, 415

Assess for new change, 415

HCO Info. Ltr. 14 Nov. 1961 ROUTINE 3D, 416

Dynamic clears, 416

Goals assessment, 417

Opposition assessment, 417

Opposition goal, 417

Modifier, 4 18

Goals terminal for pc's goal + modifier, 418

Pre-Hav level, 418

Compose command, 418

Goals test, 419

R3D vocabulary, 419

Cautions, 420

Procedure of assessment, 422

Security Checks, 422

Rudiments, 423

HCO B 16 Nov. 1961 SEC CHECKING—GENERALITIES WON'T DO, 424

How to get withholds off the irresponsible pc, 424

Preventing a missed Sec Check question, 425

20 Nov. 1961 ROUTINE 3D COMMANDS, 426

Goal Problem Mass described, 426
Meter behavior on Routine 3D commands, 426
Tips on assessment, 427
Tips on running levels, 429
Rules of using the process, 430
Administration and records, 431

HCO B 23 Nov. 1961 METER READING, 432

Errors in reading E-Meter, 432

HCO B 23 Nov. 1961 AUXILIARY PRE-HAVE 3D SCALE, 434

27 Nov. 1961 ROUTINE 3D COMMAND SHEET, 437

28 Nov. 1961 ROUTINE 3D IMPROVED COMMANDS OF 28 NOV. 61, 438

HCO PL 29 Nov. 1961 CLASS OF AUDITORS, 439

What the Class I, II, III can audit, 439
Unauthorized processes, 439

**30 Nov. 1961 ROUTINE 3D IMPROVED COMMANDS
OF NOVEMBER 30, 1961, 441**

HCO B 30 Nov. 1961 ARC PROCESS 1961, 442

E-Meter doesn't register on ARC broken pc, 442

HCO B 3 Dec. 1961 RUNNING 3D LEVELS, 443

Steps of running levels on 3D terminal and "oppterm", 443
Reruns, 444
Third run of levels, 444

HCO B 7 Dec. 1961 SEC CHECKS VITAL, 445

Routine 3D prerequisites, 445
Auditor training, 445

7 Dec. 1961 COMMAND SHEET FOR ROUTINE 3D, 447

HCO B 13 Dec. 1961 VARYING SEC CHECK QUESTIONS, 449

Always flatten original question, 449

HCO B 14 Dec. 1961 RUDIMENTS MODERNIZED, 450

List of rudiments bulletins, 450
Meter can go out if ARC break is present, 450
Rudiments at the beginning of session, 451
End rudiments, 451

HCO B 21 Dec. 1961 MODEL SESSION SCRIPT, REVISED, 453 [CANCELLED]

Use of 'R' factor, 453
Start of session, 453
Beginning rudiments, 453
Start of process, 454
End of process, 454
Repeated commands, 455
Cognition, 455
End rudiments, 455
End of session, 456

26 Dec. 1961 COMMAND SHEET ROUTINE 3D, 457

3D commands whole track O/W, 458

HCO B 28 Dec. 1961 E-METER ELECTRODES
—A DISSERTATION ON SOUP CANS, 459

History of E-Meter, 459

Use correct electrodes, 460

HCO B 28 Dec. 1961 3-D RULES OF THUMB, 462

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 2 JANUARY 1960
(Originally issued in Washington, D.C.)

BPI

HAS CERTIFICATES
(Cancels existing directions)

The qualifications for a HAS Certificate are changed to fit the reality of existing courses.

Great success is being obtained by placing people in the Co-audit directly from PE, according to U.S. and some other Franchise Holders.

Therefore a modified HAS Certificate will be issued to all persons attending Central Organization or Franchise PE Co-audit Courses; such persons must have: cleared the present lifetime of overts and withholds of one other person and have their own overts and withholds cleaned up, all incidents discovered to have had responsibility flattened on them.

LRH:rlw.js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

STATE OF MAN CONGRESS LECTURES
Washington, D.C.
1—3 January 1960

L. Ron Hubbard gave the following lectures to the State of Man Congress held at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington, D.C:

** 6001C01	SMC-1	Opening Lecture
** 6001C01	SMC-2	Responsibility
** 6001C01	SMC-3	Overts and Withholds
** 6001C02	SMC-4	A Third Dynamic in Scientology—Why People Don't Like You
** 6001C02	SMC-5	Marriage
* 6001C02	SMC-6	Group Processing
** 6001C03	SMC-7	Zones of Control and Responsibility of Governments
* 6001C03	SMC-8	Create and Confront
* 6001C03	SMC-9	Your Case

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 3 JANUARY AD 10
(Originally Issued in Washington DC)

BPI

A THIRD DYNAMIC FOR SCIENTOLOGY

To bring about a Scientology third dynamic greater than any group has ever before had, your co-operation, whether pro or layman, is requested.

Any Scientologist, whether certified or not, may participate. There are two ways you can participate:

1. To get off your own overts and withholds, and
2. Urge other people to get off theirs.

To accomplish this and provide an orderly check on this and to prevent any overt being used by anyone, the following procedure is recommended:

- (a) That a full list of present lifetime overts and withholds be made, with or without the assistance of sessions, particularly as they apply to Scientology or related groups and personnel, and signed and sent to HCO WW, Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex, England.
- (b) That a second list then be made giving what responsibility one could take for these. Instead of the second list an auditor's report saying it has been done, the auditor attesting it, may be forwarded.

That these files exist in my personal possession should make it effectively impossible for anyone to try to use the information.

In this way we can cover all existing certificates and people and by following this with new people keep an expanding group clean and clear.

I appreciate any co-operation you can give me in forwarding this programme and will doubly appreciate any auditing you do toward this direct goal.

All persons so cleared on overts would be listed from time to time in HCO publications as "people you can trust".

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.cden
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[For further information, see HCO PL 1 January 1960, *Administrative Procedure for Reducing Overts*, OEC Volume 4, page 514.]

HUBBARD CLEARING SCIENTOLOGIST COURSE LECTURES

Washington, D.C.
4—8 January 1960

L. Ron Hubbard addressed the students of the Hubbard Clearing Scientologist Course Unit which began on 4 January 1960.

** 6001C04	HCS-1	E-Meter Phenomena
6001C04	HCS-2	E-Meter and Time Track Structure
6001C05	HCS-3	Title unknown
6001C05	HCS-4	Title unknown
6001C06	HCS-5	Title unknown
** 6001C06	HCS-6	Identity
** 6001C07	HCS-7	Inability to Withhold
6001C07	HCS-8	Case Level and Needle State
60 .. C ..	HCS	Supplementary Lecture 8: Specialized Problems
** 6001C08	HCS-9	Sessioning and Withholds

HCO BULLETIN OF 7 JANUARY 1960

Fran Hldrs
Assn Secs
HCO Secs
HCO Staff &
Cen Orgs

THE UNMOVING CASE

And here we are ten years after the date I wrote the first book with the solution to both types of cases that give us trouble. And that's a good anniversary release.

Of course you saw the first book after January of 1950 but in the cold bitter winter of Bay Head, New Jersey, I was busy writing down the research of years which would become first a best seller and then a long term steady seller across the world, beating most book records.

You know "Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health" and you know its data, and you know also that any case could be cleared if you could run all the engrams off the case. And you know as well that you have run into cases that resisted all efforts to run engrams or penetrate the bank. It was only these cases that kept Dianetics and all its goals from being realised by all auditors.

We have concocted many dodges and much training skill has been perfected, all to run just two types of cases—for most of the cases around in the public could still be cleared by straight Dianetic processing right out of Book One.

In this and the next bulletin I am going to take up these two types of cases and their solution. Valuable data? You stated it correctly.

The first of these two types was the case which didn't experience any improvement even after you had run the exact engram necessary to resolve the case.

The hallmark of this case was unreality. It either went through it all with no emotional change or it jumped all over the track and de-railed at unlikely moments. This case also ARC broke very easily and was plain hell to keep in session, or it was so apathetic it continually slumped. When the case did make a gain it promptly relapsed and was telling everyone how bad the auditor was.

Well, we've actually been talking about this case for several bulletins. It is the case which mustn't let anyone find out. Its earmarks are one or more of the following:

1. Runs with no reality
2. Skids around on the track
3. Goes out of Communication easily
4. Experiences little if any gain in processing
5. Criticises the Auditor
6. Propitiates
7. Tries to blow

Any one of the above and probably several more characteristics may be present in such a case. But it just can't run engrams whatever else can be said about it and it just doesn't make progress.

One of the things this case is doing is using auditing to make people guilty of

overt acts. As an auditor this case won't really get down to auditing and as a preclear the case just doesn't ever get up and fly.

There are various degrees of this case. Almost anyone has sooner or later run into one or another of these. But the whole summary is contained in one fact: The person gets little benefit from Dianetics or Scientology.

If all the cases in Scientology were really wheeling we'd get no hold-ups either as auditor or as pc. Further we wouldn't be tiptoeing around holding on to so many pc secrets that we ourselves get giddy making sure nobody tries to capitalise on them. We would be in fact a free people, the only free people on earth.

Further we can only be harmed by those things we have harmed and if all of us—for you have an influence in this too, remember—had our worst overts and withholds off no person or agency on earth would be able to touch a Scientologist harmfully. And that's worth working for isn't it?

The failed case doesn't move (as listed above) and doesn't audit very well, since it just can't confront overts from another and turns them away.

Well, that's the Dianetic failed case. And it's the Scientology failed case. And knowing this we begin the road to freedom as a group as well as individuals.

The case that does not advance under auditing is the case that has undisclosed overts and withholds. The main ones that are harmful to an advance of the case are in the present lifetime and are known to the preclear (but sometimes are a trifle out of sight and bounce into view quite suddenly and painfully).

Get the overts and withholds off the case and run responsibility on them and you have a case that is wheeling at last. It can run anything and it can be cleared.

Well that's the main Dianetic failed case and why.

Remember that when a pc tells you his current lifetime overts and withholds you are code bound to run responsibility on them.

Now, let's face up to it and do it, do it, do it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.cden
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 8 JANUARY AD10
(Originally issued in Washington, D.C.)

HCO Secs
Assn Secs
Ds of P
Staff Auditors

OT PROCEDURES FOR HCS/BScn COURSES
AS RECORDED IN WASHINGTON, D.C. ACADEMY
JAN 1960 LRH TAPES, 9 HOURS, 7¹/₂ ips.

SESSION DATA

Rudiments:

- (a) Auditor checked out—o/w's off on auditor or auditors or pcs until OK to be audited.
- (b) Environment checked out—o/w's on auditing room, associated personnel and people.
- (c) PTP checked out—o/w's on people connected with PTP unless it can be done by Problems of Comparable Magnitude or two-way comm.
- (d) ARC breaks—check earlier sessions. TR5N.
- (e) Goals for session.

Omit any or all of above except goals if pc already in session. Use any or all of above at any time if session bogs down or pc gets upset or choppy.

AUDITING ATTITUDE

You do the auditing. This is all HGC type auditing, not PE Co-Audit. The auditor handles pc and improves pc on his own responsibility. Instructions which violate this (making auditor a via, not cause) may be disregarded both by student and staff auditors.

Audit the pc on the whole track as a general rule only when pc's tone arm is sitting at Clear as a consequence of setting up the session, getting off present life overts, rehabilitating ability to withhold, getting responsibility run on incidents pc has revealed, getting off discreditable creations and getting responsibility run on them.

Don't wound-up doll on pc. Keep finding out what he is doing and how he is doing it and if he is doing anything else. Be interested.

Use heavy control, as extreme as you feel necessary, as mild as works.

If pc is ARC breaky work rudiments over *or* look hard for present life overts and withholds discreditable to pc.

Enfin DO WHAT YOU DO THOROUGHLY. If you only do a small portion of this, do it *well* and finish it before looking for greener pastures.

First Stage

1. Clean up *and continue to keep cleaned up pc's overts and withholds* in life which would interrupt two-way comm with auditor. This includes *anything* pc has done in his life which disturbs the tone arm.

Rehabilitate pc's ability to withhold on any terminal he has done lots of overts against.

(Overts include making another person guilty of anything. Don't overlook these.) Always run responsibility on any major overts discovered.

2. Only when a pc has a needle reading at clear reading for his sex should you go for chronic somatics, etc.

Note: The following steps are not necessarily to be run in the order they are listed here. It is at the auditor's discretion which is tackled when.

3. Hunt up pc's "discreditable creations" (use wording that best communicates to pc in asking for these), starting with his present lifetime. Run responsibility on these. Use some such commands as: "What part of that incident could you admit causing?"—"What could you withhold from that person (those people)?"
4. Check well into his goals. What goals does he particularly want rehabilitated? Clean up his earliest present life "discreditable creation" on this goal line by running responsibility on it. You may do well to run several of these. This, of course, may be done much later in session after whole track. This is artistic rehabilitation.
5. Find out how he feels about generally improving himself. Burning question: Does he deserve to get well? Investigate his chronic somatics and find out who he is making guilty by having them. Do this by clever two-way comm, *not* by repetitive auditing command. This is the make-break point of a case. Get real real about it. This step applies ordinarily to the very boggy case that isn't running well. Any case can benefit from it but it is a must on a boggy case.
6. Clean up "social atmosphere" of present life by getting off 2nd and 3rd dynamic overt-withholds. Family, job, etc. This step would be more germane to an HGC pc and may be omitted by students. However, a bad tone arm that won't adjust to clear by the above will possibly adjust with this step if you rehabilitate the pc's ability to withhold from such areas.

General Note on Above. Always run some responsibility when a pc communicates an overt or withhold of magnitude. The tone arm will *not* come down or go up when pc communicates overt or withhold unless he assumes responsibility for the act.

Always rehabilitate pc's ability to withhold, especially when auditor is getting him to spill a great deal. "Mindless Object" reading (1.5) indicates pc's ability to withhold has been badly shaken. Good command: "Think of something you could withhold." Runs well, alternated with various forms of "What could you admit causing?"

Second Stage

1. If pc has a field, somatics, malformity or aberration, clean it up as follows:
 - (a) Find out what he is looking at.
 - (b) Date it with the meter.
 - (c) Run "What part of the scene could you admit causing?" (Keep on with the same command no matter how much the scene changes, until pc is in PT when he will most likely come up with the scene of present auditor and auditing environment within the last day or two. It is then flat for your purposes.
2. Disassociation from identities. *Stable Datum:* Any "identity" is a misidentification, therefore get it off case.
 - (a) Identity most in restimulation. (Whole track.)
 - (b) Identities of the last two or three lives, with special attention to the *shifts* of identity involved.
 - (c) Any identities you can get hold of. Be sure to get his most creative life. (Whole track.)
3. Immediate past lives. Most cases crack when the last life before this one and perhaps the last few lives are well explored. Tackle these with the E-Meter. Find out all about them.

The rule is that in stage one you set the pc up to be audited and clean up present life. In stage two you clean up immediate past life or lives and then the whole track.

SUMMARY

The keynote is INCREASE CONFIDENCE by increasing ability. The gradient scale is:

- (a) Confidence in being audited.
- (b) Confidence in present existence (immediate time track).
- (c) Confidence in present life.
- (d) Confidence in regaining health by running off chronic somatics.
- (e) Confidence in regaining memory of and recovering from past few lives, particularly the last one.
- (f) Confidence on the whole track by removing overts and re-establishing withhold ability on the whole track.

If a step is done well and thoroughly, the *next* step is done more easily by pc. If no thoroughness is present and if pc never wins on any step, recovery is only partial.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH : mg js .rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 14 JANUARY AD 10

Fran Hldrs
HCO Secs
Assn Secs
HCO and HASI Staffs

THE BLACK CASE

In the last bulletin I mentioned that two case types held us up in Dianetics and that I had now solved these ten years after the first book's writing.

The first type was the case that had so many overts and withholds in this lifetime that it could not be gotten into two way communication. The remedy for this is to get the overts and withholds confessed and run responsibility on these acts.

The second type is the "Black Field" case. The case with a field could not run engrams because he could not see them. Before I started to teach people to audit I never found this case. I didn't find it because I merely assumed that the case was stuck on the track and I persuaded the case to get unstuck. In May 1950 in teaching a class in Washington, D.C., I found that at the exact moment of stuck there was sonic, visio and the rest.

After I started teaching people how to audit this case eluded them and after a while I found some that eluded me too. Naturally anyone knowing that this was an unauditible case (for the fact was quite well advertised) used the mechanism to cover up overts and withholds.

The mechanism I am about to give you relieves however any such case and changes it around considerably. This remedy applies not only to Black Field cases but any kind of constant view including invisible fields and stuck pictures.

This formula has proven sufficiently good that the only way to get around it is for the pc to run like the dickens—and you can keep him from doing that by getting off his overts and withholds.

Whether or not you have relieved his overts and withholds, you can use this formula with great profit—and just because it's simple, let's keep it as simple as it is. It will work.

In taking hold of a new case, the first thing to do is start the session letter-perfect with rudiments and goals, whether the case has ever been audited before or not. Then ask the person to close his or her eyes and find out what the person is looking at. If it is PT, okay to proceed along any process line. If not PT but a stuck picture, a field or "nothing" at once put the pc on the meter (where he should have been all along) and do a time scout. Pin whatever the person sees in time as exactly as you can, right down to the minute of the day.

This may blow the pc up to PT in some cases. But usually it will only change the view slightly.

Now understand this: If a pc is stuck on the track all the auditing you are doing is around an out of PT area and is not valid for present life. So it is very valuable to handle just what it is that's sitting there and not scramble it up with any other process than this one.

It does not matter, for this formula, where the pc's tone arm is located for its

reading will be more or less for the stuck incident and not as a result of present life material. So disregard the tone arm and the injunction never to audit a pc with a high tone arm when you are doing this. Attend to the tone arm after you've got the pc in PT.

All right, we've got the time of the incident. The pc is still sitting there with his eyes closed. His data is very vague, perhaps he may be totally unco-operative. Who cares. Do this anyway.

Run now "What part of that scene you're looking at could you be responsible for?"

He may give you the most strained or vague answers. That's all right. This will still work. Keep running it no matter how many times he repeats the same answer.

The picture will start to shift. It may shift with slowness or enormous rapidity or both, but it will shift. Well, just go on and run the process as above right up to PT and then skip it except for noting where he was stuck.

When you have the pc in PT get off his overts and withholds and let the tone arm down. "What would you let me know?" "What would you withhold from me?" alternated will do very well to clean it all up providing you run responsibility on any incident of importance the pc comes up with.

Well, that's the case that couldn't see pictures. That's the psychologist who says they don't exist. That's the rough case that wouldn't move on the track.

Despite all the randomness I'm getting some things done lately, eh?

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jsjh.cden
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 19 JANUARY 1960

BPI
Franchise Holders

TAPES FOR SALE

The 5th and 6th London ACC tapes and the Melbourne ACC tapes and all 1959 and prior Congresses are now for sale to Franchise Holders.

Price: £5 (\$15) per hour, less all discounts. At least two hours must be ordered at any one time.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 19 JANUARY 1960

HCO Secs
Assn Secs

CASUALTIES
(not confidential)

There are a few casualties along the line of getting off overts, and by my telling you about them, you may be able to prevent others and to better understand what is going on.

Only about eight people have “run for the brush” to date because of an unwillingness to reveal their overts against Scientology. There may be a few more but the data is not to hand. The overwhelming majority of Scientologists have embraced these new techniques and measures with enthusiasm.

Factually, those that blew were not in possession of much data on overts. I feel that if they had been they would have stood up to it.

In early November I ordered all organizations to give an E-Meter check on all staffs preliminary to auditing these on the new overt/withhold—responsibility combination. I also forbade Central Orgs to employ persons with hidden social crimes that might be used to hurt Scientology (blackmail) until expiation could be accomplished and auditing completed.

This began by suspending one Doug Moon in HASI Melbourne until he had been cleared since he was such a social liability.

Almost instantly on receipt of the E-Meter check order Iain Thompson in HASI London, long-time friend of Moon, unexpectedly resigned and caused Kaye Thompson to resign from HCO WW.

All that had happened at Saint Hill up to that moment was my release of casual non-Scientology personnel and a liquor stealing butler before I left for Australia so Mary Sue could carry on more easily.

The day I returned to Saint Hill Norma Webb, a Peter Stumbke and another non-Scientologist named Dinah Day resigned and ran away.

On November 23rd at the urgings of Nina West, close friend of Webb, Nibs Hubbard deserted his post in Washington and left no forwarding address. It transpires that he had been caught up in the Moon—Webb—West connections. He tried to find nerve to face an E-Meter the Saturday he left but did not report for his scheduled session with his Washington auditor on that day. He has since been heard of here and there borrowing money and staying out of sight.

The registrar in Melbourne subsequently left before she could be put on a meter.

The only action taken concerning these people is suspension or cancellation of certificates pending E-Meter checks and clearing of overts against Scientology. None except Moon were dismissed, but they have been heard to say that they were. They resigned without notice to me.

Any Scientologist encountering any of these personnel would do all of us a favour by getting them on a Meter and getting their overts against us off and reporting having done so to HCO WW.

If any further blows occur as a result of present know-how, the same procedure will be followed.

As Nibs Hubbard was probably being blackmailed it is creditable that he removed himself from post before he could be made to harm the Washington Organization.

LRH js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 21 JANUARY AD10

Fran Hldrs
HCO Secs
Assn Secs
HCO and HASI Staffs

JUSTIFICATION

When a person has committed an overt act and then withholds it, he or she usually employs the social mechanism of justification.

We have all heard people attempt to justify their actions and all of us have known instinctively that justification was tantamount to a confession of guilt. But not until now have we understood the exact mechanism behind justification.

Short of Scientology Auditing there was no means by which a person could relieve himself of consciousness of having done an overt act except to try to *lessen the overt*.

Some churches used a mechanism of confession. This was a limited effort to relieve a person of the pressure of his overt acts. Later the mechanism of confession was employed as a kind of blackmail by which increased contribution could be obtained from the person confessing. Factually this is a limited mechanism to such an extent that it can be extremely dangerous. Religious confession does not carry with it any real stress of responsibility for the individual but on the contrary seeks to lay responsibility at the door of the Divinity—a sort of blasphemy in itself. I have no axe to grind here with religion. Religion as religion is fairly natural. But psychotherapy must be in itself a completed fact or, as we all know, it can become a dangerous fact. That's why we flatten engrams and processes. Confession to be non-dangerous and effective must be accompanied by a full acceptance of responsibility. All overt acts are the product of irresponsibility on one or more of the dynamics.

Withholds are a sort of overt act in themselves but have a different source. Oddly enough we have just proven conclusively that man is basically good—a fact which flies in the teeth of old religious beliefs that man is basically evil. Man is good to such an extent that when he realizes he is being very dangerous and in error he seeks to minimize his power and if that doesn't work and he still finds himself committing overt acts he then seeks to dispose of himself either by leaving or by getting caught and executed. Without this computation Police would be powerless to detect crime—the criminal always assists himself to be caught. Why Police punish the caught criminal is the mystery. The caught criminal wants to be rendered less harmful to the society and wants rehabilitation. Well, if this is true then why does he not unburden himself? The fact is this: unburdening is considered by him to be an overt act. People withhold overt acts because they conceive that telling them would be another overt act. It is as though Thetans are trying to absorb and hold out of sight all the evil of the world. This is wrong-headed, by withholding overt acts these are kept afloat in the universe and are themselves as withholds entirely the cause of continued evil. Man is basically good but he could not attain expression of this until now. Nobody but the individual could die for his own sins—to arrange things otherwise was to keep man in chains.

In view of these mechanisms, when the burden became too great man was driven to another mechanism—the effort to lessen the size and pressure of the overt. He or she could only do this by attempting to reduce the size and repute of the terminal. Hence, not-ness. Hence when a man or a woman has done an overt act there usually follows an effort to reduce the goodness or importance of the target of the overt. Hence the husband who betrays his wife must then state that the wife was no good in some way. Thus the wife who betrayed her husband had to reduce the husband to reduce the overt. This works on all dynamics. In this light most criticism is justification of having done an overt.

This does not say that all things are right and that no criticism anywhere is ever merited. Man is not happy. He is faced with total destruction unless we toughen up our postulates. And the overt act mechanism is simply a sordid game condition man has slipped into without knowing where he was going. So there are rightnesses and wrongnesses in conduct and society and life at large, but random, carping criticism when not borne out in fact is only an effort to reduce the size of the target of the overt so that one can live (he hopes) with the overt. Of course to criticise unjustly and lower repute is itself an overt act and so this mechanism is not in fact workable.

Here we have the source of the dwindling spiral. One commits overt acts unwittingly. He seeks to justify them by finding fault or displacing blame. This leads him into further overt acts against the same terminals which leads to a degradation of himself and sometimes those terminals.

Scientologists have been completely right in objecting to the idea of punishment. Punishment is just another worsening of the overt sequence and degrades the punisher. But people who are guilty of overt acts demand punishment. They use it to help restrain themselves from (they hope) further violation of the dynamics. It is the victim who demands punishment and it is a wrong-headed society that awards it. People get right down and beg to be executed. And when you don't oblige, the woman scorned is sweet-tempered by comparison. I ought to know—I have more people try to elect me an executioner than you would care to imagine. And many a preclear who sits down in your pc chair for a session is there just to be executed and when you insist on making such a pc better, why you've had it, for they start on this desire for execution as a new overt chain and seek to justify it by telling people you're a bad auditor.

When you hear scathing and brutal criticism of someone which sounds just a bit strained, know that you have your eye on overt acts against that criticised person and next chance you get pull the overt acts and remove just that much evil from the world.

And remember, by and by, that if you make your pc write these overt acts and withholds down and sign them and send them off to me he'll be less reluctant to hold on to the shreds of them—it makes for a further blow of overt acts and less blow of pc. And always run responsibility on a pc when he unloads a lot of overt acts or just one.

We have our hands here on the mechanism that makes this a crazy universe so let's go for broke on it and play it all the way out.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 21 JANUARY 1960

BPI
Franchise Hldrs

RESPONSIBILITY

Responsibility is often misdefined by the pc.

The definition for auditing of responsibility is “Admit causing,” “able to withhold.” Usable commands would be “What about a (terminal) could you admit causing?” “What could you withhold from a (terminal)?” “What could you admit causing?”

Responsibility as a word can still be used as itself in an auditing command.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.cden
Copyright ©1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HCO BULLETIN OF 24 JANUARY 1960

All Staff Members

OT PROCEDURE

I have tested and released a new OT procedure for your use on Staff Clearing Course, in the HGC and in your own co-auditing which I know will give you theta clears in a relatively short time.

I am well embarked on a program now for the UK to release this new material.

We can get one theta clear a month off the HGC.

We can work successfully toward the goal of having nothing but theta clears on staff.

The Washington Congress blew the lid off in the US. People finishing the HCS Course there are fanning out all over the country giving non-certificate courses to old auditors by sweeping demands from the field.

The new PE program is also working wonders. It omits the Comm Course and puts people straight from the PE into the Co-audit, and there runs—"What could you admit causing a person?" "What could you withhold from a person?" This is advocated now for HASI London.

We are getting together a UK Congress that gives the Washington Congress over again and which is rigged to succeed as a Tape Congress.

To begin this decade of 1960's we are well away from the mark and have the majority of the countries with us. We now have to make a hard push on the UK to get things wheeling like we mean it.

I thank you for your forbearance and hard work, and can assure you that it is all in the direction of the biggest win man has ever had.

This one we are going to make.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:rf.nm
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HCO BULLETIN OF 25 JANUARY 1960

Cent Orgs

**OT-3 PROCEDURE
HGC ALLOWED PROCESSES**

This bulletin supersedes all previous bulletins.

Any case that cannot adequately define simple words like "change", "problem", "responsibility": run CCHs 1, 2, 3, 4, as per their earliest bulletins.

STEP ONE:

Rudiments:

Check for present time problem. Run by any good method. Check for ARC breaks with auditor and environment. Erase by any effective method. Set goals for session when PT problem and ARC breaks handled.

Establish rudiments at the beginning of each session. Re-establish rudiments if pc goes out of session. Check over what pc got towards his goals at session end.

STEP TWO:

Scout for present life overts and withholds. If found, run "What about that incident could you be responsible for?" (see note on "responsible"). Flatten off all present life overt/withholds and zones of irresponsibility (high or low needle).

This should bring the needle into quietness and the tone arm down to clear reading for the pc's sex.

On a low tone arm case, particularly below two, find any terminal that dips the needle, however slightly, and run withhold on that terminal: "What could you withhold from a ____?"

"What could you make (terminal) contribute?" run alternately with "What would you rather not contribute to (terminal)?" has also made a low tone arm rise. S-C-S and CCHs have also done so. The low tone arm is supposed to be the tougher one. Actually it's the valence of a mindless object and the last resort of the pc to withhold, so rehabilitating withhold cleverly should get it easily.

STEP THREE:

Clear the pc's field with responsibility as per recent HCO Bulletin on black, invisible or dub-in cases. When pc sees pictures of PT then go at case in general.

STEP FOUR:

Run "What about a victim could you be responsible for?" until the tone arm tends to read at clear reading for sex in this lifetime.

Whenever the pc encounters an incident that seems very sticky, which is to say when the picture sticks many commands by the E-Meter, spot the time in terms of years ago and down to the month and day. When the incident is spotted, if it continues to hang up run it as an incident with this command: "What about that incident could you be responsible for?" and, as needful, on a two way comm basis, and by any process as needed get off its overts and withholds and "Who would it make feel guilty?"

When any incident is reasonably flat continue with "What about a victim could you be responsible for?"

This does not mean that you spot and run every incident encountered. Spot and run only those that stick.

STEP FIVE:

Explore the immediate past lifetime or lifetimes of the pc. Get the pc's identity and form (sometimes they were animals), and if lifetime alters position of tone arm, run "What about (name) would you be willing to be?" "What about (name) would you rather not be?"

Do this until incident is flat. If heavy engrams in such a lifetime stick, run "What about that incident could you be responsible for?"

STEP SIX:

Run down any famous or enduring identities of the pc on the whole track, and handle as above.

Ease off this with responsibility as a victim.

STEP SEVEN:

Do a dynamic assessment on the pc and locate any terminal that drops, and run on this "What could you withhold from a ___?" until pc can withhold.

If any severe incident turns up flatten with responsibility.

STEP EIGHT:

Any chronic somatic or disability of the pc, if still not located, should be tackled with "What about that (name it) could you be responsible for?" and untangle the resulting pictures by placing them in time and running responsibility on any that stick hard.

STEP NINE:

Flatten once more responsibility on a victim.

STEP TEN:

Rehabilitate the pc's ability to withhold by running cause-withhold version of responsibility (see note below) on all dynamics with various terminals.

Cautions: Until some responsibility is run on some cases no present life overts show up. Responsibility is the key to high and low tone arms, not overts. Handle any severe overts that turn up on a case with responsibility process.

Do not run a mass-less terminal such as "sex" or "help". Find instead some actual terminal, not a significance.

Beware running adjectival commands such as "frigid woman" or "a little boy with a mole under his left grind". Run instead the plainest terminal that drops.

Do not run things that are not real to the pc as he has made them unreal to lessen the overt. Instead run lots of overt finding processes such as "What could you admit causing a (terminal real to pc)?" alternated with "What could you withhold from a (same terminal)?"

Much of the material here is on the Washington 1960 HCS tapes. But this rundown here is to be followed in the event of any conflict of procedure.

IMPORTANT NOTE: WHERE RESPONSIBILITY IS USED ABOVE IT CAN ALSO READ "WHAT COULD YOU ADMIT CAUSING (TERMINAL)?" "WHAT COULD YOU WITHHOLD FROM (TERMINAL)?" THIS ALTERNATE COMMAND IS A BETTER PROCESS THAN "WHAT ABOUT (TERMINAL) COULD YOU BE RESPONSIBLE FOR?"

Note: Usage of this rundown should be taught on staff theta clearing courses.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd

Copyright © 1960

by L. Ron Hubbard

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[Superseded by HCO B 3 March 1960, *OT-3A Procedure—HGC Allowed Processes*, page 48.]

HCO Secs
Assn Secs
Fran Hldrs

THE KEY TO ALL CASES—RESPONSIBILITY

During the past three months I have made several important discoveries in the field of the human mind which iron out the bits and pieces that were getting in our road in making broad clearing programmes possible.

First of these was the discovery that the *tone arm* of the E-Meter rather than the needle was foremost in analysing the case. When the tone arm reads at three for males and two for females on the modern meter a process can be considered flat. Aside from various special states such as valence shifts, this will hold true. When the tone arm reads at clear for the person's sex no matter what one attempts to restimulate on the case you have a *clear*. Additionally the hot areas of the time track are located because they throw the tone arm to higher or lower readings. Good auditing today cannot be done without an E-Meter of good reliable quality as distributed by HCO WW in the UK and by Wingate Enterprises in the United States. It could be said that the E-Meter has just now become an absolute necessity in auditing and general analysis—using the E-Meter RIGHT we can achieve clears.

Next, but not next in importance was the discovery of the anatomy of RESPONSIBILITY. Although Responsibility has been known as a case factor since 1951 (just as the overt-motivator sequence has been) it has not been until now that I have been able to get it to run well on cases.

Responsibility is a significance. Pcs define it in various ways. And all rather tend to run from it. Pcs in general pretend they would much rather be victims than causative sources—which is what is wrong with their cases. In order to get responsibility to run I had to find out a lot more about it and not until the very end of 1959 was I able to define it in any way that made it run and come into being on a case.

Now I mentioned the E-Meter first in this because it is RESPONSIBILITY—LEVEL OF which causes the tone arm of the E-Meter to fluctuate. Place the pc in an area which has a very high tone arm reading or a very low one and you find the pc in an area in time when he was being very irresponsible.

It is not always true that a pc picked up as reading at the clear reading of his sex is high on responsibility. There is an inversion of the matter where the pc is so very low on responsibility that he just gets a body reading for his sex and that is that. The test of this is the running of responsibility, as given in this bulletin. If the pc, run on responsibility, changes the position of the tone arm from the clear reading then that pc has a very long way to go perhaps before he can achieve any responsibility. If a pc is run on responsibility as given herein, if his track is explored, and if the tone arm reads and continues to read at clear then he is very responsible and very clear. But you would have to run the pc a bit not just read him on the meter in order to get an accurate view of the matter. In other words, don't look for overts to check out on a case. Look for tone arm fluctuations when responsibility is run. *It takes at least a certain level of responsibility to show up overt acts on E-Meter.*

What exactly does the E-Meter read? It reads the degree of mental mass surrounding the thetan in a body.

A thetan accumulates mental mass, pictures, ridges, circuits, etc, to the degree that he misassigns responsibility. If he does something and then says that it was done

by something or someone else then he has failed to assign cause rightly and, doing so, he is of course left with an apparently uncaused mental mass. This to us is the “bank”. To Freud it was the “unconscious”. To the psychiatrist it is lunacy. He therefore has as much bank as he has denied cause. As he is the only cause that could hang himself with a mass, the only misassigned cause therefore is self cause. Other people’s causation is not aberrative and does not hang up except to the degree that the pc is provoked to misassigning cause. Other people’s cause is therefore never audited.

Here then we have the anatomy of the reactive mind. The common denominator of all these unwanted ridges, masses, pictures, engrams, etc, is RESPONSIBILITY.

The discovery of the direct anatomy of RESPONSIBILITY is as follows:

Able to admit causation.

Able to withhold from.

This you will recognize as old reach and withdraw and as the fundamental of every successful process. But now we can refine this into the exact process that accomplishes a removal of the reactive mind and re-establishment of causation and responsibility.

A thetan will not restore his own ability until he is certain he can withhold from things. When he finds he cannot then he reduces his own power. He will not let himself be more powerful than he believes he can use power. When he gets mad he of course can control nothing, neither can he really direct anything. When he causes something that he thinks is bad, he next seeks to withhold. If he cannot withhold then he begins to compulsively cause things that are bad and you have overt acts happening.

What we call responsibility is restored on any subject or in any case by selecting a terminal (not a significance) and running on it:

WHAT COULD YOU ADMIT CAUSING A (TERMINAL)? THINK OF SOMETHING YOU COULD WITHHOLD FROM A (TERMINAL).

Overt acts proceed from *irresponsibility*. Therefore when responsibility declines, overt acts can occur. When responsibility declines to zero then a person doing overt acts no longer conceives them to be overt acts and **YOU DO NOT EVEN GET A WIGGLE ON THE E-METER NEEDLE** when looking for overts and withholds on such a case. Thus some criminals would not register on overts at all even though they had the loot in their pockets! And it is often necessary on any case to run cause/withhold on present life terminals as given above before the person can conceive of having committed any overts against those terminals.

THIS IS VERY IMPORTANT: No case will run well and many cases will not run at all with present life overts and withholds undisclosed and unflattened. These overts and withholds may not even come into view **UNTIL THE VERSION OF RESPONSIBILITY GIVEN HEREIN IS LIBERALLY RUN ON THE CASE.** Choose any area where the pc conceives himself to be a victim. Select a terminal to represent that area that falls on an E-Meter. Run cause/withhold as given herein on that terminal and watch the overts pop into view. It is not necessary to handle these overts when they come up with any other process than cause/withhold since cause/ withhold given here is responsibility.

There are other factors on cases that need handling but these are all handled with responsibility processes. If all the factors involved in a case are well handled as given herein you will have a theta clear who will be able to do a lot of things humans can’t do. And if you handled a case totally with this material and its specialized skills then you would have an Operating Thetan. Fortunately for this universe no thetan will let himself go free unless he can operate without danger to others and the responsibility factor is way up on all dynamics.

This material is covered in tape lectures from the Washington January Congress 1960 (nine hours) and in the HCS Course lectures, Washington, January 1960 (nine hours). The Congress, which was very warmly received in Washington, is being replayed in many areas by public demand and the HCS Course is being given as the HCS/BScn Course in all Central Organizations.

This is the major breakthrough we are starting the 1960s with. We are counting on HGCs turning out theta clears at regular intervals and we are working to get all staffs of Central Organizations through to theta clear on Staff Clearing Courses.

This material is also being used on PE Courses which now should run as follows: One week PE Course with TR demonstrations, this free. People pass from this course directly into Co-Audit (no Comm Course) at a fee, on the following process: "What could you admit causing a person?" "What could you withhold from a person?" Terminals other than "person" may be selected by the Co-Audit Instructor. A full intensive given by HGCs on the basis of OT-3 Procedure is sufficiently in advance of this to make individual auditing necessary in most cases. OT-3 has been released to all Central Orgs who have the Washington HCS tapes. The CCHs are used on cases incapable of defining terms.

In view of this material and what is now known of responsibility and overts and what they do to case level, a new kind of justice comes into being, making it completely unnecessary to punish. You can know a person by his case level. Does it advance or doesn't it? Does he elect others ogres when he himself has been doing things or does he show Scientology in himself?

This is a brand new look and it can be made a brand new earth. We started the 1960s the right way as I think you will discover.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

BPI

THE CO-AUDIT TEAM

The running of a co-audit team as done on a staff theta clearing course, as done on staff and at home by Scientologists, can be either a very trying and unsuccessful activity or it can be a wonderful success, depending on whether it is done wrong or right. A fine example of this is the old time inability of a large percentage of husband-wife teams to succeed. But even a husband-wife co-audit team can succeed these days and come out clear if they follow the rules laid down in this bulletin.

Co-audit teams fail not because either partner is unwilling but because they dive into the deep without preparing the weather in advance.

The first requisite of any co-audit team is to thoroughly prepare the auditing climate and keep it repaired. This is true of any new team, no matter what either member of it did on any old team.

Therefore co-audit procedure must do the following before any cases are tackled:

Audit alternate sessions (not alternate intensives).
Run as the first process to be flattened:

“What have you done to me?”
“What have you withheld from me?”

and they run this every time the ARC breaks stack up.

Assess the case with an E-Meter as to whether Dianetics and Scientology on one hand or the sex of the auditor on the other hand get the biggest fall on the meter or change on the tone arm.

This action determines whether Dianetics and Scientology or the sex of the auditor get run first. They are both to be run. All we want to determine is which to run ahead of the other.

Find one or more terminals that represent Dianetics and Scientology. Run each (the one with the biggest meter reaction ahead of the rest) on “What have you done to (terminal)?” “What have you withheld from (terminal)?” Run them all. Run only until each one is relatively flat and only as long as the pc has ready answers. Check them all over again.

Running the sex of the auditor must also be done. If the auditor is a woman then run “What have you done to a woman?” “What have you withheld from a woman?” If the sex of the auditor is male then run “What have you done to a man?” “What have you withheld from a man?”

All the above must be clean as a whistle before one tackles a case. So making sure of the above, no matter how many hours it’s devouring, will give wins all the way.

Every session one handles all the rudiments.

“Is it alright to be audited by me?”
If not let’s get into O/W again and clean up Dianetics and Scientology again.

“Is it alright to be audited in this new environment?”

If not, get off the overts and withholds on the environment—finding some terminal that represents it as a general terminal.

“Do you have a present time problem?”

If so get it out of the road by two-way comm if possible, picking up the overts and withholds and guilt on the terminals involved. But don't handle PTPs endlessly and skip other auditing.

“What goal would you like to set for this session?”

Buy the goal the pc sets so long as it's real to him. Don't force pc into the auditor's goals or goals unreal to pc.

When one gets down to the pc's case the auditor does a dynamic assessment and finds where the tone arm is moved by one or another of the dynamics. If the tone arm (not the needle) is moved by a dynamic, then using the needle motion, find the hottest terminal that represents that dynamic and run overt/withhold on that terminal. When this is flat, do another whole dynamic assessment. Find a terminal that represents that dynamic and run it. And so on. Always use general rather than particular terminals. Avoid adjectival commands. Never run a significance. A terminal is flat when overt/withhold no longer moves the tone arm around and the needle is not stuck. The tone arm does not have to be reading at clear for the pc's sex if the terminal is flat—it must only be that the terminal no longer influences the tone arm and doesn't drop the needle when mentioned.

When the pc reads more or less constantly at clear reading for his sex after doing all the above, then finish the case off with “What have you done to yourself?” “What have you withheld from yourself?”

And now get this: In co-auditing there are greater strains than professional auditing. Therefore havingness problems arise. So make it a rule that for every two hours of auditing on rudiments or O/W or anything else (which I hope not), run *one half hour of objective havingness* with the following single command “Look around here and find something you could have.”

I am at the present moment working on more co-auditing manual material, but it won't be ready for quite a while and it contains more or less what you find shorthanded above. If one of the co-auditors has no HPA or HCA it's worthwhile to get training before co-auditing.

I am giving you this in the interest of making clears. I have piloted this out as probably the only safe procedure for everyone available in present technology. These are both the fastest processes and least liability. The above regimen is not just pretty good. It's a winner. But if you go running engrams or assuming the pc likes womankind or etc, etc, etc, or if you plunge into the case without clearing up the idea of auditing and sessions you are in for trouble, co-audit or professional.

Now let's see some more clears around here.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 3 FEBRUARY 1960

Sthil

SECURITY CHECK

In keeping with policy carried out by all Central Organizations, an E-Meter check will be made on all new and existing staff at Saint Hill.

An E-Meter is better known as a "lie-detector" and is used to ascertain truth of background and conduct.

The following points will be covered by the examiner:

- Any criminal background
- Any Communist or subversive connection
- Spreading of slander concerning Saint Hill or its people
- Discouraging new employees by malicious lies
- Receipt of commissions on purchases for Saint Hill
- Overts against Doctor or Mrs. Hubbard.

No staff at Saint Hill are exempt.

No suspicion is necessarily attached to any person at Saint Hill. This is a security check. It is an effort to clear the air.

The test will be administered by Robin Harper, Technical Secretary, and any undesirable results will be rechecked by Mrs. Hubbard.

L. RON HUBBARD

Fran Hldrs
HCO Secs
Assn Secs

THEORY OF RESPONSIBILITY PROCESSING

In order to make up one's mind to be responsible for things it is necessary to get over the idea that one is being forced into responsibility.

The power of choice is still senior to responsibility. What one does against his will operates as an overt act against oneself. But where one's will to do has deteriorated to unwillingness to do anything, lack of will is itself an aberration.

Variations in the reactions of pcs to responsibility processes stem from the pc's belief that his power of choice is being or has been overthrown. Where an auditor has a pc balking against a responsibility process, the pc has conceived that the auditor is forcing responsibility on the pc and very little good comes of the session.

There is nothing wrong, basically, with doingness. But where one is doing something he is unwilling to do, aberration results. One does, in such a case, while unwilling to do. The result is doingness without responsibility.

In the decline of any state into slavery as in Greece, or into economic strangulation of the individual as in our modern western society, doingness is more and more enforced and willingness to do is less and less in evidence. At length people are doing without being responsible. From this results bad workmanship, crime, indigence and its necessities for welfarism. At length there are so many people who are unwilling to do that the few left have to take full burden of the society upon their backs. Where high unwillingness to do exists, democracy is then impossible, for it but votes for the biggest handout.

Where high unwillingness to do exists then we have a constant restimulation of all the things one is really unwilling to do such as overt acts. Forcing people who do not want to work to yet work restimulates the mechanism of overt acts with, thereby, higher and higher crime ratio, more and more strikes and less and less understanding of what it is all about.

The individual who has done something *bad* that he was not willing to do then identifies anything he does with any unwillingness to do—when of course he has done this many times. Therefore all doingness becomes bad. Dancing becomes bad. Playing games becomes bad. Even eating and procreation become bad. And all because unwillingness to do something bad has evolved and identified into unwillingness to do.

The person who has done something bad restrains himself by withholding doingness in that direction. When at length he conceives he has done many many bad things, he becomes a total withhold. As you process him you encounter the recurring phenomenon of his realization that he has not been as bad as he thought he was. And that's the wonderful part of it. People are never as bad as they think they are—and certainly other people are never as bad as one thinks they have been.

The basic wonder is that people police themselves. Out of a concept of good they conceive themselves to be bad, and after that seek every way they can to protect others from self. A person does this by reducing his own ability. He does it by reducing his own activity. He does this by reducing his own knowingness.

Where you see a thetan who sleeps too much and does too little, where you see a person who conceives bad doingness on every hand, you see a person who is safeguarding others from the badness of himself or herself.

Now there is another extreme. A person who must do because of economic or other whips, and yet because of his own concept of his own badness dares not do, is liable to become criminal. Such a person's only answer to doingness is to do without

taking any responsibility and this, when you examine the dynamics, falls easily into a pattern of dramatized overt acts. Here you have a body that is not being controlled, where most knowledge is obscured and where responsibility for others or even self is lacking. It is an easy step from criminality to insanity, if indeed there is any step at all. Such people cannot be policed since being policed admits of some obedience. Lacking control there is no ability to obey, and so they wind up simply hating police and that is that.

Only when economic grips are so tight or political pressure is so great as it is in Russia do we get high criminality and neurotic or psychotic indexes. Whenever doing is accompanied by no will to do, irresponsibility for one's own acts can result.

Basically, then, when one is processing a pc, one is seeking to rehabilitate a willingness to do. In order to accomplish this one must rehabilitate the ability to withhold on the pc's own determinism (not by punishment) further bad actions. Only then will the pc be willing to recover from anything wrong with the pc—since anything wrong with the pc is self-imposed in order to prevent wrongdoing at some past time.

All types of responsibility processes have this as their goal: to rehabilitate the willingness to do and the ability to withhold on one's own determinism.

Restraint in doing something one knows he should do is a secondary deterrent but comes with other offshoots of responsibility into the cognition area.

Thus we have a formula of attack on any given area where the pc cannot do, is having trouble or cannot take responsibility: (a) Locate the area. (b) Find a terminal to represent it. (c) Find what the pc has done to that terminal that he thinks he should have withheld. (d) Reduce all such incidents.

In short all we have to do to rehabilitate any case is find an area where the terminal is still real to the preclear and then get rid of what he has done and withheld, and we come up with an improved responsibility.

Of all the responsibility processes, the oldest one I developed is still the best one by test and that is:

“What have you done to a (terminal)?”
“What have you withheld from a (terminal)?”

The processing results depend in large part on the accuracy of assessment, on the willingness of the auditor to process the pc and upon running the process as flat as it will go before finding another terminal.

Assessment accuracy depends upon skilled use of the E-Meter. Dynamic Straight Wire is best, and a weather eye upon the tone arm to see what terminal varies it, once one has the dynamic and from that has selected a terminal.

The willingness of the auditor to process the pc depends upon the confidence of the auditor to obtain results—and this is established by deletion of things the auditor has done to pcs and withheld from pcs in general and this pc in particular. Thus co-audit teams would be right always if they took each other as the terminals to be run first, get these pretty flat (and keep them flat during processing with “What have you done to me?” “What have you withheld from me?”), then as the next thing to do run the sex of the auditor off the pc, then clean up Dianetics or Scientology (or use this as step two). And only then go into “case”. That would be a pretty fine co-audit team after they have survived the first explosions and gotten them gone.

Then in searching out areas to run as a case, care should be taken not to over-run a terminal or under-run one. A pc running out of answers can get very restless.

Responsibility *can* be rehabilitated on any case and when it has been you have a clear and that's all there is to it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd
Copyright ©1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

CenO

OVERT MANIFESTATIONS ON A LOW TONED CASE

Every high scale manifestation or activity has a low scale mockery:

There can be an apparent clear reading on a case that has never been successfully audited. This case is too low toned to register at all as a thetan. The resulting read is therefore that of the body minus a bank. No overts will show up on the needle of this case.

Only when responsibility has been run does this case shift off the low reading and get different tone arm and needle responses.

Such a case is fairly easy to recognize. The case has obvious areas of great irresponsibility and yet reads like a clear. But once you scout out the case this state of affairs becomes upset and the case reads otherwise, and then eventually comes back after an awful lot of sessions and intensives into the clear range and stays there. But now the case is able where it was before very apathetic and really useless.

Any clear check out must include the following exercise and indeed this is the process which gets these low level cases really cracking. This is both a clear examination and a good entrance to cases. It is also the best way to check out overts when in doubt.

You run on the E-Meter a dynamic assessment and pick up any dynamic that gives a change of needle pattern, or take any dynamic which makes needle drop no matter how slightly.

Having located the dynamic we now ask the pc for any terminal he or she thinks would represent that dynamic. We take any terminal that has any drop on it as given or suggested by the pc.

On this terminal we now run overt/withhold as follows:

“What have you done to a (terminal)?”
“What have you withheld from a (terminal)?”

This was the terminal realest to the pc, therefore when responsibility is increased on it you have generally increased responsibility.

When we have flattened this off mildly we go through the whole operation above again.

Before we have done this many times overts will begin to show up on the case and will be recognized by the pc.

Doing this well just once unsettles the false clear reading and that reading will not return until the case is actually cleared.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.mw.cden
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 8 FEBRUARY 1960

MA
Sthil
Assn Secs
HCO Secs
Fran Holders

HONEST PEOPLE HAVE RIGHTS, TOO

After you have achieved a high level of ability you will be the first to insist upon your rights to live with honest people.

When you know the technology of the mind you know that it is a mistake to use “individual rights” and “freedom” as arguments to protect those who would only destroy.

Individual rights were not originated to protect criminals but to bring freedom to honest men. Into this area of protection then dived those who needed “freedom” and “individual liberty” to cover their own questionable activities.

Freedom is for honest people. No man who is not himself honest can be free—he is in his own trap. When his own deeds cannot be disclosed then he is a prisoner; he must withhold himself from his fellows and he is a slave to his own conscience. Freedom must be deserved before there is any freedom possible.

To protect dishonest people is to condemn them to their own hells. By making “individual rights” a synonym for “protect the criminal” one helps to bring about a slave state for all; for where “individual liberty” is abused, an impatience with it arises which at length sweeps us all away. The targets of all disciplinary laws are the few who err. Such laws unfortunately also injure and restrict those who do not err. If all were honest there would be no disciplinary threats.

There is only one way out for a dishonest person—facing up to his responsibilities in the society and putting himself back into communication with his fellow man, his family, the world at large. By seeking to invoke his “individual rights” to protect himself from an examination of his deeds, he reduces just that much the future of individual liberty, for he himself is not free. Yet he infects others who are honest by using *their* rights to freedom to protect himself.

Uneasy lies the head that wears a guilty conscience.

And it will lie no more easily by seeking to protect misdeeds by pleas of “freedom means that you must never look at me”. The right of a person to survive is directly related to his honesty.

Freedom for man does not mean freedom to injure man. Freedom of speech does not mean freedom to harm by lies.

Man cannot be free while there are those amongst him who are slaves to their own terrors.

The mission of a techno-space society is to subordinate the individual and control him, by economic and political duress. The only casualty in a machine age is the individual and his freedom.

To preserve that freedom one must not permit men to hide their evil intentions under the protection of that freedom. To be free a man must be honest with himself and with his fellows.

If a man uses his own honesty to protect the unmasking of dishonesty, then that man is an enemy of his own freedom.

We can stand in the sun only so long as we don't let the deeds of others bring the darkness.

Freedom is for honest men. Individual liberty exists only for those who have the ability to be free.

Today in Scientology we know the gaoler—the person himself. And we can restore the right to stand in the sun by eradicating the evil men do to themselves.

So do not say that the investigation of a person or the past is a step forward to slavery. For in Scientology such a step is the first step toward freeing a man from the guilt of self.

Were it the intention of the Scientologist to punish the guilty, then and only then would a look into the past of another be wrong.

But we are not the police. Our look is the first step toward unlocking the doors—for they are all barred from *within*.

Who would punish when he could salvage?

Only a madman would break a wanted object he could repair—and we are not mad.

The individual must not die in this machine age—rights or no rights. The criminal and the madman must not triumph with their new-found tools of destruction.

The least free person is the person who cannot reveal his own acts and who protests the revelation of the improper acts of others. On such people will be built a future political slavery where we all have numbers—and our guilt—unless we act.

It is fascinating that blackmail and punishment are the keynotes of all dark operations. What would happen if these two commodities no longer existed? What would happen if all men were free enough to speak? Then and only then would you have freedom.

On the day when we can fully trust each other, there will be peace on Earth.

Don't stand in the road of that freedom. Be free, yourself.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 8 FEBRUARY 1960

Sthil

THE REPUTATION OF SAINT HILL

During the war it was often stated that "a loose lip could sink a ship". Today this applies to Saint Hill. Irresponsible statements in East Grinstead concerning Saint Hill could injure our relations with the town.

Here are *some facts* we would be happy to let anyone know:

Saint Hill releases into East Grinstead some £2,000 every month in new money through merchants and in wages as well as other ways. All of this money comes from outside England and the economy of East Grinstead receives the full benefit of it. If the status of Saint Hill were altered this machine would be denied East Grinstead and its people.

There are no unpaid bills.

No person who did his job well and who caused no trouble has been dismissed at Saint Hill. The staff turnover in the garden and the house has been incidental to any new establishment seeking to settle down with the best possible staff. My basic staff policy is responsible for the turnover. I will not compromise with poor work and I will not drive bad workers into working. I ease them off or they leave.

Some discoveries of considerable interest to horticulture have been made at Saint Hill. All this research is private and its findings are given away without charge. Several of our experiments have now been repeated and accepted by U.S. laboratories.

Several advances in the understanding of the human mind have been made at Saint Hill. Saint Hill has been on National Television several times.

Sometime this year outside lighting of the Manor House will be installed.

Saint Hill Manor is the best example of Sussex sandstone structure in existence. It was completed in 1733.

Saint Hill has only had a half dozen owners in all that time. It will be continued in its original status as a Manor House. Amongst the owners are:

The Crawfords (the Sussex iron family who built it),
Doctor Cruikshank (who did the more recent work on the grounds and pool),
Mr. Lasky (once the richest man in England),
Mrs. Biddle, the wife of the American Ambassador (who had the monkey room done and who modernized the baths),
The Maharajah of Jaipur who bought it for his wife (whose bell call boards we have left up).

Saint Hill has sent several members to parliament. We are currently putting tropical controlled climates into the glass houses.

We will complete the swimming pool this spring.

LRH:js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 8 FEBRUARY 1960

HCO Secs
Assoc Secs

SECURITY CHECKS

A letter written on HCO stationery and signed by the HCO Secretary should be given (or sent) to each person checked out successfully on an E-Meter security check. The text of this letter should be as follows:

“Dear.....

“I am pleased to inform you that you have passed a full security check which demonstrates conclusively your value and reliability on a responsible post.

(signature)”

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 9 FEBRUARY 1960

HCO Secs
Assoc Secs
HCO Board of Review

CANCELLATION OF CERTIFICATES

Nina West's certificates and awards in Scientology and Dianetics are hereby cancelled, due in part to evidence of use of PDH on Central Org Personnel.

She may apply for restoration after being thoroughly checked out on overts and withholds on Scientology, L. Ron Hubbard, Mary Sue Hubbard, Scientology Orgs, and related personnel, and after passing a security check.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 9 FEBRUARY 1960

HCOs
Central Orgs Post
But not London
Paying Fran Holders Only

RESEARCH ADVANCES

I wish to thank all HCOs and Central Orgs outside the United Kingdom for their financial support of existing research lines.

Much of the research advances I have made in the last few months were possible because:

1. The increasing self-determinism of HCOs and Central Organizations, as attested by their increasing size and income, has freed me from much administrative labour and worry, thus giving me more research time, and
2. Increasing financial support from HCOs and Central Organizations as well as some Franchise Holders, while not yet furnishing me all the needed facilities, has made it possible for me to extend research lines further and faster than they otherwise would have gone and has reduced and lightened the labour involved.

I wish to thank in particular all HCO Secretaries, all heads of Central Orgs, all HCO and Central Organizations' staffs for the splendid work they are doing and for the mainstay of research support. And I wish to thank those Franchise Holders who have contributed regularly to research and who are expanding Scientology throughout the World.

We are starting *this* decade right!

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 10 FEBRUARY 1960

CenOCon
Place 1 in each
British E-Meter

BRITISH E-METER OPERATION

(see diagram on following page)

To operate the British version of the Electrometer designed under my guidance by Fowler and Allen, a British instrument firm, the following steps must be done at the beginning of each session.

The instrument has a 5,000 ohm calibration knob (a) and switch (b) not present on the U.S. Meter.

Before (or after) plugging in the electrodes at (e), with the tone arm at "off", throw the 5,000 ohm switch (b) downwards from "off". Then turn the instrument on with the tone arm (c) and place the tone arm at 2.

Now move the otherwise unmarked calibration knob (a) left or right until the needle is exactly on "set" on the dial.

Then move the tone arm to the white dot (g) between 2 and 3. The needle should move over to "test". If it does the batteries are properly up (they last a year or more unless you carelessly leave the meter "on" for days when not in use).

Now click the 5,000 ohm switch (b) up to "off".

Hand the pc the electrodes.

Have the pc squeeze the electrodes. The needle should fall 1/3 of the dial or more. Shift the 1—16 sensitivity arm (d) up or down until the pc, squeezing the cans, *does*, on one squeeze, get a 3rd of a dial drop.

You are now ready to audit.

Keep the needle around the "set" mark. Keep the sensitivity low so that you only get significant readings (not breath or heart beat). Most pcs run around 1 on sensitivity on this meter which is very live. Sticky pcs have to have a higher sensitivity setting.

When finished with the session and the meter, turn the tone arm to "off" or your battery will wear out much faster.

Stow the cord to the electrodes inside the electrodes which are hollow. A little examination will show you how. Then stow the electrodes in the case and close it.

Use the U.S. E-Meter book for all other meter particulars.

If your meter ceases to function ship to Fowler and Allen, 39 Mackenzie Rd, Beckenham, Kent, at your postage expense. Enclose return postage. Unless due to carelessness or breakage, they will service and re-battery your meter. Opening the panel or changing the meter about inside voids the guarantee.

LRH:js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD




DIAGRAM OF E-METER

For use with HCO Bulletin of Feb. 10, 1960

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 10 FEBRUARY 1960
Issue II

CenO
BPI
HCO Boards of Review

RESTORATION OF CERTIFICATES

The certificates and awards of Nile Adams have been restored with apologies.

Investigation has disclosed that Nile, in attempting to assist the setting up and financing of Scientology Centres, became the target of a push to prevent such centres from being formed.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js. h
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Fran Hldrs
HCO Secs
Assn Secs
D of Ps
D of Ts
Staff Auditors

CREATE AND CONFRONT

The cycle of action (create, survive, destroy) and the communication formula (cause, distance, effect) with Axiom 10 (the highest purpose etc, creation of an effect) become identified in the mind with one another.

The preclear who is having a difficult time is on an inversion of the cycle of action (counter-create, counter-survive, counter-destroy).

Any preclear is somewhere on this cycle. The preclear who only gets death pictures or bad pictures is somewhere late on the cycle of action or late on an inversion cycle.

This preclear believes that every cause brings about a destruction.

Thus he falls out of communication, since any and all received communication will destroy him, he thinks.

All this is covered in the First Melbourne ACC Tapes and will probably not be covered to such a degree again. The Melbourne ACC Tapes are consecutive with the Philadelphia lecture series (fall 1952), and are a little out of the way of our present theory, but have a special place in know-how.

Out of this we now have an understanding of what a limited process is. Any process which makes the preclear create is a limited process and should be avoided. Such processes as "Tell a Lie" are creative processes.

The preclear has creation tangled up with cause and cause tangled up with the overt-motivator sequence. The thing that straightens all this out is any version of responsibility run with the pc at cause. Earlier the best we had to straighten this out was confront. Responsibility is confront and is very senior to confront as a process.

When a pc over-creates he accumulates the unconfronted debris. All you have to do to restimulate debris (stiffen up the bank) is to run the pc on some version of create process.

Havingness is a confront process and straightens out the create factor.

Havingness is the lowest version of responsibility; Confront is the next lowest; Overt-Withhold is the next; and at our present top for practical purposes is just plain responsibility. Actually all these are responsibility processes.

Create is bad only when one does not take responsibility for the creation.

The key process of all processes at this writing is being responsible for having been irresponsible.

There is a great deal of anatomy to responsibility. A great many answers lie waiting on its track. When one maligns another, he has not taken responsibility for the acts of that other person and so is separate from that other person.

One of the highest points of knowingness which is not at this time known is whether we are all one or if we are actually separate beings. Enough responsibility run achieves a subjective answer to this.

While several offshoots of this present technology are under test at this time it

can be said with certainty now that the best version of responsibility for most cases is:

“What have you done to a (terminal)?”
“What have you withheld from a (terminal)?”

It will be seen at once that what could you do to and what could you withhold from a terminal is a create process, and is therefore slightly limited and leaves debris. Thus it can be said with finality overt/withhold rather than cause/withhold is the best process.

In the presence of ARC breaks, havingness is a must on any responsibility process and is always a good preventive for flops. Don't forget havingness. We know now that it is the lowest rung of responsibility. This becomes evident when we examine the withhold aspects of havingness.

Plain ordinary “What could you be responsible for” is of course a very fine process and oddly enough often goes lower (for a short run) than overt/withhold. Responsibility isn't just a high level process. It works where it works.

It is interesting that while running pure raw responsibility in its non-create form (what have you been responsible for) we see anew the old know-to-mystery scale revealed.

Factual Havingness can be run in its trio form with good results:

“Look around here and find something you could have”
“Look around here and find something you would permit to continue”
“Look around here and find something you would let vanish”

The old restrictions and know-how of running this still apply.

“Look around here and find something you could have” is of course a wonderful process. And whenever you run an hour and a half of any other version of responsibility you had better run half an hour of “Look around here and find something you could have” and be on the safe side.

SUMMARY:

The data in this bulletin is far from merely theoretical. To some auditors it will come as an emergency super frantic hysterical rush item for they should shift over any version of responsibility they are running to the above versions.

Don't run any other version of overt/withhold than that given above. You can run responsibility as itself on any incident or terminal if the pc can take it. Run a half hour of havingness for every hour and a half of any responsibility subjective process.

NOTE:

Instead of the CCHs for that low low level case, why not get it going with havingness as above and then find any terminal that ticks on a meter and run O/W on that terminal. Then run more havingness. Then find another terminal that ticks and run O/W on that. Then run more havingness. And so on and on with the same pattern until you get the case shifted on the cycle of action and functional.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.cden
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Staff Auditors
Fran Hldrs
HCO Secs
Assn Secs

HOW TO RUN O/W AND RESPONSIBILITY

I have just yesterday finally sorted out the exact relation of overt/withhold and responsibility as they apply to life and to auditing and have pretty well wrapped up the optimum auditing commands: therefore I want to get this data off to you as fast as possible and get it in use as soon as possible because here again is an increase in auditing effectiveness over and above our existing successes. In the next bulletin up I want to give you a revised form of a model auditing session and after that procedure OT 3A. However you can use this following material right now and without those, and I recommend that you recognize what you have here as a modification which changes all earlier statements even if they seem to you slightly in conflict.

To begin: A person who does an overt act to another life form has already abandoned responsibility for that other life form. An overt act and a withhold are evidently expressions of abandoning responsibility already extant and are therefore a manifestation of irresponsibility.

Therefore, for the sake of auditing skill as well as theory, overts and withholds are the same as irresponsibility.

When running overts and withholds, according to the evidence now to hand, you are actually running irresponsibility off the case. You are taking away the lower inversion of responsibility.

The way to run an overt/withhold process is to choose a terminal with an E-Meter. Early in the case choose terminals that are specific and close to PT. When you have chosen the terminal by reason of its drop on the needle and its reality in the pc's life, you run on it the following:

“What have you done to a ___?”
“What have you withheld from a ___?”

When addressed to a specific terminal it is worded:

“What have you done to ___?”
“What have you withheld from ___?”

Now this may require up to thirty hours to flatten on some cases. But whatever you choose to do on a case then do that thing well. The tone arm may or may not go down on this process. But it will become very different. Try to end up the process with the tone arm lower than it was at the start. If the pc runs out of answers well that's it. Don't force him hard. Just go on to the second stage on the same terminal in a very generalized form.

By this time you have no more than discharged an irresponsibility and you have the responsibility all to handle. Indeed, according to the many cases I have now looked over, the tone arm may not even begin to come down properly or come up properly until the second stage is run and flattened.

The second stage process is responsibility. You take the same terminal you ran the O/W on and (if it was a specific form you now use a general form, i.e. O/W on your mother becomes responsibility on a mother) run as follows:

“What responsibility have you taken for a ____?”

This is the process which will bring the tone arm down or up, but only when the O/W is fully flattened first.

This above combination of processes is the fastest and surest main line of auditing procedure now known. The above commands are far and above the best proven commands.

As you can see the slightly older process “What could you admit doing to a ____?” and “What could you withhold from a ____?” are indeed manifestations of responsibility and factually are an index of responsibility. But when it comes right down to cases the above versions cover all cases and do it right.

What a lot there is to know about auditing today. Getting a combination of processes such as the above for the general handling of cases relieves us of the constant tension of what should I run and gives us time to concentrate on a perfection of running it extremely well.

An auditor ought to be adept at CCHs and running the above. He ought to be very sharp with an E-Meter and he ought to be able to run a model session with no blunders. This done equals clearing people.

There is no substitute for training at the level of HCS/BScn. Running a session right and handling an E-Meter and pc successfully are auditors’ skills. It must be admitted that very few auditors are possessed at this time of complete and near perfect auditing ability. I take my own responsibility for this and that responsibility lies in not having established an inflexible regimen of auditing. I did not do so because there was ample room for the improvement of techniques and auditing routines. But these last five months of work have brought us closer and closer to the exact right ways to handle cases and the exact processes to run on them. This has arrived with a much fuller understanding of what complexity man is accomplishing toward aberration with the fifty-five axioms. Man got pretty complicated in digging himself in. It has been my job to get pretty simple about digging him out.

The new key data which has emerged as clear-cut fact includes as an invariable that the person himself dug himself in, lost sight of why, and is holding himself in a state of stupidity, aberration and even insanity. We suspected this for years, but a way to prove it and then give a person personal reality on it was not mapped through. Now it is as tough as this. If you run “What have you done?” “What have I done?” you can hold a tone arm inactive. Every gain is balanced with a counter accusation, which is to say a new overt, and so the process gets nowhere after a few questions. No, the pc did it all himself and must gradually come to realize that with total subjective reality through processing, not because the auditor told him.

The pc made the facsimile to restrain himself from ever doing it again. Basically good, he goes wrong by failing to keep his own high standards and so loses control of himself.

Another datum: A high tone arm shows loss of the ability to start or reach—a low tone arm (below the clear reading) shows the loss of ability to stop or withhold.

In locating a terminal on an E-Meter (and why try to audit without one of these key tools), remember that the needle drops only on those terminals that the pc still feels some responsibility for. There is some responsibility to be found on these. The drop does not mean that this is what is wrong with the case so much as this is that thing wrong with the case that can be remedied at this time. Overts don’t even show up on a terribly irresponsible case until some responsibility is restored. But a rather irresponsible case run on the above procedures on any terminal that does drop will get changes away from the clear reading on the tone arm.

To clear a case it is not so much necessary to run everything off the case as it is to run whatever you run so well that the confidence of the case is restored. Restoration of

confidence in being able to handle the bank and therefore life is a better goal than trying to flatten the whole case indifferently. What you contact, do it well no matter how long it takes. A good proceeding is to find anything close to PT and in the environment of a pc (PTPs give a real good clue) and then handle it with great thoroughness with the above procedure. Any constant restimulator of PTPs aches to be audited with the above and will do more for the case as a whole if the auditing is well done and thorough than running any amount of back track. Confidence is the keynote of clearing. That is what the pc lost on his way down.

Don't worry if the needle stays high or low and don't believe the pc is still hiding something from you. You can take the above rundown and do it all. The overts of the pc will eventually out. He doesn't tell you about overts at first because he doesn't see them as overts. They were all justified and the target has been lessened, etc, etc. Then when he has O/W and responsibility run on any terminal that drops, his general responsibility comes up to a point where he knows an overt was an overt.

I trust the above will correct any small disturbances that have been occurring or any stalls you have been running into.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.jh
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

CenO
D of Ts

HCO BULLETIN OF 23 FEBRUARY 1960

HPA COURSE CHANGE PROPOSAL TO LONDON

The following changed HPA/HCA Course schedule has been proposed to D of T in London by Ron:

1 week Comm Course
1 week Upper Indoc
1 week CCHs
E-Meter practice
Some ACC TRs
1 week model sessions with E-Meter, using Cause ARC Straight Wire
Dynamic Assessment The six types of processes (Winter 56/57 from D.C.)
Great stress on running a perfect model session (HCO Bulletin of 25th February 1960)
10 hours given and received on Op Pro by Dup.
Student trained to audit:
Cause ARC Straight Wire: (Three Commands)
1. "Recall a time you communicated to someone"
2. "Recall a time you felt affinity for someone"
3. "Recall something that was really real to you"
"What would you be willing to forget?"
Factual Havingness (Trio) and walkabout version (same process but walking about in streets or in stores).
"Describe the problem etc" for Problems in Rudiments (don't use the word "invent").
Engram Confront and Responsibility—how to run on them.
O/W and Responsibility on specific and general terminals.
Rising Scale.
A fast rundown on Route One.
Any and all versions of Confront.
Vocabulary of Dianetics and Scientology.
The Time Track. Circuits. Machines.
Create and Confront principles (1st Melbourne ACC).
Valences.
The Dynamics.
O/W and why people blow.
Muzzled auditing.
PE Foundation type work.
Marriage counselling (See D.C. tape on marriage, Jan '60).
Assists.
Short sessioning.
Be-Do-Have.
M-E-S-T.

Teach all these. Find morning tapes from HPA and ACC courses. Play other HPA tapes '59 and selections from HCS and other ACCs (5th and 6th London and 1st Melbourne) and play them straight through every late afternoon, one hour per school day.

You don't have tapes to cover all the above, but HCO Bulletins do exist on most.

Make students keep notebooks now as you are covering more than is assembled in one place, and they'll need their notes outside.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.nm
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[This HCO B was reissued on 1 March 1960 by HCO London.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

Fran Hldrs
HCO Secs Assn
Secs Staff Auditors
For use in Academies
All courses

HCO BULLETIN OF 25 FEBRUARY 1960

THE MODEL SESSION

It has been some time since anything like a proper model session has been released. I have been researching on this for some little time now looking over the proper wording, and although the do's and don'ts could fill a considerable book (and will), the exact form and sequence of a session and the exact wording of one can now be laid down for formal repetitive command type auditing such as we are doing with O/W and Responsibility and similar processes. I did not previously lay one down because I considered there was wide room for change. I find now that there are certain inevitable phenomena in an auditing session with all preclears, and these mechanisms are handled by using the following set sequences and wordings. In other languages some paraphrase of the words should be used but the sequences and sense remain the same.

There are good reasons back of these exact proceedings but it would take a book to set them all out exactly with examples. In this HCO Bulletin let it suffice that we lay down the form and wordings.

TO START A SESSION

Adjust and calibrate as needful the E-Meter (don't audit without a meter). Adjust pc's chair (never let him place it. If he does, give it another slight shift as a control point).

Wording: "Is it all right with you if we begin this session now?" If not, two-way comm it out and repeat.

"All right; Start of session" (tone forty this). Drop it thoroughly over pc's head. If you have any doubts say "Has the session started for you?" If he says "No" do it again and better. Emphasize that the session is started. This means in effect that it's now the auditor's ball and that the auditor will exert control from here on out in the session.

The instant this happens the Auditor's Code is in full force on the auditor. There are no restrictions on the pc. The auditor's control establishes the pc's behavior as far as possible and the processes pick up the ARC breaks, etc.

RUDIMENTS

Always use rudiments and use them in this order. Use them even with a child. Make a stab at them even with an unconscious person. The rudiments are in this order because the last three parts of rudiments may require some auditing, and if so you have started a session with no goals established, hence goals come first.

GOALS: "What goals would you like to set for this session?" "All right, any goals you would like to set for life or livingness?" Don't challenge or question goals. Take what the pc says. Remember what he said because you will check it at session end.

ENVIRONMENT: "Is it all right to audit in this room?" If not, two-way comm it until it is all right or run Factual Havingness on the room. "Look around here and find something you could have."

AUDITOR CLEARANCE: "Is it all right if I audit you?" If not and you get a meter fall, two-way comm it until it doesn't fall or run O/W on the auditor. "What have you done to me?" "What have you withheld from me?" Until meter doesn't fall. If this is going to be the session process anyway as in a co-audit team, ease it off here.

PRESENT TIME PROBLEM: “Do you have any present time problem?” If meter falls, run “Describe the problem to me.” “How does it seem now?” Run this until meter does not fall on the problem and tone arm is below where you started.

STARTING A PROCESS: “Now I would like to run this process on you (name it). What would you say to that?” Work out the wording by any means briefly or longly. Don’t challenge the pc’s definition of words. The auditor has reserved the right to change his mind. If it seems that the pc won’t be able to handle the announced process the auditor has said only that he would like to run it and may now say “According to what we have been talking about then it would seem better if I ran (name another process).” If this is all right with the pc then begin the process.

“Here is the first command.” (Give it.)
Acknowledge it.

Carry on with the session. Always audit a process until the tone arm is lower on it than when the process was started. A process even when it isn’t flat may stop dropping on the meter needle but it will still be able to move the tone arm from time to time. Abolish the idea that a rising needle tells you anything but that the pc is being irresponsible. Dropping needles tell you charge and shifting tone arms tell you increased or decreased responsibility. Things that start the needle rising are of no great use to you except to spot an irresponsibility and you don’t use it on the needle you use it on the tone arm.

If you start another process in the session start it exactly like the above.

ENDING A PROCESS

If you are going to end a process in the session, bridge out of it smoothly. If the pc seems a bit alert and won’t be startled, tell the pc that “If it’s all right with you in a few more commands I am going to end this process.” Then do so, warning just before the last command “This is the last command” and then give it.

On all processes which cycle the pc in and out of present time use another wording as follows: “The next time you come close to present time I am going to end this process.” Then add before the acknowledgement “When was that?” to each pc answer and then acknowledge. When you get an answer in the last day or two or in the same hour, end it. This is tricky going. Be careful with it. Be smooth. But end it in close to pt.

You can always get a pc into pt (when you’ve been running an engram or some process that leaves him back on the track) by starting a new process (which has to be started as above): “Recall something” “When was that?” Acknowledge. This is far, far better than “Come to present time”—you of course bridge out of this at the same time you start it. “We are going to run this only until you are close to present time and then end it!”

REPEATED COMMANDS

If a pc dopes off and then says something (not a cognition), or if a pc says something instead of an answer (not a cognition), the auditor understands it, acknowledges it and then says “I will repeat the auditing command” and does so. This must not be used as an invalidation. If the pc thinks he is answering the command or did answer it then apologize and give him the next one.

COGNITIONS

If the pc comes up with a cognition (something he suddenly understands or feels) (“Well what do you know about that?”), and yet has not answered the command, the auditor does not say, “I will repeat the auditing command.” The auditor understands the cognition carefully, then acknowledges it and repeats the command without saying that he is going to. To say, “I will now repeat the auditing command” after the pc has come up with a cognition is sometimes invalidative, since it yanks the pc’s attention to the auditor, the pc in the interest of the cognition having forgotten the command utterly.

KEEP THE PC IN SESSION

The definition of in session is: PC INTERESTED IN OWN CASE AND WILLING TO TALK TO THE AUDITOR.

Yanking the pc's attention to the auditor, making surprising motion toward the pc and sudden noises, or doing something off beat yanks the pc's attention to the auditor and is the source of a lot of ARC breaks. This is quite painful to a pc sometimes and snaps whatever he is holding out from him down on him by spoiling his confront of it.

Audit the pc where the pc's mind is. If you get drops on the meter you have where the pc's mind is fixed. Run him on it, keep him on it until it's flat. Don't distract him.

TAKE FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE SESSION

If something goes wrong in the session it's the auditor's fault always. So if people knock or a phone rings, promptly apologize to the pc "I'm sorry." If the disturbance knocked the pc clean out of session handle it as a present time problem as in the rudiments.

A RESTLESS OR ARC BREAKY PC

Establish the rudiments often and keep the pc from blowing. Never justify errors. Be effective and keep the code. You'll win eventually even with the worst pc if you follow the Auditor's Code and this model session.

ENDING A SESSION

Always end a session just as you began one—with full rudiments. Therefore, leave time to get it all done, and if you have time to spare then spend more time on end of session Rudiments, particularly havingness.

END RUDIMENTS

GOALS: "Do you feel you have made any part of your goals for this session?" Take this up and take what the pc says. This is a fairly rapid action, not to be prolonged as you will get him into problems from goals and mess it up if you hang around on it.

AUDITOR AND ARC BREAKS: "How do you feel about my auditing in this session?" If there is the faintest twitch of the needle, add: "I am going to run some overt/withhold on you so here's the first command." "What have you done to me in this session?" Acknowledge. "What have you withheld from me in this session?" Acknowledge. As soon as you have the needle behaving on the meter ask the pc how it is now, and if it's much better bridge it out: "I will run a few more commands on this." And do so, warn for the last command and give it and then drop it.

AUDITING ROOM: "Look around here and see if you can have anything." If the E-Meter flicks about on this, at once start the process Factual Havingness, "I am going to run a bit of havingness on this. Here is the first command." "Look around here and find something you could have." Get the flick out of the meter needle and bridge it off.

PRESENT TIME PROBLEM: "Do you have a present time problem now?" If so run "Describe the problem to me." "How does it seem to you now?" until it no longer flicks on meter. If the PTP didn't flick on the needle, skip it.

FINAL COMMANDS OF SESSION

Conclude the session when the end rudiments are done by saying "Is it all right with you if we end this session now?" "All right, here it is. End of Session" (tone 40).

The auditor can now say "All right, tell me I am no longer auditing you."

When the pc does so, that's that.

When a session is over it is over and the Auditor's Code is over, but it's poor taste and you'll have a rough time next time if you criticize the pc or what he did or said in the session.

WARNINGS

Always get the auditing command answered. Never let the pc skip an auditing command. If it isn't answered to the pc's satisfaction, there you are until it is answered. Never let any auditing command go unanswered.

With O/W, responsibility or a rough session in general, always run a lot of Havingness at the end of it.

Never restart a process the moment it is ended. You may suddenly see it wasn't flat or he wasn't really in pt. Well, that's tough. Get it next time or get him into pt with "Recall something", but don't make a bad control example by restarting what you just now ended. In other words, never double bridge, note it down and get it next session.

Run at the case reality of the pc so he gets wins. If he ARC broke heavily last session you probably had him in over his or her head, so use an easier process this next time. That terminal is real to the pc that drops on the E-Meter even when he says it's unreal or didn't even know about it. Run things that fall and you will have interested pcs—clean them up on the tone arm once you've begun and you'll have cooperative pcs.

Whatever you start do it well no matter how many sessions it takes or how minor it seems to be. Do one thing well on the case and you advance the case. Do one thing poorly and you drop the pc down tone. Two hundred hours on one engram (that's an exaggeration) is better than one hour each on two hundred engrams. Do it well. It's confidence regained that makes clears, not quantity of stuff run.

Run the pc always at cause.

If the pc is worn out with having created something in the last few lives or in this present lifetime, run anything that drops about the creativeness on "What about a (that terminal) can you confront?"

To get the pc over any condition or aberration that he is agonizing to get rid of, find a terminal that adds up to it and run single confront on that terminal. Example: If the pc is sick, the process would be "What about a sick person could you confront?" If the person is homo, it's "What about a homosexual could you confront?" Just like old-time 8-8008 creative processes and SOP 8, but with terminals and confront. A person going round the bend on an obsession or a compulsion or a fixation shouldn't be audited on sweetness and light. They are too desperate; run them where the mind is fixated and get their attention freed. Don't run alternate confront anymore. It stalls the tone arm.

Don't use "If it's wrong with you then you did it", or snide "Well what did you do?" when the pc is upset. Let him have a motivator or few as you ease him into the groove. But running the motivator and overt one after the other gives little or no gain. The motivator mentioned is a new overt and stalls the case.

The essence of good auditing is smooth confident *CONTROL*. The essence of control is smooth Start Change and Stop. Control is the background music to all overts and responsibility, knowledge and everything else, so let's have a smooth Start Change and Stop in sessions and you'll see it begin to win win win where it limped before. Academies really knock auditors into shape so they can. There is no substitute for good pro training. But pro or no it's a smooth session that wins. People that won't control can't audit. So here is the model session and I hope for you brand new gains. Use it thoroughly and by the rote and you'll have no arguments.

LRH js.mm.rd
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L RON HUBBARD

MA
BPI

SCIENTOLOGY CAN HAVE A GROUP WIN

If every one of us relieved his conscience of all his transgressions against others, what would happen to society?

The social ills of Man are chiefly a composite of his personal difficulties. The combined dishonesties of individuals add into the formidable total of aberrated Third and Fourth Dynamics.

Criminality and war (and is there a difference?) came about because of a staggering social aberration. This is only a composite of individual aberrations. People who believe otherwise are just being irresponsible for their share.

Each man and woman on Earth has contributed to this massive tangle of transgression. The overts and withholds of each are added to the total mass of social ills. Further, one man or one woman failing to take his or her share in the general responsibility which makes society sane works as a further subtractive from group or world effectiveness.

There are many, many instances on record now of a whole social situation clearing up *with others* when one person was processed on the problem. A wife, estranged for years, processed on her husband and his family, quite commonly hears from them. The enmity, vanquished in her, vanished from them.

There is, therefore, more to this than an arithmetical one for one throughout the world. It would not be necessary to process, apparently, every person on Earth to bring sanity to Earth.

First there is the easily seen advantage of returning communication and honesty to just one person by removing his overts and withholds from the total sum. On this proposition alone we could win. And we should try to win on this, whatever else we do. Each person should restore himself to communication with Mankind and the world by removing from himself his own transgressions and failures.

To this we add the fact that each person so processed becomes a strong point of effectiveness which then influences his associates and eventually, even if only by this influence, discharges their confusions.

And then to this we add the fact that when one's own transgressions are dismissed the persons involved in them, even when not processed, tend to become unburdened.

And if we strongly influence others to become honest by getting their overts and withholds processed, we have approached with thorough and hard-headed practicality a resolution of the social ills of Man.

This is an impulse which can become a wave, and from a wave can grow into an avalanche that would sweep away the snarled tangles from human life on Earth.

All great cathedrals began their building by the placement of a single stone.

The building unit of a great society is the individual.

We can speak of clearing in a broader sense and we can discuss its potentials for Earth. But while we work at that there is today another meaning to the word—a smaller meaning to the individual perhaps but a greater meaning to all men. Since it can happen *now*, in a few hours of good processing: the clearing of one's transgressions in this lifetime and the taking of responsibility therefore.

We are a group inured to high-flown tasks. This is an easy task to confront.

HGCs can do this for people. Field Auditors can do this for people. We can demonstrably and easily clear in under a hundred hours all the key overts and withholds from a case in all directions and restoring responsibility thereon. We have the skills. I know we have the will.

Every Scientologist can get this done. And every Auditor can do it using an E-Meter, and the processes of HCO Bulletin of February 18th, 1960 and the session model of HCO Bulletin of February 25th, 1960. The task is well within the scope of the skills of even the newly trained.

I think you will agree with me that this one we can do. And I assure you that doing it on a case gives that case its fastest available relief. Later we can carry the case forward to higher levels with all the gain that would bring—but just now can we not assume a goal that falls within the reality of all of us?

For it is no accusation for any person living in our times to say that he can be relieved of transgressions against his fellows. And even that small amount picked up from the great web of lies leaves the tangle surely less.

This programme is a simplicity. Its technology is to hand, proven and rechecked. And it points ahead to a big win.

Shall we take this step to a clearer Earth as our first great group accomplishment?

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HAVE YOU LIVED BEFORE THIS LIFE

by
L. Ron Hubbard

Published March 1960

Have You Lived Before This Life?, subtitled “A Scientific Survey,” is a study of past life incidents discovered during the 5th London Advanced Clinical Course of 21 October—29 November 1958. It contains an introduction to the subject, a statement of how the survey was conducted and by whom, and reports of forty-two incidents recalled by Scientologists attending the course. These incidents are dated between the twentieth century and many billions of years ago, and their locations range from England, Norway and Tibet to planets many galaxies distant.

Not only are these incidents fascinating, but their narration reflects how Scientology engram running was done.

The 21st American ACC (January—February 1959) also covered Scientology engram running; however, case histories in this book come only from the 5th London ACC.

176 pages, hardcover with dust jacket, glossary. Available from your nearest Scientology Organization or Mission, or direct from the publishers: Scientology Publications Organization, Jernbanegade 6, 1608 Copenhagen V, Denmark; or Church of Scientology Publications Organization U.S., 2723 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California, 90026, U.S.A.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 3 MARCH 1960

Fran Hldrs
Central Orgs

**OT-3A PROCEDURE
HGC ALLOWED PROCESSES**

This bulletin supersedes all earlier bulletins.

Any case that cannot adequately define simple words like help, change, problem, control, responsibility: Run CCHs 1, 2, 3, 4 as per their earliest bulletins.

STEP ONE:

Rudiments—(See Model Session HCO Bulletin of February 25th, 1960.)

Goals
Surroundings
Auditor and ARC Breaks
Present Time Problem

Establish Rudiments every session. Establish them more often with touchy pcs.

STEP TWO:

Run Cause ARC Straight Wire to give pc a win on getting audited. Once each over and over. End process only with pc in present time on cycle.

“Recall communicating to someone”
“Recall a time you felt affinity for someone”
“Recall something that is really real to you”

STEP THREE:

S-C-S
High Needle Case: Run with emphasis on START
Low Needle Case: Run with emphasis on STOP

STEP FOUR:

Scout for present life overts and withholds. If found run “What about that incident could you be responsible for?” (See note on Responsible.) Flatten off all present life overt/withholds and zones of irresponsibility (high or low needle).

This should bring the needle into quietness and the tone arm down to clear reading for the pc’s sex.

On a low tone arm case, particularly below two, find a terminal that is in a stuck picture and run withhold on that terminal: “What could you withhold from a ____?”

If an overt is a very bad one that the pc can take little responsibility for, run O/W on the specific terminal involved, then generalize the terminal form in the command and run responsibility. Commands here are “What have you done to ____?” “What have you withheld from ____?” Then “What responsibility have you taken for a ____?”

When a pc has done a very bad overt to a person or thinks he has, his level of responsibility is already below zero on that type of person. Therefore responsibility run on the specific terminal (such as “Agnes”) won’t work as pc’s responsibility on “a

woman” was very low before he did an overt to “Agnes”. Therefore it would be O/W on “Agnes” and responsibility on “a woman”.

The whole essence of clearing in this lifetime is done by the steps up to and including this one. The procedure would be to locate the present life overts (or personnel in PT Problems), run O/W on them and then responsibility on the general form.

STEP FIVE:

Clear the pc’s field with responsibility as per recent HCO Bulletin on black, invisible or dub-in cases. When pc sees pictures of PT then go at case in general. O/W on persons in a stuck picture will move it. Running withhold only on such persons will raise a low needle case.

STEP SIX:

Run “What about a victim could you be responsible for?” until tone arm tends to read at clear reading for sex in this lifetime.

Whenever the pc encounters an incident that seems very sticky, which is to say when the picture sticks many commands by the E-Meter, spot the time in terms of years ago and down to the month and day. When the incident is spotted, if it continues to hang up run it as an incident with this command: “What about that incident could you be responsible for?” and as needful on a two way comm basis, and by any process as needed get off its overts and withholds and ‘who would it make feel guilty?’

When any incident is reasonably flat continue with “What about a victim could you be responsible for?”

This does not mean that you spot and run every incident encountered. Spot and run only those that stick.

STEP SEVEN:

Explore the immediate past lifetime or lifetimes of the pc. Get the pc’s identity and form (sometimes they were animals), and if lifetime alters position of tone arm run “What about (name) would you be willing to be?” “What about (name) would you rather not be?”

Do this until incident is flat. If heavy engram in such lifetime sticks, run “What about that incident could you be responsible for?”

STEP EIGHT:

Run down any famous or enduring identities of the pc on the whole track, and handle as above.

Ease off this with responsibility on a victim.

STEP NINE:

Do a dynamic assessment on the pc and locate any terminal that drops, and run on this “What responsibility could you take for a _____?”

If a severe incident turns up flatten with responsibility on the incident.

This step can be done many times. Most of the pc’s case will be found connected with some general terminal.

STEP TEN:

Do a survey of case, finding anything that the pc has trouble confronting and run responsibility on it.

Clues: Sick Person—Insane Person—Robot—Prize Fighter—Worker.

STEP ELEVEN:

Find anything pc has created arduously for a long time and run responsibility on it.

STEP TWELVE:

Run Responsibility on Matter, Energy, Space, Time, Motion and Thought. Confront can be run first on these as a kinder step.

Caution: Until some confront and responsibility are run on some cases no present life overts show up. Control, Confront and Responsibility are the key to high and low tone arms. Always handle any severe overts that turn up on case with responsibility process.

Do not run a massless terminal such as “sex” or “help”. Find instead some actual terminal, not a significance.

Beware running adjectival commands such as “Frigid woman” or “a little boy with a mole under his left grin”. Run instead the plainest terminal that drops.

Do not run things that are not real to the pc as he has made them unreal to lessen the overt. Instead run lots of overt finding processes such as “What could you admit causing a (terminal real to pc)?” alternated with “What could you withhold from a (same terminal)?”

NOTE: *Confront* can be run as a prelude to any and all responsibility, with the following command “What about (...) could you confront?” Do not use the dichotomy version (rather not). Confront is sometimes easier, sometimes harder than responsibility.

Much of the material here is on the Washington 1960 HCS tapes.

Usage of the rundown should be taught on staff theta clearing courses.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.pl.rd
Copyright ©1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 9 MARCH 1960

Fran Hldrs
Central Orgs

**EXPANSION OF OT-3A PROCEDURE, STEP TWO
HGC ALLOWED PROCESSES**

Step Two of OT-3A Procedure is as follows:

Run Cause ARC Straight Wire to give pc a win on getting audited. Once each over and over. End process only with pc in present time on cycle.

“Recall communicating to someone”
“Recall a time you felt affinity for someone”
“Recall something that is really real to you”

Now people do have time tracks, the time span of the individual from beingness to present time on which lies the sequence of events of his total existence. And when the preclear *is* in session and is being run on a recall type process, he, with his attention, goes up and down this time track. He may recall things only from this life or he may recall things from his whole past track; but however that may be, his attention cycles from early on the track to present time or from present time to early on the track to present time. This is known as the cycle aspect of recall type processes. In ending such a process, it is of utmost importance that the auditor end it with the preclear in present time on the cycle. The auditor wants to watch ending the process when the preclear has not made a smooth cycle into present time, but has made a big jump from way back in the past to present time. In such a case, the preclear has really bounced out of the past incident into present time, and it is only an apparency that the preclear is in present time.

So when ending such a process, the auditor must exert caution to be certain the preclear is in present time. Being left with one's attention back on the track is not a comfortable sensation and sometimes can be quite painful, despite any justification offered by an auditor who himself has no reality on the time track, and I hope there are no such auditors.

With Cause ARC Straight Wire, the auditor must forget his fastidiousness about ending the process precisely so on the last command, “Recall something that is really real to you.” He ends the process, no matter on what command of Cause ARC Straight Wire, when the preclear's attention has come into or close to present time, close to present time being the last day or two.

In ending such a process the communication bridge used is as follows: “The next time you come close to present time I am going to end this process.” He continues to give the commands using the question, “When was that?”, after each answer the preclear gives and before the acknowledgement. When the preclear gives an answer close to present time, he says, “That was the last command of that process; end of process.” Bang. With processes that cycle, there can be no communication bridges like, “If it's alright with you in a few more commands I am going to end this process.” It could take fifty more commands until the preclear is close to present time; and by that time, the preclear has entirely forgotten that there ever was any intention on the auditor's part to end the process as it seems to him that the auditor must have changed his mind and decided to run the process longer than *a few* commands.

An auditor should not get upset with a preclear when the auditor, in an effort to get the preclear to give an answer right in present time, starts the preclear back down

the time track again. Remember it is the auditor who calls the shot, and if he misses, then he had better learn to gage it a bit better. A good auditor allows himself time in which to properly end a process.

Now two further cyclic processes which can be seen under Step Two of OT-3A are:

1. "What would it be all right for you to make forgotten?"
2. "What would you permit to have happen again?"

These are called Cause Elementary Straight Wire and are two separate processes which are not to be run alternately.

The first process puts the preclear at cause over forgetting, and the second process rehabilitates the preclear's ability to duplicate. These are both terrific processes in turning on recall in the preclear. All processes under Step Two are unlimited, with the "make forgotten" one only slightly less unlimited as it has a bit of a tendency to run down havingness. Havingness, however, should be checked upon in each session and run as needed.

The auditor should not consider Step Two of OT-3A lightly. These processes are, in reality, very potent and will certainly do more for CCH-step cases than anything we have had before. An example of this is how preclears broke through from psychosis to neurosis to sanity with the simplified version of ARC Straight Wire as given in the original *Self Analysis*. So use these processes and win faster.

Note: On second thoughts for purposes of differentiation, the first process, "What would it be all right for you to make forgotten?", should be termed Cause Elementary Straight Wire; and the second process, "What would you permit to have happen again?", shall be called Duplication Straight Wire. These two processes were first used in early Advanced Clinical Courses in Phoenix and were called at that time "Elementary Straightwire". The commands of "Elementary Straightwire" as given in *Dianetics 1955* were: "Give me something you wouldn't mind remembering" and "Give me something you wouldn't mind forgetting". As the ability to recall depends upon the mechanisms of forgetting and remembering (the ability to duplicate) you can easily understand the importance of these in Step Two of OT-3A.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Fran Hldrs

STANDARDIZED SESSIONS

There are many reasons why sessions should be standardized and held in pattern. First of these is confidence. The auditor, going over practised ground, feels more confident and, startled by some sudden action or new development, does not lose session control by seeming incapable to the pc. The preclear, accustomed to repetitive session pattern, feels a security when all his sessions are predictable as to pattern of address. And if he changes auditors he is still able to feel confident that he is getting real auditing.

A second reason is duplication: Just as old repeater technique *done by* the auditor to the pc will run out a phrase or charged word, so do session patterns, well followed, tend to run out earlier sessions. Duplication does not make all things seem alike. Duplication of a session adds communication to the session and speeds up the willingness of the pc to communicate to the auditor.

The basic freeing action of auditing depends upon the separation of thought from form, matter, energy, space and time and other life.

We see in “science” as currently practised a nearly total identification by the “scientist” of mass with thought. “Man from mud” is a natural conclusion by anyone who has all his thought bound up in mass.

The reason a clear’s needle is so free (and you’ve seen, certainly, how an E-Meter needle gets sticky, then freer and freer) is that his thought is separated from a matter, energy, space, time consequence.

The “deadin-’is-’ead” case is totally associating all thought with mass. Thus he reads peculiarly on the meter. As he is audited he frees his thinkingness so that he can think without mass connotations.

What auditing is doing is making the preclear think key thoughts until they can be thought without creating or disturbing matter, energy, space and time.

As most pcs associate themselves with *thought*, only when they can think a thought without ploughing anew into mass can they exteriorize. Difficult exteriorization or exteriorization with bad consequences is all caused by a person’s considerations of thought being matter, self being matter, etc, etc.

The basic overt act is making somebody else want mest. This recoils so that self wants mest. Thus we have the “necessity for havingness”. Running havingness restores the pc at cause over matter, permits him to be separate from matter to some degree.

Thinking, then, is separated from mest by repetitive thinking on the exact points that pin a particular person to mest.

If a person is aberrated, say, on the subject of women, the shortest cut to de-aberration (barring havingness difficulties—see below) would be the repeated command “Think of a woman.” At last he would no longer have pictures or masses just because he thought *that* thought and you would then find he could *think* about women as opposed to reacting about women.

This naturally leads to an obvious basic process, “Think about matter” “Think about energy” “Think about space” “Think about time” “Think about a thetan.” In theory each one could be run flat in turn and then all run again.

In actual practice this is pretty steep for most cases and would not be real to many. A more complex approach containing more significance is more real to the pc.

The pc's mind is trapped into *forms* of mest and life, rather than merely mest and life. Thus, what falls on the E-Meter needle shows what form of mest and life his attention is fixed upon.

Havingness is a complicated subject when viewed in a pc's mind. Familiarity, which is to say, predictability, is strongly connected with his ability to have or own. When he receives shocks or surprises, his ability to predict is invalidated and he *can't have*.

The reason a thetan "dies" is his loss of the familiar by the introduction of the unpredictable. Rapidity of change of state, unpredicted, would be a definition of surprise, also of death and forgetfulness.

The more change he is subjected to, that he did not predict, the less he can have.

Thus when he is given a "rough session", the pc's havingness goes down. Not predicting the shifts and changes of the auditor, the pc ceases to be able to have the session or its appurtenances—the auditor, the room, etc. The smoother the auditing the better the pc's havingness stays up.

The model session is designed to avoid unpredictable changes. Thus it is designed to retain havingness by retaining pattern, which is to say, retaining predictability by l;he pc.

Auditing, done smoothly, duplicatively session by session as to session pattern, runs itself out, even if the pc has a constantly changing bank.

A pc began to use pictures when he changed lives and sometimes, therefore, language, but only after he had already adopted language for thought. So an ultimate step in processing could concern itself with separating the pc from the significance of words. Some such process as "Think of a word," followed by "Think of a meaning," would in theory, if it could be run (but has not been tested and would violate havingness), discharge the pc of his dependence on language for thought and would find him less fixated on having pictures (which of course bridge the language barrier).

Appearing in a form composed of matter, running on energy, existing in space and keeping pace with others in time is a favour pcs do one another (or an overt act depending on how cynical you may feel when you consider it).

The games condition of havingness is have for self, can't have for others. Appearing in a form violates this games condition. Also, giving another words violates it. Thus actors and writers tend to go downhill by violating their own games condition *if they are in one*. A games condition evolves from separateness. Running some form of separateness can then result in exteriorization not from willingness to lose the mass of the body but by curing the games condition. Separateness is of course handled on lower cases by running out obsessive connectedness. But separateness itself can be run.

Any auditing is a solution: Solutions are ordinarily an alter-is of problems. Thus getting people to confront problems or even solutions can resolve not only case but auditing where auditing itself has now and then, in absence of smooth analysis and session handling, become a problem to the preclear.

A fine process for this is "Tell me a problem that auditing would be a solution to," and for that matter, this also applies to any psychosomatic illness. A person with a bad leg would experience relief if audited on "Tell me a problem a bad leg would be a solution to," as a repetitive process. Similarly, it might work if one asked "Tell me a solution to a bad leg you could confront," or "What problem about a leg could you confront?" which last is very good as a process.

The separation of thinkingness from a problem, from particular forms, and from Life and Mest are the primary targets of auditing. And just as the repetitive auditing command runs out not only the connection with a mass but itself, so does a repetitive session design eventually free the pc from not only his aberrations but auditing itself.

A person gets as able as he regains confidence—and he gets as free as his auditing is a constant not itself a wild variable.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 21 MARCH 1960

RESEARCH PROJECT

May I request the assistance of all auditors in the following research programme:

Have You Lived Before This Life?, the new HASI book, has elicited such deep interest that it will be followed in a few months by a sequel: *Where Are You Buried?*

You can help by doing the following. (a) Check out your pcs for recent deaths, and any you find have died in the last century in the country where you are, (b) write down all particulars for record. (c) Then go to the place of burial and locate grave or get a copy of the death roll from official sources or both. And (d) send all data, the story of the life and death, to HCO WW, Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex. Be sure you have pc's permission for data to be used. Be sure the data is authentic in every possible way. The resulting collection may be published in book form.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.jh
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 24 MARCH 1960

Fran Hldrs
HCO Secs
Assn Secs
All Staff Auditors
D of P
D of T

GOALS IN THE RUDIMENTS

A session is a cycle of action.

Unless it is started, continued and ended properly the preclear is put in continuous session. If it is not given a proper cycle of action it does not result in any control of the preclear.

Rudiments are not something it is nice to do. Rudiments are something that must be done.

A great deal of the value of auditing lies in the mechanics of the session itself. If you wish to demonstrate this for yourself all you have to do is try short sessioning. This consists of starting, continuing for a few minutes, a session, and ending the session. It has good gain qualities for a pc who has poor concentration. It does not matter what is run. What matters is that direct control of thought results in setting an example that thought can be controlled.

A session without proper rudiments is a session without control. A session without control gets no gains of any note.

After working with this for years I believe a nearly foolproof method of handling the rudiments has been developed.

The parts of modern rudiments are as follows:

Goals
Surroundings
Auditor and ARC breaks

Present Time Problem

End rudiments:
Present Time Problem

Auditor and ARC breaks
Surroundings
Goals

(Note the end rudiments are changed in order from HCO Bulletin of February 25, 1960.)

GOALS

Goals are set at the beginning of the session in order to make the preclear postulate session occurrence. If the pc says nothing about goals or even says nothing will happen, probably nothing will happen of any note in the session. Goals are taken up first in a session before environment, auditor or problems because these may entail auditing if they are not right, and the moment you start to audit the last three then you are running a session without setting goals and may run the entire session of the auditor or the present time problem and muff it because no goal was ever set. The auditor who does not set up goals immediately following the start of a session may wind up without getting a chance to set goals.

There is a lot to know about goals. There have been processes entirely devoted to goals. A great many more processes could be developed about goals. However the value of these tools or processes does not compare to just getting a goal or three set for the session itself. If you run into difficulties about goals there are two processes which can be used, and perhaps other old processes might also be worked on the subject.

The basic reason we give stress to goals is to keep the auditor from making one of the greatest fundamental errors he can make: The auditor is processing in one direction and the pc wants to go in another. This creates a basic disagreement between auditor and pc which prevents auditing from getting anywhere and results squarely in ARC breaks and upsets. Where these are frequent this mistake must be supposed to exist and must be cleared up.

There are only three things a pc can do in a session so far as results are concerned: he can get better, he can stay the same, he can get worse. Therefore there are only three basic types of goals: improvement goal, no-change goal, deterioration goal. All this derives from survive and succumb as the two opposite poles.

The auditor may be seeking improvement while all the pc wants to do is succumb. The auditor may be trying to keep the pc from getting worse and the pc wants only to get better. The auditor (but let's hope not) may be working unconsciously or otherwise on a particular pc to make him or her worse and the pc is trying to get better. Of course in the last case O/W is indicated for the auditor on this type of pc. Fortunately the last type is rare.

The commonest disagreement on goals comes about on the first mentioned. The auditor wants improvement and the pc wants deterioration. Some auditor trying wildly to make a pc better gets a failure only because he has never closely observed the pc's goals and hasn't got this straight with the pc.

If goals go wrong the simplest process to clear the pc on direction is a problem process. This might sound odd, but it is quite true. The fastest goals process is a general problems process. This occurs because the pc in looking over problems falls into realizing what his actual desires are. The quickie version of this process handles solutions in this fashion:

The auditor looks over the preclear and sees that the pc has some obvious disability. He asks the pc if the pc has any disability and steers it into getting the pc to bring this one to light. This would be something like a bad foot or cough. One selects a mass terminal for this disability, such as chest for the cough (whatever the pc says it is), and runs the following command, "What problem would a bad foot be a solution to?" Using this on one or more disabilities and running it a while (until pc is in pt on it) shows the pc at once that at least as far as a foot is concerned he has been trying to succumb.

This is a very ordinary occurrence since factually any chronic psychosomatic is an effort to succumb. Remember that the doors are all locked from within by the pc himself.

If pc is still reluctant and upset about goals or isn't getting better faster because of the solutions process above, run some consequences in this fashion: "What would you be likely to do if you didn't have a bad foot?" This makes the pc look at it some more, and some responsibility run on what he has said he might do will clear the thing away.

The general process that uncovers most of this is "Tell me a problem"; when pc has, "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" When pc has, the auditor says again, "Tell me a problem," etc, etc, etc, on a repetitive basis.

Now remember that we weren't trying to make his foot well. That may or may not happen with any rapidity. What we are trying to get the pc to look at is that his goal alignment is not an improvement but a deterioration.

The old process of worse than, minus the invent part, also accomplishes the same end: "Think of something worse than a bad foot." This on a repetitive basis will turn up all sorts of horrible consequences to not having a bad foot. Of course having a victim with his face kicked in before one and the police sirens sounding is worse than having a bad foot by the pc's rationale.

Because people hold in and cripple themselves mentally and physically to keep from doing things they know are wrong, goals, more frequently than you would like to find, are in the direction of getting worse. Until you untangle this one as an auditor you may not be able to make any lasting progress with a pc.

Factually a pc in bad condition is more likely to have succumb goals than survive goals.

When handling rudiments, get the pc to set a goal, any goal or even two or three goals he really thinks he can make in the session. But if after two or three sessions it is apparent that he is not achieving his goals as set by him in the session, despite care to handle them by the auditor with processing, it should be suspected that the pc is technically an "opposite vector" case and has private goals quite the reverse to getting better. When one has uncovered this fact as the auditor, without evaluation, he had better get it uncovered to the pc.

There are no auditing failures. There are only errors in auditing. Chief amongst these errors is failure to take up and straighten out the pc's goals. That is the first amongst the rudiments and last in the end rudiments so it must be pretty important. Don't discount its value, and handle it with the attention it deserves.

Once upon a time or two I have asked some auditor auditing me what *his* goals for the session were. It produced some interesting randomness. But a pc is under no orders but the auditor's and it isn't something that is needed in the session. Also I have just up and told the pc what I would like to get done in the session and sometimes it worked and sometimes it didn't, and I found that what the pc wanted to get done and what the pc said he or she wanted to get done were more important.

Unless the pc postulates his recovery, it won't last even if you make him recover in spite of himself or herself. The way to make the pc postulate it is by handling goals as above. The pc is often very startled by what he finds out about his actual intentions.

I have stopped being startled by what pcs do. I find that when they don't recover very fast they don't want to and I start working over their goals no matter what else seems to be the matter.

The CCHs work better if rudiments are used, but sometimes that's impossible due to state of the pc. Take up goals with such a pc at the first available chance however and make your work easier.

Life is a series of attained goals. Auditing requires at least the setting of goals and their attainment.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 30 MARCH 1960

All Auditors in
South Africa
CenOCon

INTERROGATION

(How to read an E-Meter on a silent subject)

When the subject placed on a meter will not talk but can be made to hold the cans (or can be held while the cans are strapped to the soles or placed under the armpit, I am sorry if that sounds brutal, it isn't), it is still possible to obtain full information from the subject.

Asking questions, one expects no reply, asks for no pictures. The auditor just watches the needle for dips when questions are asked.

It is best to start with several nul questions: "Will it rain?" "Do you like bread?" etc. And then shift off to heavier leads. At any time the subject gets too agitated to read, return to asking nul questions or use the agitation as a dip.

Meter response for "No" or negative or don't know = no fall.
Meter response for "Maybe" "You're getting close" = slight fall.
Meter response for "Yes" or "Correct" = steep fall.

Sample interrogation: Subject is given cans. Nul questions are asked. Then:

"Were you persuaded to make trouble?" (fall)
"Was the person who persuaded you a native?" (fall)
"What was the person's name?" (no verbal answer, heavy fall)
"Do you know where the person who persuaded you lives?" (heavy fall)
(Name various nearby towns.)
"Does the person live in .. ?"
Take town with heaviest fall.

Divide town named into streets, sections, sort out the exact part of the town named. Give leads on location until you know the house.

If person were educated you would use: "Considering the alphabet to divide at 0, does the person's last name start with a letter in the first half of the alphabet (pause, look at meter) or the last half of the alphabet" (pause, look at meter, compare the two readings—you may have to ask this two or three times). "All right, it was the first half. Now was it A, B, C, was it D, E, F, etc." "Now the second letter of the person's last name ... ", (repeat the same performance).

It's a good idea to mark down your findings on a blackboard where the subject can see them if he's very reluctant and can read.

A phonetic system can be worked out for subjects who are not educated. Maps of town areas are useful. With one eye on the meter you just point to areas of the map and let the meter guide you in.

When you have worked out an area or name, repeat it several times and shift it around until you get maximum drop.

A whole mine of information can be picked up from a silent person.

On reporters, looking for possible accidents is a good convincer. Tell the reporter

not to speak and use over and under times “Have you ever had an accident?” “Was it more than five years ago?” “Was it less than five years ago?” Watch the needle, pin it down to maximum fall. That’s the year. Now get the month (first or last half of year, then, for first half, ask about Jan, Feb, Mar). Month found get the day. Then the hour of the day. Then the type of vehicle or accident. Then who was hurt, etc. Reporters always start talking somewhere along about this time. Don’t pay any attention. Just go on and nail it down.

In a security check, you want the person who persuaded the person you have on the cans to engage in a riot. When you locate and have brought this new person, you do the same thing. But now you have a whole committee of names to get and your subject is better educated.

Taking ten people from a strike or riot, you can find the instigator of their group. Finding the instigator and getting him on the cans you can run it back to a higher command level.

The end product is the discovery of a terrorist, usually paid, usually a criminal, often trained abroad.

Given a dozen people from any riot or strike, you can find the instigator of that group or more than one. Finding that one, you can get his boss.

Twenty or thirty paid agents provocateurs can keep a whole country in revolt. Clean them up and the riots collapse.

Thousands are trained every year in Moscow in the ungentle art of making slave states. Don’t be surprised if you wind up with a white.

Revolts kill an awful lot of natives. Only when security has been established can a reform be applied.

Use E-Meter “clean hands” to convince people that a population is loyal and that reforms are in order.

In the riots in London, anybody arrested has his fine paid for him by some mysterious group. Demonstrators are recruited. So this isn’t limited to South Africa.

Crack the agents provocateurs’ identities and you’ve cracked the new slavery of Earth—the worker’s production demanded by the state for nothing.

We have a lot of reforms ourselves but we don’t need criminal agents or dead people killed in riots to put them in effect. Don’t use guns, use E-Meters to make a country secure.

By the way, the answer to passive resistance is for the government to passive strike against any district from which it occurs. No water, lights, pay, government or service. Simply use the same tactic back. Don’t use guns, cordon the area off and shut off power and water.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.cden
Copyright © 1960 by
L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[HCO B 2 January 1967, *Dating-Forbidden Words*, Volume VI, page 191, changes the words used for dating. See *The Book of E-Meter Drills*, Drill EM-25, for correct E-Meter dating procedure.]

Fran Holders

THE PRESENT TIME PROBLEM

Everybody has present time problems at times. They come up unexpectedly. They happen, between intensives. They pop up between sessions. They, indeed, occur within sessions. And the auditor who neglects to handle them when they arise will get little auditing done.

It's the present time problem that sticks the graph, makes it register no change. (It's ARC breaks that drop one.)

What is a "PTP", as the auditors write it in their reports?

It is basically the inability to confront the dual terminal nature of this universe.

It is an inability to span attention and denotes that the pc who is having lots of PTPs has his attention very fixed on something.

The definition of a problem is intention v. intention or "two or more opposing and conflicting views on the same subject".

If the pc has problems with wife or husband, we can be sure that they have divergent views on some basic thing in life. Thus the auditor who has a pc who always has PTPs with one, the same, person, had better run O/W (overt-withhold) on that terminal in a specific form (George) and then responsibility on the general form (a husband). Thus a PTP is as good as an assessment. Find what terminals the pc has PTPs about and handle that terminal as above. Indeed this is more than a trick—it's a great time-saver. One can waste hours on a pc who repeatedly comes up with a PTP on the same person. But that person in the PTP is often the current clue to the case. "Grace the wife" leads to "a wife" leads to "a woman".

Present time problems are not always concerned with the world outside auditing. Auditors can be a PTP to the pc, especially when the pc has big withholds!

PROCESSES ON PTPs

Present time problem processes are many. The earliest was two-way comm. A later one was "Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to" But this one of course is a create type process and is therefore very limited.

Still another process was "Tell me your problem." "How does it seem to you now?" This almost runs the whole case.

A recent one that has workability is "What problem could you confront?" This finds out for the pc that he can't *confront* a problem at first without doing something about it. *That* isn't confronting the problem. This is an amusing, effective and educative process.

Problems tend to snap in on the pc. The mechanism here is that he cannot confront them so, of course, they snap in upon him. When he invents a few the first problem he had visibly moves away from him. This last is now a demonstration, not a process, because of the create factor.

The fastest current process is “Tell me your problem.” “What part of that problem have you been responsible for?” This is an alternate question process. You will find the problem changes and changes. It runs the whole case.

A general process on problems, which is a very healthy process, is “What problem have you been (or might you have been) responsible for?”

The easiest process on problems to run, if slower, is “Tell me your problem.” “What part of that problem could you confront?”

CONFUSION AND THE STABLE DATUM

Problems are nasty case stickers because in a problem one has an old solution causing new problems. This is the principle of confusion and the stable datum. The confusion (two or more opposed views or actions) stays in position because it is hung on a single fixed point. If you want to see a pc go into confusion ask him what solution he could confront. (This is not a good process, it’s a demonstration.)

A preclear is sometimes chary of motion in the bank. He seizes upon fixed particles to avoid moving particles. A very top scale process that does some fabulous things to a pc also illustrates this: “What motion have you been responsible for?” This truly sets a bank whizzing, particularly black cases or stuck picture cases. Running this, it is possible to discharge pc liability to problems.

THE DUAL UNIVERSE

The basic unit of this universe is *two* not one.

The less a pc can confront *two* things, the more he fixes on *one*. This is the highly individual person, also the self-auditing case.

This is probably the basic trap of a thetan. He is a single unit that has not cared to confront dual units and is therefore subject to the persistence of all dual things. As he does not seem to care as much for *two* as he does for *one* that which is not admired tends to persist and we have a persisting dual universe.

Also, when he is with somebody else, he tends to confront the other person but not to confront himself. “What about you could you confront?” is a murderous process. It is all right to run. It picks up the times when his attention was off self and yet self was creating. This is the genus of a reactive bank. It is probably what pain is.

However, a better and more spectacular process that demonstrates this and gets to the heart of problems is “What two things can you confront?” This increases ability and reduces one’s liability to problems. I suppose one could go gradiently up in number and have at last a pc that could tolerate any motion or number.

It is quantity not quality which makes a bank. Thus running significances is of little worth. A thetan gets ideas of too many and too few. He cannot have, at length, anything that becomes too scarce—one of the old important rules of havingness given in *Scientology 8-8008*.

OUT OF SESSION

A pc is in session when (a) he is willing to talk to the auditor and (b) he is interested in his own case.

The primary violation of part (a) is overts and withholds—the pc is afraid to talk or talks to cover up.

The second violation (b) occurs when the pc’s attention is “over there” in present time, fixed on some concern that is “right now” somewhere in the physical universe. Technically a *present time problem* is a special problem that exists in the physical

universe now on which the pc has his attention fixed. This violates the “in session” rule part (b). The pc’s attention is “over there” not on his case. If the auditor overlooks or doesn’t run the PTP then the pc is never in session, grows agitated, ARC breaks, etc. And no gains are made because the pc is not in session. Hence the unchanged graph when the pc has a PTP that is overlooked or not properly handled.

PTPs are easy to handle. If you, the auditor, become impatient at having to “waste time” handling a PTP or if the pc considers it a waste of time to handle it, a mistake is being made. So long as a PTP falls on a meter even slightly, it had better be handled until it no longer falls when checked.

If the same type of PTP keeps coming up, use it as a case assessment and run it out-out-out as given above, using O/W and responsibility.

And if the pc *always* has problems, better note he *also* has motionless pictures, is only-one and self-audits heavily and get him used to motion and two particles as given in processes above and he’ll be a better case very soon indeed.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 7 APRIL 1960

Franchise Hldrs
All Staff Auditors
Note HCO Secs
send to every certified
auditor in your area.

A NEW SUMMARY OF AUDITING

(This bulletin is the first major break-through in processing in 1960. It is a new statement of processing you will appreciate.)

In ten years, the chief thing which needed improvement in the dissemination of Dianetics and Scientology was more and faster processing results.

A good result in processing depends on two things:

- (a) The workability of the technical process; and
- (b) The ability of the Auditor to apply processing to a preclear.

The bulk of my own work for ten years, then, has been on these two things.

However, you should not make a mistake in thinking that the first released processes did not work as processes. Book One Engram Running, as any old time Dianeticist can tell you, works.

Engram running from "away back" works so well that I probably would not have advanced auditing technically to any degree, if people at large had been able to apply Book One engram running as given in 1950.

Personally I have rarely failed to resolve a case and bring it to a happy conclusion solely with engram running. I would have gone on researching to resolve the mystery of life but not to improve auditing if a majority of auditors had been able to get excellent results.

Alas (or happily) there were too many cases that didn't change when audited by some auditors. And so I tied further researches on life with the development of processes most auditors could handle and with which they could obtain spectacular results rather easily. I do not say that to condemn auditors, only to show the why of further processes, the basic impulse behind the release of new processes. They make it easier to do it faster and they reach the few cases we now and then failed to reach before.

For a long, long, long time I've felt we have been there. I have wanted it to be positive enough so that all auditors could experience being there at a process level.

Training is better and easier. Theory today goes light years beyond what I would have considered as necessary years ago. Processes reach even unconscious people.

But in all this wealth of technology, we still have the problem of auditor application. Here is an example: In spring 1959, I gave the exact way to handle a co-audit group (London HPA and 6th London ACC tapes). To obtain maximum results, I had learned, the instructor was the auditor to each pc in the room. Each case was assessed by him. Each person run by him on a via of the co-audit auditor. Here and there I hear of a co-audit losing people. I hear of an instructor saying, "I only have to look in on them (the co-audit people) once in a while during an evening." And I hear of a spectacularly spectacular co-audit group, fully successful, several clears in fact, where the only thing that was done was the *exact* duplication of the London HPA and ACC instructions!

Now do you see what I mean by processing results depending upon the auditor?

Co-auditing in groups was wrapped up, complete, in the spring of 1959. The task

now is to get it adhered to so there will be more clears. A whole year later we are just starting to win on this.

The programme of research may present a myriad of new data. It has not changed certain fundamentals about auditing. It has not changed the exact way to make a clear. Let's not lose sight of these facts.

The first and foremost rule of auditing is **FIND SOMETHING THE PRECLEAR CAN DO AND PROCESS HIM TO IMPROVE THAT ABILITY.**

A lot of auditors audit quite oppositely and fail here and there and say they don't know why. The auditor finds "what is wrong" with the pc and tries to remedy it. That has *nothing* to do with the goal of auditing. That's a Q and A with the pc's bank. The pc thinks something is wrong with him and restrains himself. All you have to do to make a pc clear is to help him build his confidence back in the things about him that are right!

To clear a pc all you have to do is give him or her a series of wins he or she realizes are wins.

The 1947 scale of wins was this: Get a pc to have pictures by any device. Get the pc to erase light locks. Get the pc to be more and more able to handle gradiently heavier bits of bank. When pc was fully confident, pc was clear.

(That wasn't all, by the way, that's been overlooked in clearing. Read the Book One clear definition again.)

Of course as time has gone on we have been more and more articulate. I have found ways to say things, found ways to describe things that I thought *everybody* knew. I have erred consistently in overestimating understanding. I seek to remedy that by stating things more clearly. I feel I am winning on this.

But there are certain things I myself find very hard to understand. Among these is how I can run any engram flat in a few hours unless its overt has to be run first; and that some auditors take 50 to 75 hours to flatten an engram. How is that? Well, I'm sure I don't know unless it is as follows:

All you have to do to run an engram is first get the pc accustomed to his bank and track by various mild processes, get him under good control, contact the least incident necessary to resolve the case and flatten it. Well, that's it. To flatten an incident Dianetically, you only erase it. To flatten it Scientologically you run it until pc has it back again fully and is total cause over it (you run it after it has erased). To accomplish all this apply the rule in capitals above. *No auditing tricks are necessary* unless you have thrown the pc in over his head without a gradient approach to the bank.

Recently I had some auditors complain that they were being forced, using OT-3A to start at step one on new pcs when "auditor discretion should be used as to what step should be first taken". And what was auditor discretion? Throw the pc in over his head, I guess; new pcs deserve at least some recall process to start out.

The rule I audit by is the one in caps above. By gradients I recover for the pc confidence in handling himself. At length analytical handling replaces reactive handling.

Here are the first winning sessions on two pcs and the point of first win on each:

PC "A" 1952: No pictures. All unreal. Suicidal. Now most people would have tackled the suicidal trait or some such. This pc had had at least 200 hours on engrams. No results. I found pc had an allergy to milk.

By using "think processes" I managed to get Expanded Gita run without creating mock-ups. "Think how you could waste milk," etc.

The pc was able to drink milk after that. Big win! Pc made steady gains of like nature afterwards. The pc could drink water. That was an ability. I made the pc able to drink milk too!

PC "B" 1959: Pc never before audited and had a mysterious field. No relief or release on scouting the present life. No change. Got the pc to describe field. Found it was a window. Ran "What part of that picture could you be responsible for?" for a half an hour with pc's *only* response, "I could be responsible for looking out of this window." Then suddenly all shifted, pc got a big kinesthetic of jumping into his car and tearing off in it.

We stopped right there. Pc had a big win, felt there was a change. Felt he could be helped by auditing.

The indicated procedure after was to run responsibility on anything pc saw in the bank until he was in present time with his pictures and then, little by little accustom him to locks, secondaries and engrams, a win every time, until he was clear.

Clearing is a *qualitative* return of confidence in self *not* quantitative handling of bank. By returning confidence, one achieves clearing in a short while.

By the quantity approach one drags the hours out endlessly since there's an endless supply of engrams. The regained ability to handle *one* fully is better than ploughing through a thousand briefly.

Well some day *somebody* will hear me. And we'll have *lots* of clears.

There's also this matter of having a session going before we tackle a bank, for the pc is always tackling his bank out of session and doesn't recover, so there must be a session if he tackles his bank and *does* recover.

A session depends mostly on these conditions:

1. Pc willing to be helped by auditor (or as in an unconscious pc, unable to prevent being helped);
2. Pc under auditor's control to the extent of doing the process;
3. Pc willing to talk freely to the auditor;
4. Pc interested in own case; and
5. Auditor well-trained enough to handle a session form properly.

Then and only then can we begin the gradient approach of recovering pc's confidence in analytically handling himself and abandoning his reactive withholds and restraints and self-imposed barriers.

To accomplish 1 above, run two way help. Even an alcoholic bum, antagonistic and vicious, will come around eventually on two way help more or less two-way commed until it is running like a process.

"How could you help me?"
"How could I help you?"

Those are the magic words on the reluctant or unwilling pc. Eventually the pc becomes willing to be under the auditor's control.

To accomplish 2 above, it is sometimes necessary to run "You make that body sit in that chair" or "You make that body stand still" or both for a long time, pc doing command each time, before control exists sufficient to run S-C-S. These can be big wins for a pc.

To do 3 above, the auditor can run "Think of something you could tell me," "Think of something you might withhold from me," until the E-Meter arm dives. Pc will eventually talk if the pc was under control enough to do the process.

To accomplish 4 we have only to be lengthy in discussing the aspirations and upsets of the pc's life.

To accomplish 5 we should have started a long time ago.

To give pc Big Wins we tackle small targets. Open up the recalls with Cause ARC Straight Wire and "What would you be willing to forget?" Erase and put back a lock.

Erase and put back a moment of pain (stubbed toe, cut finger). Erase and put back a secondary. Erase and put back a minor engram. Erase and put back a rougher overt engram. Do every little job well. Handle every session well. finish what you start. If pc goes greasy on the track and skids, return to control processes via 1 to 4 above. Then win up some more wins.

Straighten up women and men and other terminals with O/Ws.

Do what you like, but keep it no heavier than pc can win with. Give him wins, not a caved-in bank.

Sometimes you have to patch up a whole case that was long ago flubbed. Go at it just as above and *then* run out the first engram that pc was ever thrown into and *then* run out that auditor.

This is the basic philosophy of auditing. The main reason any auditor has lost on a case is his misunderstanding of his approach. He knows "What's wrong" with the pc and attacks it. And the pc loses before he wins.

The only thing *wrong* with a pc is his lack of confidence in handling himself without hurting others. So he creates disabilities which automatically restrain him from making the same mistakes again. Try to relieve those disabilities without returning confidence to the pc and you are liable to lose every time.

It would help you if you made up a chart for each pc and checked it off each session.

1. Pc still willing to be helped _____
2. Pc under control and executing every command _____
3. Pc willing to talk to me _____
4. Pc interested in own case _____
5. I am following model session exactly _____
6. Pc havingness is up _____
7. Pc is having wins _____

If you check these off every time before a session, you won't miss. And you'll know what to tackle if the intensive is not going too well. The answers are *there* in those seven points, not in a startling new departure in processes!

Look, I want you to have even more wins than you are having.

I'm not really growling about it. I'll even concede I've never said it so succinctly before or lined it up so smoothly. But study it well, won't you? It contains the whole "secret" of auditing. We want more clears.

Whip me up some more won't you?

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.cden
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 7 APRIL 1960
Issue II

D of Ps
Cent Orgs

IMPORTANT

CHECK SHEET FOR HGC

The following check sheet is to be made up in a mimeo form and issued to your staff auditors to be used at the beginning of each session. The data relative to it is in HCO Bulletin of April 7, 1960. Teach your staff auditors that bulletin. Insist heavily on the use of the check sheet before session commences while sitting down with pc. And thereby watch your results and number of clearings soar. This is **IMPORTANT**.

Check Sheet:

Pc Name _____ Date _____ Auditor _____

1. Pc still willing to be helped by me and HGC _____
2. Pc under control and executing every command _____
3. Pc willing to talk to me freely _____
4. Pc interested in own case _____
5. I have been following model session exactly except to establish the above
6. Pc's havingness is up _____
7. Pc is getting wins he knows about _____

The following has been handled on pc's case:

Pc has been run on objective havingness

Cause ARC Straight Wire _____

Forget _____

Pc willing to recall something without regret _____

Pc's field has been cleared with responsibility _____

A minor painless lock run as an engram with confront and responsibility _____

A minor recent physical injury has been run with confront and responsibility and finally reappeared _____

A secondary has been contacted and run, erased and made to reappear _____

A mild engram has been run with confront and responsibility until it was erased and run further until it reappeared _____

A past death has been run fully _____

O/W has been run on necessary general terminals as indicated by meter _____

The case is progressing. _____

Auditor's signature

The above check sheet does not supplant the Auditor's report. It is turned in with the report.

Its purpose, in 1 to 7, is to keep Auditors alert to what makes cases advance.

LRH:js.rd
Copyright ©1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 11 APRIL 1960

Assn Sec
HCO Secs
D Of Training Hat

NEW TRAINING SCHEDULE

Earlier bulletins this year have presented a new training line up, more or less as follows.

Based on eight weeks, the weeks are divided as follows:

- I. Comm Course
- II. Upper Indoc Course
- III. Model Session
- IV. CCHs
- V. to VIII. Theory and practice as per London HPA/BScn tapes.

It will be seen that the order of weeks I to IV can be changed around save for Comm Course.

You have just received HCO Bulletin April 7, 1960, which gives a new rationale of training. It affects the stress but not the programme. It means in short that the HPA will have to know how to run Straight Wire, locks, secondaries and engrams and how to use an E-Meter. Further they have to know the six types of processes.

Now this is asking a lot at HCA/HPA level, in view of the fact that the South African ACC on the Model Session at the end of one week quiz flunked out at the rate of 2/3rds of the class.

The Model Session (HCO Bulletin of February 25, 1960) can be broken down into sections like the Comm Course and a Straight Wire process run, or it can be run from the sheet enough times to make students familiar with it.

You will have a new book on auditing based on HCO Bulletins since December 23, AD9, but it will not be in circulation for a while.

Teach people light taps not heavy slugs. Go on this basis—Doctors treat injuries because they cannot confront bodies. We confront people. We can always see what is wrong with a person. It takes real genius to find something right and improve it. A pc is ill because he is restraining himself from doing wrong. We have to convince him he can do right. Reactive self-restraint is the purpose of all engrams. This must be replaced with analytical control. Until one can confront his bank and win he does not regain confidence in controlling himself. So he has engrams. "We don't treat wrongness. We treat people."

Until a student has that down pat, you won't get any real training done anyway. He'll go out and lose. And we'll then lose him.

Hence the push on training and the half price course offers (when accompanied by a letter signed by a certified auditor).

I hope you are going to have to cope with a lot of students.

If you arrange your course well now, you will have wins later.

And when you teach a student to get little wins to make big wins we'll really have this show on the road.

LRH :js.jh
Copyright ©1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 14 APRIL 1960

Assn Secs
HCO Secs
PE Director Hat
Franchise Holders

NEW PE DATA

SUPERVISING PE CO-AUDIT

The best way to run a PE course was given in the London 1959 HPA/BScn tapes and the 6th London ACC tapes.

This consisted of supervising the PE as though you were the only auditor present, all the co-auditing auditors to be used only as your mouthpiece. The "Instructor" audits each case through the co-auditor.

All pcs present can be put on one meter at the instructor's desk by means of leads and a multiple switch. This is of considerable use and is authorized for all Central Orgs, PE Foundations.

ASSESSMENT

An assessment is a necessity on each case. At the course's start, assess rapidly with a meter and then when the majority are running on terminals go back and do a longer assessment on the hard one. Keep a record of your assessment. But don't spend all your time favouring hard cases. It makes other cases tend to toughen to get your attention.

If a case isn't getting meter fluctuation on the meter at the instructor's desk, check into it. A running case gets a changing needle and a changing tone arm.

Keeping a record of tone arm position and needle state for each case helps you keep track. It's done by making a three column roster, the same one you used for assessment.

PROCESSES

You have three processes you may now use.

1. O/W on a selected terminal "What have you done to ___?" "What have you withheld from ___?" A good assessment for this is: "What person do you have problems about?" Run that person.
2. Comm process on a body part. "From where could you communicate to a ___?" on an E-Meter, assess for a body part that falls not what the pc says. The part that falls will be real to the pc. An obviously ill part may not be real. When the chosen part is flat or reasonably so, assess for a new body part. Body parts are safer to run on co-audit than indefinite terminals. But "friend" or "car" can still be used. Use the paper trick on all co-audit comm processes.
3. Responsibility process "What part of your life have you been responsible for?" This requires no assessment but it is rather rougher than the first two above.

PROCUREMENT

Your best procurement comes from word of mouth and happy cases.

If you supervise well and make sure the co-audit pc gets gains, you will have good word of mouth.

Free co-audit weeks given for one reason or another (such as highest scores of PE course quiz) is good procurement.

Well advertised free PE and a good comm course are the best procurements. A good info package mailed to everyone on your list and all callers is a necessity.

Being on time, handling bodies in an orderly way are good procurement.

HAS CERTIFICATES

HAS certificate requirements have changed.

A passing grade on an examination of materials covered is all it takes at this time.

Later we may require that they pass a comm course too. But not now.

So examine your past students on essentials they've been taught and as they pass send their names and addresses to your central organization and the student will receive a nice HAS certificate.

Your student having a certificate will help procurement.

SUMMARY

PE co-audit is running well where auditors are doing it by the book, running badly where the handling of processes, students and paper work is sloppy. Good total 8-C = good course. Courses where regular charges are made and collected get better graphs.

Here and there a PE co-audit set up is running poorly because the auditor instructor does not have info packages and does not even try to handle bodies walking in.

Most everywhere PE co-audit is doing well. I am very proud of the way most auditors are trying and winning. Thank You.

By the way, the Scientology population of earth has exactly doubled in the last ten months!

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PRESESSION PROCESSES

Have you ever wondered how to persuade a stranger to get audited? Have you ever had to “sell” a hostile family member Scientology before you could audit someone? Have you ever had trouble auditing anyone?

Well, you’ll be pleased to know that these problems have been vanquished by some material I’ve developed. You see—I *do* think of you!

Pre-session processes are a new idea. They were hinted at in HCO Bulletin April 7, 1960. But there’s more to it.

A pre-session process is a process that is used to get into session:

- (a) A stranger who isn’t receiving well;
- (b) A person antagonistic to Scientology;
- (c) A person who ARC breaks easily in session;
- (d) A person who makes few gains in session;
- (e) A person who relapses after being helped;
- (f) A person who makes no gains in auditing;
- (g) A person who, having been audited, refuses further auditing;
- (h) Any person being audited as a check-off before session, aloud to pc or silently by auditor.

Pre-session processes parallel in importance the auditing of unconscious people. But I feel they have wider use and will assist dissemination enormously as well as improve graph gains.

These processes are four in number. They are designed as classes of processes to handle these four points:

- 1. Help factor
- 2. Control factor
- 3. Pc Communication factor
- 4. Interest factor.

Unless these four points are present in a session, it is improbable, in a great number of cases, that any real, lasting gain will be made. This is old data.

It is new data to consider these as *pre-session* points.

Before one has a pc in session he cannot really run a Model Session or any session at all.

The usual struggle is to start a session and then try to start a session by having the pc go into session.

This is a confusion of long standing and leads auditors to run processes like the CCHs when they could be running higher processes. The CCHs are often necessary, but not necessary on a pc who *could* be put into session easily and could then run higher level processes for faster gains.

The only thing this changes about a Model Session (HCO Bulletin February 25, 1960) is the START. If a pc is in the auditing room and auditing is to be attempted, then one starts, not Tone 40, but formal. "We are going to begin auditing now." The auditor then goes over his check list and ticks off the pre-session points 1, 2, 3, 4, and satisfied, goes into the rudiments and carries forward a Model Session. Naturally, if he wants to put the pc into session with pre-session processes, when the pc is finally in session we would startle him out with a Tone 40 "START".

A pc who is running extraordinarily well and making fast gains should be checked over silently at beginning and then given "START" Tone 40 as in the Model Session and the auditor proceeds at once to rudiments. But this would be used only after the pc was really getting along. A new pc or new to the auditor should be pre-sessioned as above for many sessions.

A pre-session type of session might find the auditor not satisfied with more than the first two of the four points by session end. If so, end the session easily with a location of pc's attention on the room and simply end it by saying so.

While many processes may be developed out of the four classes of help, control, communication and interest, it is certain that these classes will remain stable, since these four are vital to auditing itself and imply no wrongness in the pc. All other known factors of life and the mind can be handled by a session and improved. But these four—help, control, communication and interest—are vital to auditing itself and without them auditing doesn't happen.

One or more of these four items was awry in every pc who, one, did not take auditing, two, on whom gains were poor or slow, and three, who failed to complete auditing. So you see that is a number of pcs and the pre-session processes are the important remedy. Why make the same error again.

One of my jobs is to improve auditing results. This may be, as you may find, the biggest single step in that direction since Book One, since it includes them all. The auditor can *cause* help, control, communication and interest rather than hope they will come to pass. As such these four factors are practically clubs.

I would almost rather not give you some processes to fit these four conditions. I certainly desire you to be free in inspecting, understanding and employing them. What great art could arise from this innocent scientific quartet. I would rather you used them as a maestro rather than play sheet music.

How adroit, how clever, how subtle we could become with them!

Example of what I mean:

Grouchy car salesman. Knows that anything Scientologist friend Bill takes up is "rot". Hates people.

Scientologist approaches. Gets a scoff at Bill's enthusiasms.

Scientologist handles help. "Don't you think people can be helped?" Lazy argument, all very casual. Car salesman finally wins by losing utterly. He concedes something or someone could help him.

Another day. Scientologist approaches. Asks car salesman to move here and there, do this and that, all by pretending interest in cars. Really it's 8-C. All casual. Salesman wins again by losing.

Another day. Scientologist gets on subject of communication with car salesman. Finally salesman concedes he doesn't mind telling Scientologist about his shady deals. Does. Salesman wins and so does Scientologist.

Another day. Scientologist gets car salesman to see pictures or blackness by any smooth conversation. Salesman becomes interested in getting his flat feet fixed up.

Negative result: One scoffer less Positive result: One new pc.

Any way you handle them the Deadly Quartet *must* be present before auditing, or even interest in Scientology, can exist.

Talk about John Wellington Wells. The Scientologist can weave even greater magical spells with help, control, communication and interest.

Talk to a new club. What about? Help, of course. Get them to agree they could be helped or could help.

And when they ask you to come back talk about good and bad control. And when they want you again, it's communication you stress.

And interest of course, when you give *that* talk, will find you ready people.

In Scientology everybody wins. It's the only game in which everyone does. With these four factors you can't lose and neither can they.

As a Scientologist you know several processes under each heading. It's establishing each point in turn that's important.

Ah, what a shock you'll get on some pc when you find he wasn't ever interested in his own case. He was getting audited for his wife! You'll only find that out if you get the three forerunners flat first.

PROCESSES

On processes, under help you have two-way comm about help, two-way help, help in brackets, dichotomies of can-help can't-help, rising scale on help; lots of forms.

On control you have two-way comm, TR 5 (You make that body sit in that chair), CCH 2, old-time 8-C, object S-C-S, S-C-S, etc, etc.

On communication you have two-way comm, "Recall a time you communicated," etc, but much more basically, two-way comm to get off overts, O/W on the auditor, "Think of something you have done to somebody" "Think of something you have withheld from somebody" with occasional, "Anything you would like to tell me?" when meter acts up. Nothing helps communication like getting off fundamental overts that would keep pc out of session or ARC with auditor. That's the point of this step, whether done casually in a drawing room or in an auditing room. "Surely, Mrs. Screampack, you can't sit there and tell me that, unlike the rest of the human race, you have never done a single wrong thing in your whole life!" Well, that's one way to knock apart a case at a formal dinner party.

Interest is the place where your knowledge of the mind comes into heavy play. But note that this is Number Four. How often have we used it for Number One and flopped ! That was because the correct One was missing, to say nothing of Two and Three! I can see you now trying to interest a family member with Four without teaching on the first three. Why, I've done it myself! Just like you.

I audited an official of a government after a dinner party for two hopeless hours one night. He knew he'd been run over. But he surely was no sparkling result. I shamefully and vividly recall now that, not touched by me, his idea of help was to kill off the whole human race!

The first steps of OT-3A will gain interest from almost anyone. Even the Black Fives will get confounded when they find what state their recalls are in.

AND THEN?

And then follow a gradient scale of gain. Find something the pc can do and improve it.

When the four points, the Deadly Quartet, are covered, we have the rudiments and they must cover facts, not glibity.

After the four points you improve the case by gradient scales.

And you keep the four points established.

SUMMARY

If it takes you a hundred hours to establish the four points of sessioning, you'll still win faster because you will win.

If it takes only two hours the first time you do them on a pc, feel lucky.

Be thorough.

Establish the four points. Use a Model Session. Follow a course in processing of finding something the pc knows he can do and improve that ability.

And you'll have clears.

And if your use of the Deadly Quartet becomes as adroit and smooth as I think it will, we will have this planet licked and be scouting the stars before we're too much older.

At last, we've created the basic weapon in Scientology dissemination and processing that makes us a lot more effective on Earth than a lot of drooling politicians scrubbing their hands around an atomic warhead. By golly, they better watch out now.

But don't tell them. Just run (1) Help, (2) Control, (3) Communication and (4) Interest.

Now go tackle somebody who wouldn't buy Scientology—use the Deadly Quartet. And win!

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 24 APRIL 1960

U.S. Fran Hldrs

CONCERNING THE CAMPAIGN FOR PRESIDENCY

A person named Richard M. Nixon will enter his name this Fall at a convention as a citizen aspiring to the Presidency of the United States. Many Scientologists think he is all right because I once quoted him. This is very far from the facts and I hasten to give you the real story why Richard M. Nixon must be prevented at all costs from becoming president.

Two years ago in Washington this man's name appeared in a newspaper article as uttering an opinion about psychology. I called attention to this opinion as a matter of banal interest in an article.

Shortly two members of the United States Secret Service, stating they had been sent directly by Nixon, entered the establishment of the Founding Church of Washington, D.C., armed with pistols, but without warrant or formal complaint, and with foul and abusive language threatened the girls on duty there.

Hulking over desks, shouting violently, they stated that they daily had to make such calls on "lots of people" to prevent Nixon's name from being used in ways Nixon disliked.

These two men stated they were part of Nixon's office and were acting on his express orders. They said that Nixon believed in nothing the Founding Church or Scientology stood for.

Their conduct before the ladies present was so intolerable that Mary Sue, having heard the shouting and curses from her office, had to come and force these men to leave, which they finally did, but only after she threatened to call the police.

As Scientologists were present, much information was obtained, of course, from these agents as to their routine activities. These were not creditable. Nixon constantly used the service against the voteless and helpless people of Washington to suppress the use of his name.

I am informing you of an exact event. It convinced me that in my opinion Nixon is not fitted to be a president. I do not believe any public figure has a right to suppress the use of his name in articles. I do not believe a public figure should enforce his will on writers or organizations by use of the Secret Service. I believe a democracy ceases to exist when deprived of freedom of speech. I do not believe any man closely connected with psychiatry should hold a high public office since psychiatry has lent its violence to political purposes.

Would you please write your papers and tell your friends that Nixon did this and that his actions against private people in Washington cause us to defy his cravings to be president.

It's my hope you'll vote and make your friends vote. But please don't vote for Nixon. Even his own Secret Service agents assure us he stands for nothing we do.

I do not tell you this because Mary Sue came close to serious injury at Nixon's hands. I tell you this because I think psychiatry and all Fascist-Commie forces have had their day.

We want clean hands in public office in the United States. Let's begin by doggedly denying Nixon the presidency no matter what his Secret Service tries to do to us *now* in Washington. It is better, far better, for us to run the risk of saying this now, while there's still a chance, than to fail to tell you of it for fear of reprisals and then be wiped out without defence by the Secret Service or other agency if Nixon became president. He hates us and has used what police force was available to him to say so. So please get busy on it. I am only telling a few friends.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 25 APRIL 1960

HCO Secs

SEND YOUR CLIPPING FILES

Please look into your Central Org files and desk drawers and bundle up every magazine and newspaper clipping you have and ship them surface mail to me at HCO WW.

I am going to write a booklet on social conditions and psychiatry as *The Philosophy That Failed*.

People have been sending and giving you clippings for a long while. They may have been filed under various headings. If it is a mag or newspaper clipping, please send it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd
Copyright ©1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 28 APRIL 1960

All Fran Auditors
HCO Secretaries
Assoc Secretaries

BOOKS ARE DISSEMINATION

One of the oldest Organizational Health Charts states "...given books in distribution, the remainder of these facts are true. . .".

No matter what you do with an organization, no matter how much writing of letters you do, the dissemination success of a group will not accomplish any security unless books are distributed.

Seeing to it that the newly interested person is provided with the proper reading materials is a far more important step than most HCO Secs and PE directors have realized, but these are not the worst offenders. The field auditor, attempting to run a group and keep afloat, fails most often, when he does fail, in the Book Department.

Making sure that interested people get books is making sure that they will continue their interest.

Assuring then they will read and understand the books, it is necessary to get them into an extension course.

If you think you can interest a person in Scientology and yet avoid your responsibility in getting him or her to read books on the subject, you are wasting a tremendous amount of effort.

Do you know why the first book DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH was written? Word of mouth on Dianetics was going forward so rapidly that my letter volume, even before the first book, was startling. Each one of these people expected me, either to write them a long letter and tell them what it was all about, or to be given a chance to come and see me so that I could tell them personally what it was all about. In other words, my time was going to be consumed, not in further research, but in writing letters and talking to people. My answer to this was to write DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH which rapidly informed the newly interested person what this new science was all about.

I will make you a wager. I think you are wasting most of your time answering questions which are answered in books. I think you are talking yourself hoarse to friends, and other people, and groups, explaining over and over and over things that are already taken up in books. I think your time is being devoured by attempts to reach through the natural conversational barriers of people.

You are not giving, I am sure, the newly interested person an opportunity to go and sit down quietly by himself, without any social strain, and study a book on the subject. Only in this way will he come to a decision about the subject which is his own independent decision having inspected the materials. This has to be done quietly and it is best done through the pages of a book.

Without any reservations, I can tell you that DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH, based as it is upon mental image pictures and energy masses, those things which are most real to people, is the best forward vanguard in our possession. It was written at a time when I was very interested in bridging the gap between an uninformed public and an informed public, and contains in it most of the arguments necessary to quiet the suspicions of the newly interested person and contains as well most of the answers to that person's questions.

DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH contains today a perfectly workable therapy. But more importantly it contains a bridge between the uninformed and the informed public on the subject of Scientology.

If you are not furiously pushing DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH and if you are not insisting that each newly interested person read it as something new, startling and strange in the world, you will be wasting most of your dissemination efforts.

Oddly enough, this book, to this day, sells more copies around the world than the average best seller in any given year. Where it has been pushed, Scientology is booming. Where it has not been pushed, Scientology is limp.

Just inspect the number of simple, startling items in DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH. Here you find the Dynamics, here you find several of the earliest Axioms, here you even find the rudimentary ARC tone scale. You find as well a thoroughly accurate description of clears and the reactive mind.

Do you realize that the world does not yet know anything about the reactive mind? Here is the total answer to Freud's subconscious. Here is the resolution of most of the problems of psychotherapy.

You know so many things that are new and wonderful and strange that you forget that Bill and Joe and Mary have never heard of any part of them. They are not interested in past lives. They are interested in what makes them do strange and peculiar things. They have heard vaguely about the tenets of psychology. They do not know that these have all been answered in DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH.

When people are asking you questions about Dianetics and Scientology, no matter how obtuse or abstruse the questions are, your best answer to these questions was my earliest answer and that was, "Read DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH and that will answer your question".

In the last HCO Bulletin I gave you pre-session processes. This makes a complete cycle. With pre-session processes we can take a new person and by running the course of help, control, communication and interest, put him in a frame of mind to want to know more about the subject.

In this Bulletin I am trying to tell you what to do about the person once you have brought him up to this point. It is all right for you to go on and audit him but I assure you he will never get anywhere until he has read DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH. All the questions and counter arguments and upsets which are boiling through his mind now are answered in that book, bringing him up to a point where he wants auditing, where he successfully goes through PE. Give him auditing, let him co-audit, do anything you want with him, but insist, insist, insist that he reads DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH.

You would be completely amazed at the ideas some people have of Scientology even after they have gone through a PE Course and have read *Problems of Work* or some other manual pushed off on them simply because it is cheap. *Problems of Work* is all right and should be distributed but it is not informative on the subject of the human mind.

Let's get down to basics here and see what we have really done. We have made a breakthrough. The moment of the breakthrough is recorded at public level with **DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH**. If people do not read this book, they just will not have broken through.

Any "sales tricks" you employ after you have succeeded by use of help, control, communication and interest in arousing that interest, to get them now to inform themselves of the moment of breakthrough, will be well expended by you, otherwise these people will be talking through a fog and will experience a sensation of having been brought up to some high plateau without having climbed a cliff. It is factual that you can bring a person all the way to clear and have on your hands a mentally illiterate person. I know, because I have done just that. All the clears I made twelve to thirteen years ago evaporated into the society. I did them a great deal of good. Some of them are now occupying high positions, but none of them have ever associated me and my work in Dianetics and Scientology with what happened to them. They are, for the most part, convinced that what I did was some fabulously magical thing which was done for them only, and for them especially, something like a spiritual revival, but nothing to be understood. These people never did gain that understanding because I never explained to them what was happening. It was only after **DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH** was written and distributed that we began to get somewhere in the world. People we processed might have been led to worry more about their own cases than those I processed, but at the same time their worrying was at least intelligent. I can still clear people with the technologies of twelve and thirteen years ago and, indeed, have been carefully reintroducing you to these technologies. Now the time has come for us to realize that there are very close to two and a half billion people on this planet who are mentally illiterate. They do not know what makes them tick. They have no concept whatsoever of the basis of human reaction. They are intolerant. They are at war with one another. They follow strange leaders and wind up in strange places. They have no hope that anything will ever dig them out. Only a minute percentage of these people have ever been introduced to **DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH**.

Do not believe for a moment that just because I wrote a book on the subject cases became harder. As a matter of fact they became more co-operative. We are making a great many clears today. Hardly a week passes on my correspondence lines without clears being reported. But look at the mental illiteracy even of some auditors. Do you know that people report me clears and call them releases. These people have never studied the definition and capabilities of clear in **DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH**. They bring preclears up to this standard, find there is a considerable distance to go and start striking for theta-clear before they say anybody is clear. You yourself may have made a clear and classified the clear as a release just because you were not totally familiar with the conditions of clear. I still think the best statement of a clear occurred in **DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH**. I have had no reason to revise that statement. Pushed at, however, by many Scientologists, I have tried to find way stops between clear, as defined in **DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH**, and OT. There are quite a few. I almost laughed in somebody's face the other day when he said to me that a notable person on one central organization's staff was being audited by him and that he had gotten her up to a state of release "with a free needle on anything you asked her", and added that he would soon have her clear if he kept working at it. Concerning the same person, visitors at that central organization for some time have been saying, "She has a sort of feeling about her as though she might be clear". The truth of the matter is she has been clear for several months but her auditor is straining so hard, seeing as he does how far human capability can be made to reach, that it has never occurred to him that he has passed clear some time back. Any PC that has a relatively free needle has probably been cleared by the standards laid down in **DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH**.

Now that we can interest people, let's take the next inevitable step. Let's push this book. Let's crowd it into people's hands and demand that they buy it. Let's develop the trick, when they ask us complicated questions, of stating that they should read **DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH**.

After all, we have a brand new science in the world. DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH is a brand new book that describes it at public level and it is a good thing if you want to get people into a house to get them to come in the front door. The front door we have is DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH. I, personally, do not believe the book could ever be written again, since it was written at a time when I was well aware of the public arguments concerning the mind. For the indifferently literate person it forms the necessary bridge from knowing nothing to knowing something. It is an exciting book. Push it. Get your people to read it. Now let's get going.

If you cause cards to be printed concerning the whereabouts of PE Courses, always add to them:

“To know more about this subject read DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH, available at (give the place). The greatest scientific development in this century has happened.”

To all Central Orgs. Push this book with every possible display and mention. Where you find people have not bought it in your Central Files, you'll find interest has been lagging. Play down all other PE books, display DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH as *the* book they must now buy. Tell them so during the breaks. “DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH answers your questions.”

Unlimited stocks are available at HCO WW and even more are already printed and being bound now in New Zealand for N.Z., Australian and South African shipment. Order all Southern Hemisphere stock of DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH through HCO WW.

We've lost the people in a maze of many titles. Take down all your many book displays. Concentrate on *one*, DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH.

I am asking Australia for instance to have a huge wooden book, DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH, erected on their marquee and spotlighted.

We can absorb the world's confusion on *one* stable datum. Let's do it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE SCIENTIFIC TREATMENT OF THE INSANE

The insanity rate per capita in South Africa is appalling. Through the papers and reports of Peggy Conway and other sources, it is easily seen that a primary requisite in any programme of the rehabilitation of the Bantu in South Africa would be mental health.

Any race which lives in poverty is already overwhelmed by bad food and disease without adding insanity amongst its familial units.

For instance, a white family in the United States which has amongst its number one insane person is crippled economically through concern and confusion. In a family already burdened by the environment, one insane or even neurotic person could become the back-breaking straw.

However, my records show (and will have to do until I can make a closer survey myself) that the number of insane and neurotic persons runs much higher than amongst comparable populations. The subject has not been studied well probably because “native customs” or “tribal characteristics” are too often advanced as an explanation of irrational conduct. True, there are native customs and tribal characteristics but it would take a Scientologist to separate out the ethnic factors and understand the remainder as neurosis and psychosis.

Malnutrition and anxiety in any person, as we well know, can produce all the symptoms of insanity.

Having studied twelve separate primitive peoples in far flung parts of Earth in this life, it has become obvious that when a state of primitiveness is veneered by white customs the incidence of insanity rises amongst the primitives. For example, the American Indian, when he lost his tribal lands and hunting diet, turned to alcoholism and other degraded forms of insanity. The whites then adjudicated these as characteristics of the Indian rather than insanity.

Any race which is seeking survival under adjusted conditions experiences a high incidence of mental illness.

The keynote of insanity is destructive efforts on various dynamics.

It is doubtful if anyone has realized the part insanity has played in various disturbances, nor how it has prevented the bettering of various conditions in the world.

Mental Health, a *real* programme of mental health, is vital to the public peace and public safety.

Here we have a hardworking man, trying to adjust, trying to hold his head up. At home he has a wife too neurotic to help, a teenage son that has gone the route of criminal insanity, a father who has taken to drink, all of them hanging upon his work and pay. It's rough trying to remain steady, hardworking and sane under such conditions. The temptation to quit is strong. Before a populace can be a credit it must have some hope it can live through it—and insanity is the biggest threat to that hope.

Yet insanity in any population is not limited to the poor. Indeed, the incidence of insanity in the United States is as high in the very rich as it is amongst the very poor.

Real mental health, which the Scientologist can accomplish as the practitioner of the only validated psychotherapy in the world today, would reduce the statistics.

South Africa lately suffered from insane have-nots and even worse at the hands of an insane “have”.

Insanity is a problem that is both legal and scientific. A criminal is in fact insane. A terrorist is insane. People can be policed only so far. The insane, as we know so well on a scientific level, are so far from being policed that they cannot follow the simplest order.

Insanity is neither hard to understand or treat. But only Scientology could say this.

Insanity divides into eight general types. These are easily plotted, they are irrationally destructive or succumb impulses on each dynamic. Assign the tone scale to each type and you have all the insanities there are.

The cure of insanity is accomplished in its deeper stages by very light and careful handling. A person has to be brought up to the level of being processed. The first step is rest. The second step is mild exercise. The third step is group processing. Above this level processing is possible. The cost of treatment is not high if undertaken sensibly. But 19th Century practitioners who knew little about it got on a compulsive “do” and, failing with milder methods, resorted to brutality. Fortunately, such practices are now fading out under our influence. Rest camps and hospitals would do more for insanity than all the violence in the world. But only a Scientologist would be wise enough to refuse to Q and A with the violence of insanity by using violence to “cure” it.

Scientology could handle the problem of insanity in South Africa. Only when insanity has been handled could there be broad guarantees of a calm future. What is a riot but a third dynamic insanity?

The tremendous work done by Peggy Conway, bless her, in her surveys and contacts now comes to great use.

Without in any way transgressing, we have already formed a programme on this.

We must legally establish ourselves, support the government in its desire to handle this problem, and coordinate our efforts.

The government and the population need our help. And if we help we will bring order in our sphere of activity. We will be wearing our own hats.

I am in deadly earnest about our role in public peace. It is not political but technical and as such we have no peers.

All we need to work on at the moment is getting people convinced of the truth that we *can* help the situation and that only we can help in this sphere.

So here we go. Are you with me?

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: dm.nm
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 4 MAY 1960

All Assoc Secs

ASSOCIATION SECRETARY LETTER

Tapes

The D of T Washington has just collected the titles of the 65 hours of tape necessary for a total play of an HCA/HPA course.

These include the London HPA/HCA tapes. The additional ones are probably not in your possession, at least in good condition.

Therefore we are doing the additional tapes to those you already have so you will be able to play through a whole course, all the selected tapes.

Please signify your willingness to have these additional tapes 3³/₄ ips, 2 hrs per reel to complete your HCA/HPA course routine.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 5 MAY 1960

All Fran Auditors
Assoc Secs
HCO Secs

HELP

We have known for some time the importance of the button *Help*. It is first and foremost amongst the key buttons of Scientology. Thoroughly clearing Help alone, and on back track terminals, has made clears.

In an essay published on the otherwise unpublished Students' Manual, I stressed the fact that unless the preclear and the auditor had Help straightened out they were not likely to make very much progress. Help is the key button which admits auditing. The remaining buttons of Control, Communication and Interest, give us a session. But ill we cannot even start pre-sessioning with any other button than Help.

Since the winter of 1957/58 when this was used in an American ACC I have been working with this trying to get a better understanding of it for you.

It now appears that Help is the make-break point between sanity and insanity. That a person cannot accept help along some minor line does not mean that he is insane, but it certainly means he has some neurotic traits.

The inference level of this condition of aberration on the subject of Help would be a fear of dependency. This means that Help has already gone wrong with the person. We see in children occasionally an enormous striving to be self-reliant. We ordinarily applaud this but if we inspect the child carefully we will find that resistance to being helped goes along with an obsession to help. Parents themselves, disbelieving that the child can help them, usually inhibit the child's help and thus worsen the condition. I have seen one child go downhill to "normal" by reason of a thwarting of help by the parents. But no matter how fondly the psychologist used to believe in the nineteenth century that childhood was a good pattern to use for estimating future social conduct, we in Scientology know that the child has already become aberrated on the subject before it is manifested in this light.

My examinations have now led me to the conclusion that a person has a make-break point of sanity on any given subject. This point is help. On the tone scale it would compare at 2.0 for any dynamic. The whole index of a personality could be adjudicated by an examination of the person's reactions to various types of help. Above this point a person can help, and can be helped, providing, of course, the help is sincere, and really is help. Below this point help becomes betrayal.

Help is always betrayal to a thoroughly aberrated person. This explains a great deal to us when we understand it. The first example that comes readily to notice is the reaction of a very low scale pc undergoing auditing. He invariably thinks, and may even sometimes tell the auditor, that the auditor has not helped him but betrayed him.

All auditing protests except those against flagrant breaches of code denote a breakdown of the help button in the auditing session. While it does no good to run Help on a preclear and continue while running it to repeat flagrant code breaks, it does do a great deal of good to clarify the whole subject of help if a session seems to be full of ARC breaks, no matter what the auditor tries to do to patch them up.

It is unfortunately true that help can be as wrong with the auditor as it can be with the preclear where we have uncleared people doing auditing. However, it has been my experience that even while some of their efforts were completely knuckleheaded,

practically no auditors exist who are not sincerely trying to help the preclear. The trouble comes about when the preclear clips the effort of the auditor into the category of betrayal. This makes the auditor react against the preclear, and the situation deteriorates.

We have, in the immediate past of this civilization, the deterioration of several of the practices which began as a sincere effort to help and which are not now classifiable as anything better than betrayal. Psychiatry and medicine are both good examples of this. The person who goes to a psychiatrist usually finds himself betrayed. He does not receive help, he receives brutality in the form of electric shocks, brain surgery and other degrading experiences. Even in the highest form of psychiatry it was common advice for the psychiatrist to tell the wife that the best cure for her troubles was to betray her husband, and vice versa.

The psychiatrist was caught in this help-betrayal deterioration. Psychiatry had so long attempted to help the insane without success that at last they began to Q and A with their patients. Of course, to an insane patient help is always betrayal. Medicine is now going a similar course unwittingly, and has lost most of its public repute through not having stayed on a research line that would bring medicine upscale, but continued with a line of application which considered man a body and would not consider him anything else. Considering a person to be a "hunk of meat" is a sort of a betrayal in itself. Naturally one betrays a thetan when he regards the thetan as a piece of meat.

World War Two pretty well saw the end of the last dregs of sincere help in psychiatry, most governments involved in the war employed psychiatry, it now turns out, for political purposes. They were set a very good example by one, Hitler. Thus the last embers of sincere help in psychiatry were more or less extinguished. Nothing like this would happen in Scientology because we are dealing with basic truths rather than basic ambitions. Where ambition becomes greater than truth any sphere of activity goes to pieces. Indeed, in the final analysis that is the fundamental deterioration of the track.

Another excellent example is found in the Mau-Mau uprising in Kenya. The terrorists killed only twenty whites as compared to thousands of natives, but the whites they chose to kill were only those who had sought to help them. The Kikuyu was evidently completely certain that anyone seeking to help him was only betraying him. Their reaction, then, in killing their best friends becomes more understandable. The action remains insane, but in their frame of reference it was entirely comprehensible. Any time we go about the task of handling large bodies of insane people or illiterate and fearful native populaces, we would do well to keep in mind the importance of this help button, realizing that to these help is totally betrayal. The thing to betray is this help-betrayal identification, not the people.

If you sort this out and find your own examples and see whether or not it holds true for you, I think you have a small gasp of relief coming to you. No Scientologist has been without a preclear who has not become absolutely certain somewhere in the course of auditing that the entire goal of the auditor was to betray. This left one hanging with an unsolved riddle. Our own sincerity was beyond question. How to be misinterpreted this wildly was so incomprehensible that we often assigned the reasons to ourselves. Perhaps some of these reasons did lie with ourselves. Nevertheless, in the final analysis the only thing we did wrong was not to clear the Help button with the preclear.

CLEARING HELP

There are many ways to clear the Help button. As this is the first step on pre-sessioning, it may be that the button has to be cleared several times in the course of auditing.

The first thing to do is to put the preclear on a meter. If you don't have a good meter, and you don't know what a meter does, order one fast and get instruction. Discuss help with the preclear, and note the needle reactions. If the needle tended to stiffen and stick on any discussion of help, then you have your work set out for you. If

the needle remains free and continues to be free on the subject of help, no matter what you run or how you discuss it, of course the button remains free.

It is important that any attack you make upon this button be continued as a pre-session activity for auditing period after auditing period, if necessary, until the meter needle is free on this subject. There is no need to go on, in fact there is no point in going on, if the pre-clear thinks that you are going to betray. Somewhere this will manifest itself as ARC breaks, the whole auditing programme will go to pieces, and you will wind up without a pre-clear, as well as an unfinished cycle of action. So pay attention to what I tell you here, where auditing is concerned: work with help and nothing but help until the needle is free on the subject.

What processes should you run? The first process, of course, is ordinary two-way comm. One discusses the pre-clear helping others and others helping the pre-clear. One gets the pre-clear's views on the subject of help, and without evaluating for the pre-clear, lets the pre-clear express these views.

The next process is Help on a two-way bracket. This is, "How could you help me?", alternated with "How could I help you?" Do not expect this to do very much to the tone arm, because it won't. A two-way flow of this character is not a reliable way to bring a tone arm down. But it does do something, and does tend to free up the needle on this particular subject.

The old five-way bracket on help can then be employed: "How could you help another person?" "How could another person help another person?" "How could another person help you?" "How could you help me?" "How could I help you?"

This is a rough bracket but it is useful and should not be dropped out of the repertoire.

Is there any process which would clear up the help button thoroughly and totally?

Naturally, since it moved forward again into such importance, I have been doing work on it and have developed up to a stage of conditional application (which means, I leave myself free to change my mind when broad experience has been gained) a new way of loosening up any solution. I have been applying this to the central buttons in Scientology and have found it working. The general formula is to take the button one wants to clear and ask the pc what problem a certain solution could be to him.

Applying this to help, one would repetitively ask the pc, "What problem could help be to you?"

I first used this on the button responsibility with very good results, since I found that responsibility is very aberrated in its reactive definitions and, because one is often being a valence, is run irresponsibly. This version of running responsibility to a flat point seems to be quite workable.

If the pre-clear is inventing answers rather than picking them up off the track, you might do better to ask him the following version, "What problem has help been to you?" If invention was present one always has the remedy, in spite of the fact that no terminal is apparently present, of running, "What help could you confront?" "What help would you rather not confront?" I don't know how far this would go as I have not tested it over a long period, but at least in its first stages it works. Responsibility, oddly enough, can be run on a no-mass terminal or significance. I have not had much chance to test out confront, but on the theory that anything you could run responsibility on you could also run confront on, I would say at first glance this is probably a workable process. I will know more about it soon and I would appreciate your telling me anything you have on it.

You have, therefore, several processes by which help can be flattened. Unfortunately, none of these processes reach an unconscious or insane person. Of course, when I say unconscious, I mean somebody with his eyes shut, and when I say

insane, I mean somebody who is institutionalized, and should be. In the matter of the unconscious person, you have the CCHs and you also have them with the insane person to some extent. However, the best thing for an insane person is not processing, but rest, and when the person has had considerable rest, still processing is not yet the answer, exercise is. And when the person has had some exercise over a long period of time, you will find that group processing with other insane persons is still better than individual auditing. Only at this time is it possible to do very much for the insane. The first reason, of course, that one takes this approach is the auditor. Why attack large numbers of insane cases with individual auditing when other methods are far more economical and efficacious, so long as those other methods are only rest, exercise, group processing, hobby work, and such. Efforts to reach the insane with help, of course, simply restimulate the insane idea that help is betrayal. This is why psychiatry resorted to such savage and bestial "treatments" as shock and surgery. They were up against people who apparently would not be helped. Thus psychiatry went into total effect. This is why psychiatry failed, and is in a failed state today and has lost all of its public repute.

People have been betrayed so often on the whole track that it is no wonder they get help mixed up with betrayal, but help became betrayal only at those periods of the track where the dwindling spiral had been reached for any civilization. Even the upstanding Roman by the third century A.D. was happily using the political mechanism of inviting all the Germanic chiefs, that would accept, to feasts and then poisoning them, after vast assurances that Rome was about to help the chief's country. A deterioration of help can occur on any dynamic and in any area, but, as I said above, it occurs at the make-break point of sanity-insanity.

One word on all this. The preclear may be sane analytically and still react violently at times in session. Remember that he is reacting in session because he has been thrown into the area of his reactive mind. In reactive zones and areas help is almost always betrayal. Thus when running a rough engram do not be amazed to find the pc (whom you have carefully cleared on the subject of help) getting rabid about betrayal. He is in the middle of an engram and, of course, the hard core of any engram is betrayal. Don't break off and start running help on him, just run him on through the engram. He will come out of it all right, if you do your job. Help should be handled as a pre-session process and should be handled well and thoroughly and if in any series of sessions the preclear's idea of help apparently deteriorates, you have gotten him into a series of incidents where help is betrayal and he should be cleared once more as a pre-session activity in some later session on the subject of help.

There are many possible processes, there are many possible approaches. As a Scientologist, understanding this, you should not permit yourself too far into the frame of mind of believing a pc is evil or cannot be helped, simply because he apparently will not be helped. All pcs can be helped. Most pcs have aberrated ideas on the subject. It's up to you to take hold of these as a first order of business and clean them up, at least until the meter needle is free on the subject, no matter how many hours that takes.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.gh.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 10 MAY 1960

HCO Secs
Ds of P
All HGC Auditors

OUR TECHNICAL PROGRAMME

(This applies to all HCO and Central Org Staffs everywhere)

As the data has come in and I have had a chance to view what has been happening, I would say that many riddles are answered and that we are now embarked upon broad HGC pc and Central Org staff clearing programmes. I will be talking more about this and you will see the pattern shaping so here is a forecast of it.

From October to March I stressed security on Central Org staffs and heavy withholds on HGC pcs as the important point. Now we have broad experience with this. We will continue to use it and not forget what we know about O/Ws and we will continue to teach it.

Don't let a bad security risk *near* a staff position ever whether you know the overt or not. It's enough if the needle falls badly on key questions. That's it. The person is not put on any post until audited. (Don't retain on post while auditing for you'll get Dev-T and other evils.) On an HGC pc a bad O/W picture must be cleaned up before you can get too far as the first thing to do. Not even Help bites on a non-confessed criminal. Such persons *know* their own overt. We're kidding ourselves if we think they don't. So shake the pc down when you see a wild tone arm. Getting the O/Ws confessed is all you do; the tone arm may not change much. But the pc will stop dodging it all and you can begin "Help", for responsibility is too steep at this stage and the pc too far down for real high auditing.

In other words there's a pre-session stage for all staff members and a wild tone arm HGC pc. It's not auditing, really. It's a confessional. Cure the analytical "I'm afraid he'll find out" the pc is holding to. Don't run anything on it as though it were a real session. Just shake the info out by any means or process. That's enough.

Now we begin on Help. Two way help is probably the hottest PE process there is. You can shift to that in PE. But remember to get the PE Co-audit team to a more general form of help within a couple of weeks. The five way bracket would be good enough for PE (complicated enough).

For the staff member we go from getting off a few of the hotter O/Ws to help. And we run help flat-flat-flat. Any version, type or kind. We run help until the pc can be asked "How could you help your worst enemy?" without registering the tiniest change on a needle. All we run is help, any version for hours and hours. We take up terminals. We take up dynamic assessment. But we only run help on anything we find. We flatten help until you couldn't get its width with a micro electronic caliper. *Nothing* else. And you'll hear me on this for months to come.

The same applies to the HGC pc. Once the worst O/Ws are confessed we run help in suitable versions. And we run it for weeks if need be until we get a needle flat, free, utterly calm on *any* help question. (Of course if the pc can't talk sensibly at all, we use the CCHs.)

Remember, Help was the primary reason for the clears in 1957-58.

Remember, at 2.0 there is the make-break point. Help is betrayal. How to help? Betray! What is help? A way to do you in! So we audit pcs up to 2.0 with other processes, they blow, they don't come back. "The auditoryak yak yak." So

why run any other process? If you do you'll evidently lose the pc in lots and lots of cases.

Flatten help until the pc *can* be helped and *can help* without *any* qualms.

You've learned a lot about help. Apply it.

Now when we have help flat we'll go to other things. We'll follow up the scales of processes like this:

For a staff member in an HCO or Central Org:

O/Ws confessed only
(don't employ a wild tone arm)
Help flattened
Control flattened
Communication flattened
Communication re-established thoroughly
(by O/W and responsibility)
Havingness completely rehabilitated.

For an HGC pc:

O/Ws confessed
Help flattened
Control flattened
Communication re-established thoroughly (O/Ws and resp)
Locks, secondaries, etc as per the "light touch" bulletin.

If you have to use CCHs you probably are auditing somebody who shouldn't be in an HGC.

On an HGC pc havingness can be run on any pre-session type session. End it up each day with an hour of "Look around here and find something you can have" and have a comfortable pc. But in using havingness while pre-sessioning before control is flat to a free needle remember to make sure pc has done each command before you give the next.

On the field auditors and anybody who has been trained we ought to carry on a programme like:

Get O/Ws confessed
Get help flat-flat-flat
Make sure they get the highest cert they trained for
Get them in for modern training
Get them validated for 1960
Get them audited the rest of the way.

If we attack the field in that order, flattening ourselves, each step we take with them, and taking this step by step with each new Academy trainee, we'll be clearing the field.

Ah, so you penetrate what I'm trying to do! Yes you're right. I've stayed on post and not gone off hunting lions and have re-researched ten years of work and successes and have plotted out the broadest clearing programme I could practically apply. I am clearing every staff member in Central Orgs and HCOs on a timed programme of a few months for each step as given above. You've had the first step, confessed O/Ws. It worked well. By the way, income came way up and flubs went way down. From an October of strewn wreckage we have moved to a May that sees us in pretty wonderful shape organizationally. Income is moving up everywhere. Comm lines are better. Staffs are happier. What did it? The first step for staff members—O/Ws confessed and their use in establishing security.

In my programme, just to make sure we thoroughly win, I've calculated how long it takes to move a new concept in. It's about 5 months. O/Ws info is now grass common. Almost everybody on staffs is aware of meter action and potential. We won't forget or lose it. All right. We conclude this stage for staffs as of now and move into help. You're going to get help for months! Run it, PE it. Co-Audit it. HGC it. Staff clear on it.

Any one of you can grasp all this in minutes. But as a group we have to experience it, learn about it, know it, use it. So it's months now coming on Help. After that we'll move on up.

This is a long-range clearing effort. I want to see nothing but clear staff members the world around. And we'll do it. In just twenty months from now it will be done. That's the timetable. We're five months on our way. Like it?

Now when I'm stressing this on staff members and HGCs are hitting it hard (HGC will continue to run the scale for HGC as given here on each pc), you are going to hit the field auditors and the public with the subject in vogue. Thus you'll be stressing help now until five months are up to all the people you reach. Of course even after that you'll stress it, but for five months we're monomaniac on it. Dig up the help essays in lectures and Abilities. Use them in mags and letters. Get familiar with handling help, talking to people about help, handling help in all its phases. You get clever on the subject. That's all part of it, you'll see another resurgence in Central Orgs and the field just by flattening this one for five months. O/W doubled our success. See what help does now.

What formidable people we'd be if we had all five steps flat! We're already the most effective group on Earth. Let's upgrade our own group ability.

So that's the programme. A staff member is lucky to be aboard just now. Has been lucky especially since Autumn 1959. That was when the bell went. And do not send to find for whom the bell tolls. It tolls for an aberrated Earth.

I audit you. You audit the field and Scientologists, they audit Earth. Is it a bargain?

So get hot on the staff co-audit programme. Get hot on the PE with help. Grind help to pieces on the HGC. Picasso had his blue period. This is the help period.

So let's get clear!

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.cden
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 12 MAY 1960

Franchise Holders
HCO Secs Assn Secs

HELP PROCESSING

At last we've found the button almost any case and all the world can run.

Help may not be everything that is wrong with the world but it is the only common denominator the world can understand.

I have known about *help* for some years and in 1957, autumn, used it, with fateful Step 6, in clearing people. The first clears made easily by others were done with meter assessments and five-way help brackets on terminals.

It was found that Step 6, being a creative process, was bad on some cases. The clearing formula was help and Step 6. We tended to abandon both when Step 6 became an overt. It blew us off.

The next big technical development was O/W. Overt-withhold, of course, is as old as 1954 (Phoenix) when reach-withdraw was introduced. But the full knowledge of what overt-withhold meant to cases was not released until November, 1959. Here came much new technical data, all of it vital to clearing. A person with large withholds from the auditor will not go into session. This is true, valid and useful. We could not clear many people even now without it. Further, we find all losses in Scientology personnel in Central Orgs and the field stem from O/W.

In researching O/W, as early as December, 1958 (Washington, D.C.), it was found and proven conclusively that it was what the person himself did to others that was aberrative, *not* what was done *to* him. The test of this can be made easily. *Given*: an ARC break between auditor and pc who have known each other some time. Note the position of the meter tone arm. Run "What have you done to me?" "What have I done to you?" Observe that after some small variation the limited value of this two-way flow (which assumes the auditor's bad action was half what was wrong with the pc) shows up in a stuck tone arm. This two-way process is too limited to alter the tone arm after a few minutes. A lie has been introduced. This lie sticks the tone arm. Now shift to "What have you done to me?" "What have you withheld from me?" And watch the tone arm free up and eventually go toward clear reading. In other words, the situation freed wholly only when we assumed that only what the pc had done had any aberrative value.

This and other vital material learned between 1957 autumn and now was the technology necessary to do full clearing on everyone except the wholly psychotic and unconscious people (where we have the CCHs).

Everything learned about O/W is still necessary to clearing. *But* everything that applied in O/W *also applies to running help*.

It's marvellous that a five-way bracket on help cleared people. It did clear some. But where it failed it ran into the rule that it's only what the pc does that is aberrative, what is done to him is not. Thus, what *help* the pc has given and what *help* he has denied or failed to give are aberrative. What help the pc received, in the long run is not (no matter how the psychologists cut it).

There are probably thousands of ways *help* could be run. You can think of

dozens. All of them would be effective in greater or lesser degree. Just add help into any process form we know. But the one general process on help that would rank high would be “What have you helped?” “What have you not helped?” alternated.

This is not a dichotomy. This is the best way I know of to run the sense of what help one has given plus what help one has withheld. This is the O/W version and we will call it “Help O/W” to keep ourselves oriented and not introduce too many new terms. I find “failure to help” instantly upsets “What help have you given?” “What help have you withheld?” This version does *not* run. The correct sense wording is “What help have you given?” “What help have you not given?” This lets the pc as-is his failures to help as well as his denials of help.

This is only the general form. Think how much more we know about O/W. Apply it to help.

Two-way help would have use. But would be limited. Use it. Know it’s limited.

Five-way bracket help would have use. But would be limited. Use it. Know it’s limited.

This pair has enough power to gain more constant attendance in a PE Co-audit than we have had. So use them in PE Co-audit. Two-way help has just moved a PE Co-audit case that has been in co-audit for one year without moving on any other process.

Two-way comm on help has value. It’s the pre-session version. No matter who is helping who, a discussion of it can get the pc closer to session.

Now here is data you’ve been wondering about. Does help in pre-session become an end all in the HGC. No. Hit the pre-session points lightly, then in Model Session form use *help* as the process to be run. And run it until it’s flat-flat-flat.

When the Model Session has begun, run a meter assessment. Find any terminal that drops. On that terminal, in specific or general form, “How have you helped?” “How have you not helped?”

Any experience you’ve had with O/W and meters and assessments, apply it to help.

And that’s how you’re going to clear people. It’s amazingly fast, even on a psychosomatic illness.

Now get your own reality on this.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.gh.rd
Copyright ©1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 19 MAY 1960

Franchise Holders
HCO Secs
Assn Secs

HOW HELP BECAME BETRAYAL

Help is the button the world spun in on a few million years ago. It's where we find our pc. "Help is betrayal", so there is no way out. Scientology "must be bad" because "help is betrayal". *Everybody* knows that. So if Scientologists help people then we "must be betrayers" !

We've heard it, seen it. But now we know what it is and can laugh quietly when people try to chew us up.

When they really wanted to make a trap of it all, it was propaganda given out that "help is betrayal". None must have any help lest they be betrayed. So the thetans stay in their cages.

It is interesting how this mechanism developed. The game of victim is very old. It intended to arouse mercy and safeguard possessions. It became a trap. Once one *believed* in victims thoroughly he started to help *only* victims.

So this sequence began—one hurt another (who played victim), one felt sorry for the other, one sought to help the other. (Ever see a professional help sponge?) When this was very old, the action of injury became identified with the action of helping. As the cycle was injure—victim—help, as soon as the time gets vague in it, the parts of the cycle become injury-is-help or help-is-injury.

It has long been true that help could be injury as a common denominator. Out of this rose self-reliance as a virtue. You've known people who refused help because they were "proud" or "self reliant". Well, that's only the first stage of "help-is-injury".

The second phase is not so old. I think it's only been reversed for the last two million years or so in this quarter of the universe. The "complete flip" is not an identification of help with injury but a disassociation, a complete dispersal on the subject. How-to-injure becomes *help*. *This is* betrayal. With the intention to injure, one offers help to create a dependence on something disguised, which on use becomes injurious. It is this psychotic action which finalized the trap as a trap. "Don't dare accept any help because it is only an effort to betray", is the fixed idea which has become prevalent. One can have neither games nor life with that idea. It's this idea which poisoned Christianity.

Now that may be hard for you to see because, by the very virtue of being a Scientologist, you don't think all help is offered just to injure. But others have that idea and so you find *them* hard to understand. We are few because we few didn't believe all help was injury. But as soon as we sought to help others, who didn't accept Scientology, we ran into a wall. What was the wall? The above idee fixe. The majority in the world evidently believe that help is only an intention to injure. This is more than help-can-injure. This is "all-help-is-dangerous-because-anyone-offering-to-help-intends only-to-injure" .

There are too many examples around for you to need many more. You can find your numerous own. But the Mau-Mau people killed only those whites that had sought to help the blacks. And just as I was wrapping up the research on this technology (which is now beyond being only a theory) I received a letter from a white attorney who had been asked to help. In a panic he was demanding to be let off quick! It was very funny. With my research papers on my desk before me, I was presented with a

perfect example of the technology! Poor man—little did he know what his letter was arriving into. I wrote him back and his next letter was *so* confused! He may even recover.

These ideas, as fixed convictions, are all about us and across the world. This *is* the idea which blocked our way in our sincere intention to make men free. This is how we have caught it in the press and, some of us, from our dearest friends and relatives.

We have been confused. But so is Man. Man is still confused. We are not. By studying and knowing our data on this, the “wall” will go “poof”.

Any psychosis, neurosis or illness is fragile, no matter how fierce it seems. These can only thrive in lies.

Now what will happen to the barriers we have had when they are hit by truth?

I give us twenty months to having all cleared staffs on Central Orgs, three years to all cleared Scientologists, two decades to a large proportion of Earth cleared. That’s my idea of it now.

So learn to handle *help*. Get cleared on it in co-auditing or in the HGC. Learn a dozen ways to discuss it so as to break down the barricade of “disinterest” (which is really fear) and get the show on the road.

Help is *not* injurious. Help is *not* the best way to hurt.

Help is just help. Let’s flatten it until we’ll always know it and never forget it again, and learn adroitly to collapse the help psychosis in others by talk alone.

We have bought our own Freedom to Help.

Use it.

L. RON HUBBARD

(In the next bulletin I will give you the exact way to use help in Model Sessions.)

LRH :dm.cden
Copyright ©1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 22 MAY 1960

MA
(Run in U.S. as soon
as possible as a
2nd, not lead, article)

DE-CERTIFICATION, HOW YOU SHOULD SUPPORT IT

The Cancellation of an Auditor's certificates is a measure taken by HCO when these conditions exist: (a) The auditor has consistently refused supervised processing; *and* (b) the auditor has committed anti-social acts liable for prosecution under criminal law; or (c) continues to associate with a de-certified auditor and balk efforts of HCO to bring the person into an HGC for auditing.

Wild tales and rumours are often spread by a person who has been de-certified and his "friends" to prevent the public from recognizing the truth of the action. That truth is: HCO is trying to get somebody to have auditing that is effective before he irrevocably harms himself, and that HCO has evidence of criminal activity or association.

Support HCO's efforts to get auditors in for supervised processing when they have gone wrong. You can assist HCO by doing the following: (a) Realize that the whole "punishment" by HCO consists of getting the auditor to have processing that is effective and at very low rates, (b) realize that HCO has evidence of criminal actions or association when the certificate is "pulled" and (c) support HCO's efforts to keep certificates in clean hands and the repute of Scientology beyond reproach.

If they don't believe Scientology will help *them*, why are they auditing?

Please assist HCO to make auditors keep their code. Don't buy auditing from de-certified auditors. Don't pay bills to de-certified auditors (they have no right left to sell processing for money). Force them in to the HGC where we can care for them. Very few get de-certified. But they do *all* the public damage to Scientology. In HCO we have to choose between two overt acts:

1. An overt act against the offending auditor by de-certifying or
2. An overt act against you, the public and Scientology by ignoring their anti-social actions.

In HCO we always choose 1.

Many are the cunning rebuttals and tales put out by an auditor whose certificate has been pulled. Just remember when you hear them that the person putting them out refused auditing for a long time before he lost his certificates and that HCO has evidence of criminal activities by that person it is not publishing. We don't "pull" two certificates a year in all the thousands around the world. Help us keep it low by making our demand that offenders get audited, where we can supervise it, stick. It's only kindness. When we don't get them to an HGC they sometimes die, sometimes ruin their lives, and they hurt all of us. Back HCO so HCO can back the honest and the good.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd
Copyright ©1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 26 MAY 1960

Franchise Hldrs
HCO Secs
Assoc Secs

SECURITY CHECKS

The Organization Secretary in Washington is here at Saint Hill for briefing on future US campaigns.

When I showed her how to do a security check and gave her a demonstration, she made the following notes. They are of considerable interest to all Central Orgs and HCOs as well as auditors. Therefore, I give them to you in full.

Security Check

1. Stable data—you are not processing but looking for needle or tone arm action that will not blow off. (Clear up on investigation—further questioning and E-Meter exploration.)
2. Rising needle means nothing except you aren't asking right questions.
3. You are looking for significant drops or tone arm changes that will not clear up. It is something that person is consciously withholding and as he continues to withhold it on further questioning the needle or the tone arm action will increase.
4. You start out by asking non-significant questions—50% of questions are to be these, i.e., if you have 10 significant (security) questions to ask you start out with 10 non-significant questions. If you have a needle pattern on non-significant questions you note it and it doesn't count on security questions.
5. On significant questions—any question that gets drop or TA action—you don't go any further but explore on this question. You may be getting action on past life or rather unimportant this life acts—i.e., sniping a balloon from a store as a small child. Clear this out. The needle may cool off (less action) but still be reacting. If so, explore further—see if you can clear it off. If on exploration the action increases, the person is consciously sitting on something he doesn't want you to know. If he's handing you up something else to explain the needle action (i.e., trying to clear it up by handing you something else) the action will increase because he's basically lying. If the action increases you can tell him he's sitting on something he won't tell and that he's a risk. He may break down and let go of it at this time. If so—he still needs processing on it and is a risk until he's responsible for it. Just letting go of the withhold doesn't make him responsible for it. He is not retained on staff while being processed to clear it up. What you are looking for is that which won't cool off. You can cool something off and go on to the next security check question and then later come back to the reacting question. It may have built up again. If so, explore some more.
6. On a Security Check Sheet you only note those questions that wouldn't clear. If something won't clear or cool off the person is a security risk. If he does tell you and clear it, if it's a heavy crime, note it.
7. E-Meter—use of in security check—check out meter before connecting person to be checked. See former bulletin on checking out E-Meter. Generally you set the sensitivity straight up on American meter unless the needle is very very sticky. English meter is more sensitive—so you set it lower. Then set the TA—have the person squeeze the cans. You want about a 1/3 dial drop so you can adjust the

sensitivity if the action is too much or too small on the can squeeze. Put the person at ease. Don't act accusative. You don't want to restimulate all the interrogation in the bank. It'll just take that much longer to clear it off.

8. There may once in a while be a person who reads nicely at their clear reading with no action and you're very suspicious the guy isn't clear. This could be a complete "blab" no responsibility case—a mockery of clear. You can check this out as follows. Make a somewhat accusative statement to the person that would be real to him—i.e., "You never get your work done." The mockery of clear person will wildly justify and blame. Check this person out on help—2-way—on an employer, etc. They will be real nowhere on help—i.e., can't conceive of helping an employer—can't run 2-way help, etc. This person, no matter how secure he may seem, is an employment risk because he can't help and will only cause difficulties on a post. He'll be a camouflaged hole.
9. Along with security check on staffs a help check should be given. If the person is sticky on help (can conceive of some help in some areas but has several areas of no help, especially on 3rd dynamic), he needs processing before he can be hired. If he's nowhere on help—can't run 2-way or can't conceive of helping an employer or an organization, he is not hireable until he's flat on help which will probably take many hours. He's probably a CCH case.
10. Remember, as a security checker you are not merely an observer, or an auditor, you are a detective.

I trust these notes will be of use.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :dm.cden
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 27 MAY 1960

MA (not a lead
article Issue II
but a 2nd place)

Dear Scientist:

For a long ten years I have had to wear many hats. Amongst them is an Ethics hat by which I have had to protect, often with small support, the good name and standards of conduct of Dianetics and Scientology.

To say the least the hat and necessary actions of counter-attack and defense have been distasteful to me. And in this regard, I humbly ask your help.

We have the answers today as to the why of "squirrels". We know the reason for their overts against Dianetics and Scientology. Technically, with overt-withhold and the phenomena of help we not only understand them but can straighten out their insecurity and hates to their own benefit.

Could you help me in this? It must be evident by now after ten long years that if there were any twist or untruth, betrayal or insincerity intended by me or organizational people, we long since would have passed away. The rumours that are put out by unbalanced people achieve only harder work for me and for good people everywhere.

In ten consistent years you should have proof enough that I'll stay at my post and do my job and overcome barriers, technical or administrative, organizational and field, somehow.

I dislike punishments and quarrels and enthetas as much as any of you. Sometimes I haven't handled these things well, but I have tried to do my job as best I could here on a muddy earth.

Today nothing can destroy us or our works. I have no fear for our future and I know what we can do. Available to your hands is the technology necessary to handle rumor mongers, unethical persons and enturbulators. You can help me by handling them and getting them to good auditors, preferably an HGC, and preventing them from upsetting others and our task. Winning is so easy now, success is in our very grasp.

What failure do you think I feel when I am asked to cancel a certificate? With all the wealth of truth before him, someone avails himself or herself of no part of it and with a glass of water held in hand, dies of thirst.

Yet some of this burden lies with you. When an auditor forgets his personal auditing, and audits without being clear, why does the field permit him to crack up? Why haven't his friends and associates thought enough of him to force him to get processing from a reliable source? Why do they wait for him, overworked already, to emerge from the tangle of some emotional crisis utterly unstrung and hating everything, before they offer processing?

Clearing the executives, the auditors, the people of Scientology is your job now. When you hear somebody "going bad", running away and raving against us all, don't harbour him and sympathize—you'll kill him. Make him go to the nearest HGC or an auditor with altitude over him and get his overts off and his ability to help increased.

There are thousands of auditors across the world. Few of them are clear. Once or twice a year amongst all these one of them turns upon us. Rumours fly. People wonder. Eyebrows raise. Why? In a few years they'll be clear. We've just begun the project. Right now they are not. Instead of standing around blinking, wondering even

believing such wild tales, why aren't you being effective? The person doing bad and untrue things needs assistance. The least you can do is drive or force him to an HGC where supervised auditing (and not patty-cake) will straighten the person out and make life bright again.

My lines are heavy. My days are long. To these should we also add my Ethics hat?

A breakthrough has happened here in 1960's spring bigger even than O/W. We're clearing people fast in HGCs. It just began to happen. But it isn't happening to auditors in the field yet and it won't for quite some while. Meanwhile must I go on and act to minimize the damage being done by people not only not yet clear but heavily caved in?

You could help me by pressing these people in toward auditing, by understanding the why of their rumours and hates and getting them processed. And you can help by insisting that "names" in Scientology get processed regularly by competent auditors in an HGC (not by some "friend" who'll patty-cake) until they're really cleared. I myself have had scores of hours of processing since last fall. If I could be clearer than I am, what's that make the case of other Scientologists?

You could lighten my lines, and my heart, if you'd share this burden even a little bit. Hold the field together until they are all clear.

Now, certain you will help in this and let me get on to wider work, I wish to celebrate the occasion of HGCs, using new technology, beginning to make clears again, by announcing the complete and unqualified restoration of all certificates and awards ever cancelled since 1950. They're all in force again. Let's get on with our job.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HCO BULLETIN OF 28 MAY 1960

BPI
MA

BY THEIR ACTIONS

By their actions you shall know them, whether bad or good, whether on another side or ours.

And what in their actions gives us the keenest insight? Their ability to *help*.

Some think that help cannot be done. Shun them. Some think that help is always an effort to betray. Process them for here you have the criminals of Earth.

Some people cannot help. They can only injure and destroy. And if in the name of help they only injure and destroy then know them carefully for they are criminals.

What is a criminal? One who thinks help cannot be on any dynamic or uses help on anyone to injure and destroy.

Who are these men with covert ways who bring Earth its pain? They are the men who cannot help. Who are the women who must be helped but who can only maim? They say, these men and women, that they'll help and then they make a thorough shambles of it all.

From where did Earth conceive her traps and aspects that are grim? Earth would be a lovely place if all men helped to help, not to destroy.

Think heavily on this point. Judge men from what they think of help. Judge women too and find the good ones from the bad.

The good can help. The bad will not or if they do, they "help" only to betray.

The good of Earth comes from above the point of make and break where help is help and honestly. The pain of Earth comes from the tones where help does not exist or where it's used to pull us into agony.

Know your friends. It's strange that those who argue with us against our goals and Scientology cannot conceive of honest help. Discuss help with them and you'll find their tone and whether they are worth a lot as friends.

This is the test that you can use to separate the good from bad and then clear-eyed begin to make a world in which all life can live.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.cden
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 9 JUNE 1960

Fran Hldrs
Central Orgs
HCOs

THE BASIC ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTOLOGY VERSUS OVERTS

The entire secret of all overt-withhold mechanisms is *valences*.

I have known for a long while that a profile on our tests is a picture of a valence.

If the preclear were in no valence, but was himself completely, he would have a perfect test response and would be wholly clear. In this statement we have one of the background structure points of Scientology.

This was an assumption point for some time, a point of departure, like “conservation of energy” in physics is the primary assumption point of 19th Century physics—if we assume this point then we have the “truths”, axioms and other data in elementary physics. The point, assumed and never proven (and not even well phrased) is the start point in physics from which all deductions are made. It is an “understood”, a non-examined theory. Physics was demonstrable truth, but only in a limited and finite sense. The moment nuclear physics, my dear companion that haunted my college days, came into action, the assumption point began to crumble and is not now considered to be truth. Hence while elementary physics works in a finite limited sense, it is not a considered true science any longer—it is only elementary science.

Freud, for instance, had as his start point (or assumption point), the Libido Theory of 1894 in which he based all on sex.

It is rare that a science ever embraces its own assumption point and resolves it. Freud was stuck with his Libido Theory, just as Newton’s successors were stuck with “Conservation of Energy”. So long as elementary physicists were concerned only with energy which “could not be destroyed or created” they tread-milled themselves into a dead-end mirrored in such things as inadequate costly engines, difficult construction and a complete lock out from space and other planets.

The great Einstein, not a physicist but a mathematician, established a *new* science which deserved the name of *the* physical science “physics”, a name already purloined by the natural philosophy of the 19th Century. Old time physics was the science of the age of fire and ended with the age of fire. It died to whimpering embers under the down blast of atomic fission. We are no longer scientifically nor politically in the age of fire. We are in the age of freed energy. We do not yet have an atomic physical *science*. We have only a number of guesstimates like the bronze worker of early Greece who knew nothing of the facts of fire metallurgy. The fire age, begun by Prometheus, whoever he really was, is ending on Earth. The raw energy age has begun with all the teething troubles of any new era. Called the “Atomic Age” just now, it started with hints of others before Einstein but was actually born when Einstein wrote his Theory of Relativity. This, a crude guesstimate, was yet a great departure point in the history of this planet. It has unlocked space to Man, promised him new engines, widened his scope. Unhappily it has also unlocked vast opportunities for political bungling—but I would rather say that it exposed political diplomacy as a bungling subject which must now urgently improve. Nations can no longer afford political ineptness.

Now the assumption point of physics, the science of the fire age, became disproved and the science is in question and the fire age is in fact over. The holes in physics have begun to glare. Some day a new science will be organized from the assumption point of Einstein’s work (no matter if he’s debunked, forgotten or becomes a legend like Prometheus, the professors of tomorrow can teach as a myth [Einstein

stole the secret of eternal fission from a Heaven named Princeton where the goals...])
And ages hence somebody will prove or expose the basic assumption and the fission
age will resurge or die, depending on whether or not the assumption is found to be true
or false.

In Freud's case in a lesser sense, a short and ineffective but highly interesting age
of psychotherapy began with the Libido Theory in 1894 and began to disintegrate
through lack of progress and development about 1920 although the subject itself
became an intellectual football in the late 20s, an artist's cross in the early 30s and a
teenager's subject in the late 50s. His contemporaries added nothing effective to
Freud's work and the subject, like psychology, which originated in 1879 and assumed
men were animals, failed in all fields but wide popularity.

Back of all work on mental states, however, lie various assumption points, most
of them hidden or undelineated, from which the remainder of the subject evolves and
grows. If the cornerstone is proven only relatively factual, a long enduring career is
guaranteed to the subject. Freud used as his assumption point more than his Libido
Theory that all impulses and behaviors are sex-motivated. He assumed that if one were
sex-motivated, then if one unblocked this drive by removing an early traumatic sex
experience that was impeding the drive, the patient would recover from neurosis. All
manner of interesting complications proceed from this: art, being considered a
sublimation or aberration of the sex drive, had to be considered wholly neurotic:
success, being most desirable as sexual success, was a product of a blessed neurosis if
achieved in any other field. As treatment it was common for a Freudian practitioner to
cut through the Gordian knot by ordering a patient to go out and have sex with
everyone, prove his or her prowess and thus become well and happy. While this
secured the popularity of the subject, it did little to reduce asylum statistics as these
were on the increase throughout the Freudian age and were highest at its end, and
indeed were higher in Freudian dominated areas than in others where Freudian
treatment was not used. (Not my propaganda, just a recorded fact.)

The psychiatrist, following a Russian science, has a more basic and brutal
assumption point which is that a shock cures aberration. The idea goes back a very long
way, making psychiatry a long, if sporadic, age. Psychiatry ebbs and rises in use since
it is a dramatization rather than a science. It springs from the same impulse that assumes
punishment cures wrong-doing. The limited workability of this is apparent around us
on every hand. We could do nothing socially about crime so we *inhibited* crime by
striking at criminals. This gave us suppressed criminality and more criminals *but*
it must be said that lacking *any* solution that worked *well*, then any solution that even
seemed to work occasionally was considered better than nothing.

Perhaps at some early date in whole history this worked better, but all expedient
cures tend to become a new illness. Alcohol, in any alcoholic, once cured something
but now produces with amazing similarity the malady it once cured. These are stop-gap
cures that do this, not cures in any absolute sense.

As the earliest punishment was the production of a shock in the offender whole
track history continues to repeat the treatment for misbehavior as a dramatized action,
not an intellectual undertaking. If a person misbehaves, he should be punished. Thus if
a person misbehaves insanely he must be punished. Psychiatry is not, then, a science,
but a legalized, at present, dramatization. And this is the very dramatization that makes
this a cruel universe when it is. Punishment is unworkable as all the statistics show.
Punish the criminal and he becomes, too often, a confirmed and hardened criminal.

All this, however, is based on a yet earlier lie. The last two years of my
researches have been devoted to establishing or not, as the case may be, whether
anything could actually be done to a person, or whether it was not the person himself
who did it. I "knew" the latter was theoretically true but I had not found means to
demonstrate it-and indeed was quite prepared to discover that something *could* be done
to a person without his being prior cause. This work will be found under all 1958-59
data released all overts and withholds.

The earlier assumption to punishment is that something *can* be done to another being.

By evidences to date, odd as it may seem, it appears, by all processing tests, that one becomes aberrated only by means of his own, not another's actions. I do not say that *nothing* can be done to a person or a being by another person or being. Obviously communication exists. I am only saying that all aberrative effects of action are created by the person who has them. Indeed none could be processed successfully through a burn or engram unless he himself were holding the aberration there—for the fire, location and other people are not consulted and are not even there in fact at the time of processing. A preclear being audited on a past incident can recover from its ill effects. Therefore it seems conclusive that he himself must be causing the ill effects in present time or he could not eradicate them since the "sources are not present". Thus they must not have been the sources of his "ill effects". The preclear must have been.

Inspecting the assumption points of Dianetics and Scientology one finds now that what was originally assumed is fact. Thus we are to be here as a science for a very long time.

As no science before ever proved its assumption point that I know about, we are suddenly unique in that our results tend to verify more than our basic truths. The further we go forward, in other words, the more basic are the assumption points. Unlike, then, physics or psychoanalysis or other sciences, we have examined and improved our assumption points.

We assumed in Dianetics that if we removed engrams, life would resurge and become good. This assumed that a being was all right until injured and that eradicating the injury would find him all right again. This is not the same as Freud for Freud never assumed goodness or rightness in Man, but on the contrary seemed to warn that we had better not go too far, art and all that depending on the madness of us all. As God seems to be blamed for most of the art work in this universe this seems a most impudent evaluation of God's sanity on Freud's part, although I do not think he ever displayed an actual professional sign saying "S. Freud, Psychotherapist by Appointment to God".

The Dianetic assumption that Man is basically good and is damaged by punishment holds valid in practical practice and in some tens of thousands of cases (and we're the only ones in history that validated our findings by strict long, long precise testing on cases); we find that the more we process successfully, the kinder and more ethical our people become. That disposes of the vile nature of Man by staggering poundage of evidence. The assumption that "all art is derived from aberration" is discounted by the numbers of singers and artists who sang better and painted better after they were made saner by us.

The basic psychiatric assumption that enough punishment will restore sanity is disproven, not only by psychiatric statistics but by actual observation and removal of the effects of "punishment" by processing.

That a being, without aberration, would be good, ethical, artistic and powerful, is still a basic assumption in Scientology. It has just been demonstrated as factual for our practice. This is news. Our assumption point has just become a basic truth. It is not just an assumption. Therefore we will now find ourselves on a new plane of progress, perhaps with new teething troubles, certainly with even further goals.

The truth was demonstrated in this wise:

I knew valences, those mocked up other-beingnesses a person thinks he is, were the source of test profile patterns.

When we rid the pc of an undesirable valence his profile rose on the graph and he felt and acted better. When we did not alter the valence in tested cases the profile remained much the same. If the preclear were driven into undesirable valences by

experiment, his profile worsened apparently, although this is more difficult to verify, since the tone of the existing valence was undoubtedly dropped as well.

Now from this I have found the mechanism by which a being gives himself pain that is actually self-inflicted but is apparently other-inflicted. And this is a vast stride for it resolves O/Ws and we can consider it a broadly completed cycle of research ending two years with a victory for our assumption point.

By being a valence, not himself, a person confuses the source of pain. Inflicting it himself upon the valence he is in, and by experiencing the pain from the valence, a being can counterfeit the effect of being an effect of punishment. By being Valence A, he can conceive the environment is guilty of striking Valence A, but as this is in fact an overt by himself against Valence A (if only by failing to protect it) he feels the pain of Valence A. As he thinks of himself as Valence A, he can then feel his own pain.

The conclusion is that to feel pain and for pain to persist one must be in a valence.

The remedy for pain, illness, aberration, insanity and the lot, then, is to free the preclear of valences. Apparently, freed of all valences of an unconscious level, the preclear would yet be able to experience, but would not be involved with pain, etc, except by postulate.

The way to free him of all valences or unconscious counterfeit beingness is not the purpose of this paper.

Here I only wish to examine with you the aspects of assumption points of subjects and sciences (each of which has one, usually unknown to the originator) and to pass along the interesting intelligence that our former assumption point of "remove the aberration and you have a worthwhile person" has become demonstrable in practice and can be considered truth.

This means a new level has opened to the future with new certainty.

An overt recoils upon one because one is already in a valence similar to that of the being against whom the overt is leveled.

The mechanism is exposed. And as it is exposed, we find it is not needed since a being without valences is basically good. Only a being *with* valences has his overts recoil upon him. Only a being with valences commits overts harmful to others as he is behaving as he supposes the "evil" valence would behave but as no unvalenced being does.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

MA

WHAT WE EXPECT OF A SCIENTOLOGIST

We inherited, when we began, a great many hidden errors in the society, so deeply laid they seemed right. "Everybody knows that" is a tombstone of progress for it contains uninspected lies that bring the wittiest of us to grief. "Everybody knows that Man is Evil" was only one of the many things we found wrong, exposed and dropped from our own knowledge.

However, in the field of what is expected of a Scientologist, we have for ten years carried along an inherited error. It is this: "Everybody knows that a specialist in a science hangs out a shingle and, if a professional, becomes a private practitioner."

Now listen. Psycho-analysis was developed in 1894 by Sigmund Freud. Everybody who studied it was expected to hang out a shingle and start practising. It took half a century for psycho-analysis to become generally known by the people. Yet how could it miss? Its tenet was that if you were sexually uninhibited you would be happy.

The psycho-analyst took his cue from the medico of his day. If you could heal you were a healer with a shingle.

Well, I'm afraid a lot of us have bought this too. If we were trained in Scientology as a professional we should hang out our shingle as a practitioner. With all due respect to the Scientologist in professional practice (where they have every right to be) this is not a true idea. It is a borrowed idea. It's as old as the witch doctor.

A Scientologist is the being three feet behind society's head. And society runs on eight dynamics, not in a sick room. Some of us, of course, would become professional practitioners. But a professional Scientologist is one who expertly uses Scientology on any area or level of the society.

A housewife who does not have professional level skill in Scientology could not expect to run a wholly successful family or keep order in her neighbourhood and keep her family well. A factory foreman could not possibly handle his crews with full effectiveness without professional Scientology skill. The personal assistant to a corporation executive could not do a fully effective job without being a professional Scientologist. A corporation president without a certificate will someday fail. And the head of a country would go to pieces if he didn't know Scientology from a professional angle.

How can these people handle life if they have no expert knowledge of how to handle life.

Now we don't expect everyone in the world to become a trained auditor. But we expect the people who are making the world to have a knowledge of how to make it go.

A *trained* Scientologist is not a doctor. He is someone with special knowledge in the handling of life.

We have many, many personal success stories in Scientology. They begin with a book acquaintance and bloom when professional skill enters the background. These people, small people, big people, drove a wedge for themselves into companies, societies, with Scientology and then took over control of the area. They succeeded

where they never would have dreamed they could. And every time one of us drives in such a wedge, we all win because the world is brought nearer to a sane and decent world.

The factories, the marts of trade, the homes, the neighbourhoods, these are the places we want *trained* Scientologists. In that way alone, we're on the busy, still healthy communication lines of the world.

Some of us need to run centres and schools just to give the rest of us service when required. Training at a pro level must continue and *must* be kept good. And service and communication must be given. Hence, we have Central Organizations on every continent and HCOs. But if we avoid the throbbing comm lines of the world and act like doctors, we will not win soon enough as a group.

Any trained Scientologist can win to success in society. Heightened IQ, a knowledge of life, a forthright attitude—with these things it is easy for him or her to improve 2 social or business position, to get higher pay, to exert wider personal influence. This we know we can do, we have done it so often so let's improve the ability.

Process people weekends, run a co-audit some evenings of the week at home, but get on the active lines of the world and make your presence felt.

It takes full training to do it. It's been done from our books alone but not always well. It takes tough Academy training to make a Scientologist, so don't go at it half armed.

And stop feeling apologetic because you are not a "full time auditor". We are the auditors to the world, not to a handful of the sick.

We are not doctors. We are the world's trouble shooters. When we make a company win, the whole world wins, when we make a neighbourhood win, we all win.

A full time Scientologist makes life better wherever he is. And that is enough pro activity for anyone.

What do we expect of you? To become the best Scientologist that can be and to get on the comm lines of the world and bring a big win where it counts. We don't expect you to hang up a shingle as a doctor and have a private practice. We'll respect you if you do. But we'll respect you just as much and even more if you get trained as a pro and go out and up in the world of action and of life.

Hit for the key spots by whatever means, the head of the women's club, the personnel director of a company, the leader of a good orchestra, the president's secretary, the advisor of the trade union—any key spot. Make a good sound living at it, drive a good car, but get your job done, handle and better the people you meet and bring about a better earth.

And stop feeling hangdog because you "aren't auditing full time". Nobody expects you to.

We'll keep centres going to service your needs, some of us, we'll provide ammunition and books. And the rest of us had better invade every activity there is on a high level of success and make our influence felt on the comm lines of the world.

Scientology is the only game on Earth where everybody wins.

So let's help the world win.

LRH:js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 10 JUNE 1960

All HGCs

HGC PRECLEAR ASSESSMENT

With considerable data accumulating on Help when used in conjunction with Alternate Confront and Havingness, and with Help even working on vague past terminals in concept form (“Get the idea of helping a ____” “Get the idea of not helping a ____”), it is time to pick up any cases that have been in processing more recently, by starting them again on the first terminal they were ever run on.

You will find that Help O/W will move a case that was begun unsuccessfully no matter how long ago, providing that you discover with a meter what terminal the case was started on originally and address that terminal and audit it until it is flat.

This experimental approach should work, because it has worked that when cases were started again and the first process ever run was flattened, the case began to move.

This will work even though the first approach was engram running or straight wire away back. It should be discovered what the pc’s first goal in auditing ever was, or his first hope for auditing, and get the terminal closest to that goal. It will often be found that the pc was trying to help his eyes or his wife or himself as the first Help terminal in auditing.

When this terminal was not totally flattened the pc, finding he had not helped whatever he was trying to help, got an auditing lose. By finding out what the pc was trying to help at the very first contact with Scientology and by giving him sessions on it with Help O/W a most important win can be obtained.

This bulletin should be given very serious attention in HGCs where the cases always come that have real heavy auditing problems. HGCs get the toughest cases and usually all the old time cases. Where any case is being handled in an HGC it should be suspected that there has been an auditing flub somewhere along the line. Perhaps the pc won wonderfully with the first auditing session but failed heavily down the line somewhere. In such a circumstance always convert the loss to a win.

HGCs do more patch-up than virgin work. Thus it is safe to assume first that any applying pc has had something he tried to help in his own auditing that he received, and that it isn’t flat, and second that the pc has had a lose on some terminal.

HGC auditing as a rule should regard itself as parasitic upon other auditing already done. HGC staff auditors should rarely be attempting the new and strange in an assessment of a case but should be trying to recover past data dredged up in earlier than HGC sessions and converting the losses to wins. This is a type of assessment peculiar to an HGC and we should study it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :j s.cden
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HCO BULLETIN OF 16 JUNE 1960

Fran Hldrs

HINTS ON RUNNING CASES WITH HELP

Pre-session Help—Two Way Comm.

Rudiments Help—2 way Help, Auditor and pc.

PTP—Use ordinary overt-withhold not help on personnel involved with PTP.

Assessments—There are several Assessments. Dynamic Assessment (HCO Bulletin of May 30, 1960, "Dynamic Assessment on Help", covered this) terminals found should be handled with Concept Help. Use lots of havingness when running such a terminal.

There is another new assessment, Know to Mystery Scale Assessment. This is done by using the E-Meter on the buttons of the Know to Mystery Scale. That level which most changes the pattern of the needle is the target. Use Concept Help on it.

The most profitable, fast way to get a case moving is to find out what the person was most trying to help when he or she came into Dianetics and Scientology.

This may be "an arm" or "my friends" or "myself". But whatever it is run it on any help process until it is flat. Concept Help is a good starter for the terminal thus located. This gives the pc a big primary win.

Flatten the Terminals

We stalled on ACC Clearing Procedures because auditors did not flatten help before starting on Step 6. Let's not lose this horrible lesson.

The technical reason for this is that when *help is unflat*, a pc is still in a valence. Running Step 6 in a valence is courting disaster as the pc is in a picture that increases in mass and gives him somatics.

We are not returning to Step 6. We have better processes. But we are returning to help with far more knowledge of it.

Flatten every terminal on which you run help. By flatten is meant *no needle* change when the terminal is mentioned. A way to test this is to depart by two way comm from the terminal and then ask about it again. If the needle reacts the terminal mentioned is not flat. Just talk about something else, like the weather, and then mention the terminal again. You'll see.

It is better to use a general form of a terminal than a specific form. It is better to run "a young man" than "Joe". If the E-Meter reacts to "Joe" it is best to find out what Joe is to the pc and find the general form that reacts most ("a friend", "a young man", "a bum") and run that, *not* "Joe". You will get a lot further than when you run a specific close to present time terminal.

Help As Valence Problem

When people become a valence, they do so for at least two reasons.

First and probably most powerful: The thetan takes a valence that he believes will help others or the universe.

Second and more mechanical: The thetan tries to help something or somebody and fails and the last stage of his effort is to mock up a picture of the thing and try to help it.

There are various aspects of all this, more and more complicated. The thetan becomes a man to help women. He fails and thinks men can't help women. So he restrains men, or he becomes a woman.

A thetan can become very involved with his computations on the subject of help. One black case I know is seeking to help others by absorbing all the blackness in the universe !

There is a formula for handling 1. above. Find out what a thetan is being and find

out what that beingness helps and not helps by using the command, “What would ____help?” “What would ____not help?”

There is a general form which discovers beingnesses in a pc. Find out something, very general, that a pc is trying to help or has failed to help and run “What would help ____?” “What would not help ____?” on the discovered terminal. The pc will get cognitions on what he or she is being and what the pc is restraining himself or herself from being.

Finishing Off a Difficult Terminal

Any terminal that is being run on help that was unwisely chosen can be eased off by running old overt/withhold, alternate confront or responsibility. This is a crude way out but it will work.

In any event, any session should contain general alternate confront “What can you confront?” “What would you rather not confront?” and havingness. These take the edge off unwise choices, any rough auditing and make the case feel better.

If the pc can do it, responsibility can get a pc off a bad choice fastest. *If* a pc can run responsibility easily. The pc has to be running rather well in general before it can be attempted. The pcs who are suffering because of an auditor choice of-wrong terminal usually can’t run responsibility easily. Of course, successful auditing is “What you can get away with”.

The best and smoothest way to get off a bogged terminal is alternate confront. But when the case has afterwards been run on other terminals with help, it’s best to go back and clean up the ones that earlier bogged with help by running more help on them.

General Processes

The general processes which assist help sessions are alternate confront—“What can you confront?” “What would you rather not confront?” and Havingness, “Look around here and find something you could have.”

Any couple hours of help should be followed in the same session with fifteen minutes of alternate confront and fifteen minutes of havingness. These times are approximate and are given just to communicate some idea of ratio. A truly boggy case could do with a ratio of 1:1:1 such as 45 minutes of help, 45 minutes of alternate confront, 45 minutes of havingness. As the case gets out of long, long comm lags on help, increase help in the ratio to 1 :1/2:1/2 or one hour of help, a half hour of alternate confront, a half hour of havingness. All this is auditor judgment established by observation. As it is the help in any form that does it, remember to use help to advance the case, and alternate confront and havingness to make the pc feel good.

Alternate confront and havingness improve a case, of course, but are long, long hauls as processes if we think of clearing with them.

Help on near present time terminals is far less effective in clearing than help on general terminals that have a lot of track to them. As general terminals can get a pc into a lot of confusion on the back track, alternate confront and havingness keep the pc from getting too bogged to run. Alternate confront also takes the edge off invented answers by the pc. (Create—confront phenomena.)

There are lots of help processes and many ways to run them. They all win to some degree. It is the amount of help run rather than the number of terminals cleared that clears the case.

Help basically sheds valences. Therefore havingness is needed. But the valences are all “can’t-haves” so when the valence is off at last the havingness of the pc comes up.

Almost any brand of help run long enough by good auditing should clear a pc. Hence, the idea is to run help and run it flat.

LRH:dm.cden
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

[HCO B 30 May 1960, *Dynamic Assessment on Help*, referred to in the fourth paragraph on the previous page, was reissued on 23 July 1974 as BTB 30 May 1960.]

Important MA
Franchise Holders

SPECIAL ZONE PLAN

The Scientologist's Role in Life

Ten years ago, on about this date, I was up against third dynamic confusion of such magnitude that within a few months, I was to decide to forget organization problems and concentrate on research.

Because of this decision for years we were poorer in numbers but richer by far in knowledge.

It evidently was not enough to be able to help the basic problems of an individual. There were eight dynamics. It was necessary to take in at least some of all eight dynamics before we could be effective.

And toward the end of June in 1950, I first sensed that truth. And the maxim—bring order to your own house before you attempt order next door.

In June, 1950, the Foundations were already beginning to shatter under the enthusiastic door pounding of the public. I had built the proverbial better mousetrap and all the world was beating a path to our door—and was breaking the door down!

Yes, we could do wonders with people. Greater wonders than had been done in recent millenia. But we were ignorant beyond the first two dynamics. The moment we sought to handle the third we were done.

That was ten years ago. Within months of that date all that was left of the first organizations was rubble and newspapers blowing by in the wind.

I worked hard, and studied and researched, never friendless, often helped and worked ahead for ten years.

The First Dynamic, self, fluctuated in results and has stabilized with unsurpassed processing technology. In proof, our people are individually in better shape than any other group.

On the Second Dynamic, family and sex, we have gotten into a winning position. We know the answers to marriage, children and sex. The material isn't all published broadly enough yet even for Scientologists to know it but it's there and we're living better lives.

The Third Dynamic, groups, is the spectacular breakthrough of today. It's happened so gradiently we've hardly realized we have won. But observe: we have a magnificent organization. In America, England, South Africa and Australia we have just about the most wonderful organizations Man has seen for their size, cost and defensibility. Here we have achieved spectacular stability. Largely self-determined, yet co-operating smoothly these third dynamic examples compare with June, 1950, Foundations like the Royal Ballet compares with the aftermath of Hiroshima.

Just as we can represent in ourselves the grip we have on the first dynamic, so do we represent in our organizations that we have the third dynamic well in hand.

The technology of our third dynamic in organizations *and* the field is an exact one, as skilled as an auditor's know-how. And having applied it to organizations we are now applying it to the field, which is the main subject of this bulletin. You in "the field", you are about to win, too, with a complete new level of policy and action if you want it: you are about to be included "in".

The Fourth Dynamic, Mankind, is now an understood zone of operation and is declared herewith to be operational for a Scientologist. The prize of understanding Man as a racial and political species has fallen to our hand. Don't smile. I know it's an incredible announcement. But it's factual.

On the Fifth Dynamic, that of living things, I have been making headway since last year and know quite a bit now about them. Many of the secrets have dropped into our hands.

On the Sixth Dynamic, the physical universe, we have for some time stood well above what they know in physics.

On the Seventh Dynamic, the spirit, we covered this ground very thoroughly in 1953-54-55 and it's still all true but too advanced for general consumption. The best record of this was in the 1953 Philadelphia Lecture Series of 64 hours.

On the Eighth Dynamic, the Supreme Being, we have at least found the key question and in a little while we should have it answered on a demonstrable basis. Far from presumptuous it is about time somebody neither atheist nor zealot asked some questions, and arrived at some answers that have no self-interested curves in them.

So you can see where we are going and have at least a passing acquaintance with developments. Here we are with the largest fund of information of life and its patterns that has been assembled in a factual package on Earth.

Now the question is, what are we going to do with it?

Until we had the third and fourth dynamics demonstrably in hand technically we could not answer the question. We've each had his own idea of what we should be doing with it and each of these ideas is right to the degree that it's right for each of us. I have never discussed this point strongly because I did not want to shake anyone into an uncertainty. So let's say that all these ideas are right and then add a Third Dynamic Idea with which we can all agree.

Improvement is the common denominator of all our ideas. And of course each one has a zone of interest where he or she feels improvement is most needed or where he or she would be most comfortable in doing the work of improvement.

And that's the gist of this Third Dynamic Idea. It's a rather deceptive idea at first glance since we are each of us doing something of that.

But let us be far more definite. And let us expose a fallacy that has long been riding with us, as an unknown passenger.

People think of professional practitioners as doctors who, aloof from all other concerns, practise on the sick. This is a very novel idea. Dreamed up, probably, by the first lazy witch doctor and used forever thereafter by most specialists in human livingness. And here I want to as-is and banish that idea from amongst us all.

If we are doctors (by which might be meant "repairers") then we are doctors on the third and fourth dynamics and handle the first and second dynamics only to achieve better function on the third and fourth.

And true enough, most Scientologists agree, I think, with this concept. But it itself is as new and novel as the idea of being a professional practitioner to individual health once was.

I believe our third dynamic organization, taking in *all* Scientologists, should go this way:

The Central Organization and Centre Scientologists should service the remaining Scientologists, doing administration, instructing and auditing. Instruction to a professional level of *all* Scientologists should be entered upon as a must. Central Organization and Centre Auditing should be special and referred cases and the Scientologists themselves when they want it as part of service.

Being trained and cleared need not hold up the next zone of action, though it is taken for granted that these will occur for each.

The “field auditor” should be included wholly “in” to the general activity as a large zone divided into smaller specialized zones. The “field auditor” should of course run a group some evenings (he will find he has to) and audit not only members of his family but contacts in his zone on weekends or evenings. But, as you will see, he or she is largely wasting time by trying to be an individual doctor type practitioner where he or she is only partly successful at it. Some of course will have to work full time in centres as we get into action but centres are mentioned above as a special activity along with Central Organizations.

The largest majority of Scientologists should, I feel, consider themselves as “doctors” on the third and fourth dynamics. And if we work well at this, we will have answered all our various needs and brought it off on the third and fourth as well.

Now I wouldn’t be talking to you like this if I didn’t feel I had this studied to a conclusion.

Consider our position: we have arrived at a very special plateau of knowledge as has been reviewed above. Data on our know-how is being codified for use in these zones of action.

Consider the position of the world. The story is often repeated on the whole track. As Mest is made to help too much, a plateau of civilization is reached in which the individual is downgraded to a number. The end of this—the lights eventually go out through lack of personal initiative and ability.

We are in a fantastic position, at the right time and place, to halt this cycle of decay and start a new one on Earth. And I believe we should overtly do so.

How?

We are masters of IQ and ability. We have know-how. Any of us could select out a zone of life in which we are interested and then, entering it, bring order and victory to it.

Of course, there’s a heavy challenge in doing this. Some of the victories would be hardly won. But we would win across the world if we kept our vision bright.

The third and fourth dynamics subdivide. Any third breaks down into many activities and professions, a neighborhood, a business concern, a military group, a city government, etc, etc, etc. The fourth dynamic breaks down just now mainly to races and nations.

Now just suppose a Scientologist were to consider himself a professional only for the purposes of treating and repairing or even starting again these third and fourth zones?

See this: a housewife, already successfully employing Scientology in her own home, trained to professional level, takes over a woman’s club as Secretary or some key position. She straightens up the club affairs by applying comm practice and making peace and then, incidental to the club’s main function, pushes Scientology into a

zone of special interest in the club—children, straightening up marriages, whatever comes to hand and even taking fees for it—meanwhile of course going on being a successful and contributing wife.

Or this: a Scientologist, a lesser executive or even a clerk in a company, trains as a professional auditor, and seeing where the company is heading, begins to pick up its loose ends by strengthening its comm lines or its personnel abilities. Without “selling” anybody Scientology, just studies out the bogs and remedies them. If only as “an able person” he would rapidly expand a zone of control, to say nothing of his personal standing in the company. This has been and is being done steadily across the world. Now that we have pre-sessioning, it’s easy to straighten up other people. Our unreleased technology on handling third dynamic business situations is staggeringly large. You’d be surprised how easy it is to audit seniors. They and their families have *so* many troubles. Or how easy it is to spot the emergency-maker and audit him.

And see this: a race is staggering along making difficulties for itself. Locate its leaders. Get a paid post as a secretary or officer of the staff of the leaders of that race. And by any means, audit them into ability and handle their affairs to bring co-operation not trouble. Every race that is in turmoil in a nation has quasi-social groups around its leaders.

And this: a nation or a state runs on the ability of its department heads, its governors, or any other leaders. It is easy to get posts in such areas unless one has delusions of grandeur or fear of it. Don’t bother to get elected. Get a job on the secretarial staff or the bodyguard, use any talent one has to get a place close in, go to work on the environment and make it function better. Occasionally one might lose, but in the large majority, doing a good job and making the environment function will result in promotion, better contacts, a widening zone.

The cue in all this is don’t seek the co-operation of groups. Don’t ask for permission. Just enter them and start functioning to make the group win through effectiveness and sanity.

If we were revolutionaries this HCO Bulletin would be a *very* dangerous document. We are not revolutionaries any more than we are doctors of sickness in individual patients. But we are not revolutionaries, we are humanitarians. We are not political. And we can be the most important force for good that the world has ever known. Who objects to a company functioning better to produce a better civilization? Who objects to a race becoming sane and a stable asset to its communities? Who objects to a neighborhood smoothing out?

Only the very criminal would object and they are relatively ineffectual *when you* can know and spot them. And there are no criminals except the mentally disabled.

So this is a challenge on the third and fourth. Almost all Scientologists are in a position to begin to help on such a programme.

And I am studying now first the popularity with you of this plan and, if great, how best to help us all achieve it. The first thing required is an understandable designation for Scientologists undertaking their portion of this Special Zone Plan. I should think the word “Counselor” is acceptable with an appropriate additional designation such as “Family Counselor” or “Company Counselor” or “Child Counselor” or “Organization Counselor”. What we would do is issue an HPA or HCA as a certificate as always and would issue a special zone certificate to any person operating in that zone after he or she had completed an additional correspondence type briefing course covering that general zone. In other words anyone would have to have a professional certificate before he or she could be designated as a special zone counselor. The costs of obtaining such a certificate would be kept slight, no more than bare administration. The advantages of having such a designation are plain. A clerk with a certificate on the wall from the Academy of Scientology designating that he or she has been graduated as a “Company Counselor” would startle even a complacent executive into conversation about what was wrong with the place and as he was talking

to a pro auditor any scepticism would quickly fade. A pro would know! As it all starts with being a good auditor and as the additional technology is exact in any of these fields, the programme is feasible.

We are at this stage of this programme: I have found that Scientologists operate with high success on the third and fourth but that it rarely occurs to them to try it and when they do they think I want them to audit full time and they are apologetic about their attempt. I have the technology pretty well to hand and can write zone manuals. I feel we now have clearing well in hand in Central Orgs and will soon have it broadly so for Scientologists in “the field” but I do not feel we need wait on that but take it and further training in stride. I feel that we are ripe for an overt attack on the third and fourth down spiral. I feel our auditors should take advantage of their increased personal ability and should be regarded accordingly by society and its zones. I see clearly that we have to win on the third and fourth if we are to attain our goals of a better world.

The special zone plan is made possible by a slight shift of approach. Take the case of a police officer who got interested on a PE course and read some books. He tried to “sell” his chief on Scientology as a subject and was given a heavy loss. One, our PE level trainee was insufficiently schooled to be effective. Two, as a pro his approach could have been any one of several. He could have eased himself nearer a command source area in the department, or he could have taken over a pistol marksman on the force and made him a champion as we did with the Olympics team once. The slight shift is that we would have made this police officer get pro training before telling him “sell Scientology” to the force and then would have advised him to *sell it by action*, not words. Handling the familial problems of the commissioner as his driver or making the rookies gasp at how fast he could train them would be *selling by action* only. And no other kind of selling would be needed. He’d be running an evening coaching class for his fellows or superiors on Scientology in a few months and making some of *them* follow the same route. How long before he had altered the whole character, ability and effectiveness of the police force and through that how long before he would have civilized the whole approach to law enforcement in that area? For, once we have created an opening, we always avalanche to fantastically swift gains.

That’s the Special Zone Plan. Several hundred thousand are ready for the first steps. Those that aren’t trained as pro HPAs and HCAs could start in soon. There are special ways to get training at an Academy now. And even while awaiting this training and working toward clearing such Scientologists could begin to determine their zone goals and work on them.

Our impact on the society is already weighty. With Special Zone Plans we could move that impact up thousands of times greater and have in our present lifetimes our goals at least in part accomplished and a decent world to come back to again.

What do you think of it? Write to me in care of Central Organization HCO in your area to give me your views on the Special Zone Plan.

When you write please advise me as follows: whether you like or do not like the idea. If you like it tell me the zone you are in or would like to be in (what area do you want to help?). But whatever you say *please write* as your letter will be considered as a *vote*. We have arrived at a crossroads where our action now could well affect the future history of this planet.

LRH :js.rdjh
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

LONDON OPEN EVENING LECTURES

6006C23	LOE-1	Title unknown (possibly: The Difference Between Scientology and Other Studies)
6006C23	LOE-2	Title unknown (possibly: Help on the Case)

HCO BULLETIN OF 30 JUNE 1960

Franchise Holders

CREATE AGAIN

As you know, the basis of a reactive mind is creativeness done below the level of consciousness.

The source of all engrams is the pc who creates a picture of the incident below his level of knowingness and recreates it into a "key-in". He uses the engram to warn and restrain himself, but this as a solution to trouble is a faulty one. It might have cured trouble once but like all cures became itself a new trouble.

In 1957-58 we attempted to handle this before we had HELP flat-flat-flat. Step 6, used then, made the whole bank toughen up, if HELP was unflat.

If a person is in any valence, he is victimized by his own creation. To produce or create anything is to invite a toughening of the reactive mind.

If HELP is flat on numerous terminals and if the E-Meter no longer reacts to help questions of any kind, the person is Mest clear. Only now is it really safe for any auditor to handle the subject of create.

Several things reduce the toughening up of a reactive mind due to aberrations concerning creation. Chief amongst these are *alternate confront* in any form, particularly general. Responsibility processes also reduce the bank's heaviness. Havingness also takes the edge off a bank. And of course *help* on terminals reduces a heavy or thick bank. Therefore Help, alternate confront and havingness are the keys. Responsibility is less workable in early stages since the pc is usually in some valence and when he says "I could be responsible for..." he means "Valence could be responsible for..." which runs in fact irresponsibility, not responsibility, since valence, not pc, is responsible.

There are some ways to run "create" in early stages before help is wholly flat on other terminals. Best of these subordinate methods is "What creation have you helped?" "What creation have you not helped?" One that is pretty high but sometimes works well if the person is not in a valence is "What creation could you be responsible for?" (Combination suggested by Dick Foster.)

O/W on other people's creations is not very good but very spectacular. Using create with alternate confront ("What creation could you confront?" "What creation would you rather not confront?") is of course workable.

Enough people are coming up toward or have arrived at Mest clear now that you had better have the next stage.

I would advise help and not help on creations until the needle is floating with no reaction to questions of any kind on them. Alternate confront on creations and havingness should still be used as in help.

But first be sure help is flat on all terminals including the thing the person came into Dianetics or Scientology to help and also flatten help on every terminal that has been contacted or run on O/W processes or any help process first. Then you can try the above.

LRH :js.rd
copyright ©1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

LONDON OPEN EVENING LECTURE.

30 June 1960

** 6006C30 LOE-3 Some Aspects of Help

HCO BULLETIN OF 6 JULY 1960

HCO Secs
Assn Secs
D of Ps

MAKING CLEARS AND PICKING UP HGC QUALITY

To the HCO Sec: IMPORTANT

To improve the auditing results of an HGC, put the following programme into effect: Results are good today but they can get faster in any HGC.

Appoint a competent Instructor from the Academy (not a staff auditor). Give this Instructor the many HCO Bulletins on Pre-sessioning, Model Sessions, Help, Alternate Confront, Havingness. Have him get himself up on those and this present HCO Bulletin.

Convene the HGC, including the D of P, for one hour three days a week immediately after they complete auditing for the day.

Have the Instructor drill them on the following subjects:

First — Teach them Regimen 1.

Second — Get them easy with Model Sessioning.

Third — Get them easy on Pre-sessioning.

Fourth — Make them study all the data on Help, Alternate Confront, Havingness.

Fifth — Check them out on Dynamic Assessment, meters and flat needles.

Lay down and permit them to run as your first step, as of now, only the following:

REGIMEN 1

(Only Regimen I can be used until an auditor has excellent results on several pcs)

- (a) Assessment—ask the pc what is wrong with him. Take the pc's answer, make it into a general terminal. Run that and nothing else. When it's cooled off, assess again, same way, run that. Don't argue or dispute or change what the pc says except to convert it to a general terminal.

Example: Auditor: "What do you think is wrong with you?"
PC: "My wife."
Auditor: "OK, we'll run *a* wife."

Example: Auditor: "What do you think is wrong with you?"
PC: "I'm impatient."
Auditor: "Can you think of somebody who was impatient?"
PC: "My Father."
Auditor: "OK, we'll run *a* Father."

Example: Auditor: "What do you think is wrong with you?"
PC: "Well, I think I'm attenuated."
Auditor: "Did you ever know an attenuated person?"
PC: "Yes."
Auditor: "Who was it?"
PC: "George James."
Auditor: (since this is a specific terminal and we want a general one) "What was George James?"
PC: "A Loafer!"
Auditor: "OK, we'll run help on 'a loafer', all right?"
PC: "Fine."

When "a loafer" is flat, flat, we do the same assessment again and as above get a new general terminal.

- (b) Use as a process two-way concept help. Example: "Think of a father helping you," "Think of you helping a father," etc. Flatten it down to a no reaction on meter. (Lay meter aside for most of sessions. Use only to check.)

- (c) For a quarter of any session time run alternate confront. “What could you confront?” “What would you rather not confront?”
- (d) For a quarter of every session’s time run havingness to end with—”Look around here and find something you could have.”
- (e) Start session with checking for PTPs and ARC breaks. Handle PTP with “What part of that problem could you be responsible for?” only.
- (f) Handle ARC break with “What have I done to you?” “What have you done to me?” only.

Regimen 1 omits pre-sessioning. It does a rough kind of Model Session, as good as one can get but skip being critical of it.

It will take the instructor a week or two to get the staff to buckle down on Regimen 1 only. Don’t let the instructor get off into anything else than Regimen 1 while teaching it, except these above points and the following:

1. Handle pc pleasantly.
2. Don’t chatter at pc.
3. Get pc to execute every command given.
4. Run good TRs.

Now with the D of P, stress all auditing points *and* handling the auditors with heavy 8c. Teach D of P not to Q and A with auditor problems. Example: Auditor comes in, demands unusual solution. D of P gives it. Auditor comes back saying “It didn’t work.” It didn’t work of course, because auditor never used D of P’s solution. The only reply of D of P should be “What didn’t work?” and all is revealed. D of P is taught not to give solutions or sympathy, just to demand adherence to instructions and get results. Auditors don’t have personal cases where the D of P is concerned. The instructor must get this effective attitude into effect. Good 8c on staff auditors. No excuses accepted.

The instructor can be given this as an added assignment and can still instruct in the Academy. It’s only 1 hour 3 days a week, probably between 3.30 and 4.30. Switch the tape hour in the Academy or something.

Now on *all new* staff auditors, use Regimen 1, no matter what else comes out that’s new. While he’s learning Regimen 1 he can still audit pcs. How? You ask the new staff auditor, “What process have you been most successful with?” He says, “8c.” You say, “OK, that’s what you run on pcs until further notice.” Meanwhile he learns Regimen 1 out of session and when he has it cool, switch him to that. You could do this on the whole HGC staff while they learn Regimen 1 if desired.

SUMMARY

Here’s the point on the above. An uncertain D of P or staff auditor is guaranteed if he or she is using stuff that’s unfamiliar. Raise familiarity with the simplest version of modern processes and you raise confidence.

This is good for *any* HGC even if it is doing well.

And this *is* the way to handle new staff auditors.

You want clears? OK, build up the confidence of the HGC on a gradient scale. You’ll have clears.

It is envisioned this programme will go on for months until it is complete and all auditors are handling all varieties of help and doing assessments well enough with meters to be turned loose with everything. They are turned loose on a gradient scale as they win.

It is also envisioned that staff auditors, like other staff members, will be getting auditing evenings or on staff clearing courses.

Regimen 1 is recommended for staff clearing courses.

HCO BULLETIN OF 7 JULY 1960

Fran Hldrs

THE ASSESSMENT OF HELP

You should realize at this stage that we are still feeling around for the most adequate and fastest method of running HELP. Everything which has been given to you thus far is near the mark, and pre-sessioning, model session and flattening help are right on the mark. However there are certain things that make auditors unhappy with running help. Chief amongst these is the fact that it is a tremendously restimulative process when one has not had any run. This means that we had better get the staff theta clearing course or staff co-auditing going fast on a supervised basis.

The second thing is that help does not flatten very easily on a late specific terminal. Of course, this is true of all processes. But help is a peculiar process and is slower on late terminals than other buttons, and here is why.

Help resolves cases because it is the basis of all association, and as you know association leads to identification. And identification is the basis of all mental upsets. The action of help is not aberrative. The failure to help is what does it, or the lack of things to help. However all valences and all identification stem from this button and no other. Now do lights dawn and bells ring? Help is the button which, if run, settles all difficulties with association and identification and all problems of beingness.

Thus there is something peculiar about help which is not true of any other button. Any help run is a gain even (Gawdelpus) if it is left wholly bogged with a half hour comm lag. All bits of help run are chewing away at all tangles of identification. So chew away and to the Dickens with it. Any help run is better than no help run. And because the PC is a bundle of aberrated identifications, any help run untangles some of him. And any help run on any terminal tends to "get at" any other terminal.

So that's why help run in any old way will sooner or later make the grade. But this is no reason to believe there are not also smart ways to run help.

Any late specific terminal, being so confounded far from basic-basic on the time track, runs tough and endlessly. Therefore as always it is better to run general terminals than to run specific terminals. However in the case of a PTP you can go ahead if you have to and run help on the PTP personnel, but as soon as the edge is off the PTP for Heaven's sakes shift to the general form of the specific terminals you have been running, and flatten those a lot or a little.

Keep a very close record of what you have run on help as the only precaution you have to take, and when the PC is running toward mest clear check back with help on these terminals and make sure they are flat. When a lot of help has been run on basic material then of course you will find that what ran very arduously before will now run much better. It is almost a waste of time to run specific terminals, but still you must run things that are real to the PC, and if only yesterday was real to him then you are stuck with running the PC on later terminals or even specific terminals.

A much faster way to run help than by sorting out real terminals on an E-Meter (which is still necessary sometimes) is to do an assessment on the PC using help and the dynamics, and finding a button that is entirely off dynamic and that the PC can't imagine helping. This is a trigger to a case. Unusual results happen very fast.

Another way to go about this is a simple questioning of the PC on the subject of

his dislikes. Watch the meter and when you get a silly reaction on a dislike, like a rock slam or a heavy drop or a sudden theta bop, then pick this out, make a general form out of it that registers like the first mention, and run that on the PC. This is a rather loose and sometimes misleading assessment. But remember that all help run leads to untangling all buttons and so it is a perfectly good approach, and as the PC gets run on something he is awful darn sure he ought to be run on he is often very happy and cooperative in this. Whereas on a dynamic assessment he is made intensely curious as he didn't know he was aberrated on what you found out. In other words just asking the PC what is wrong with him, getting it into a general form that registers on the meter and running Help O/W or concept help on it, is good reasonably fast processing. It is better than assessing for just a terminal that drops or for a specific late terminal that drops.

As a comment it should be noted that help is the last thing that folds up in the dwindling spiral of aberration. About the first thing that folds up is interest. But when it is gone there are still three buttons left on which the person can function. The next one to go is communication. This becomes a contest of overts as in the ARC breaky case. Anybody below this lives his or her life this way. The next one to vanish is control. So don't be surprised to find somebody around who does plenty of overts and who can't stand control who can yet be run on help and who can still function in life. When interest, communication, control and help are gone, that's it. You haven't got a person left. So beware people who are below help. Beware of them in living. But in auditing when you can't get HELP to bite at all (and if he can talk to you you can get help to bite) you have nothing left but the CCHs. You can make it on them too but with tremendous investment in hours. And when you've got the CCHs flat then you can start running help.

But as I said above I have not yet been able to say the PERFECT way of running help. I am still investigating it like mad and am giving you all the gen as it comes visible. However have patience with me. I have learned that people not only have it twisted a bit, they've got it shattered, and that's the majority of people. So we're in there slugging away and we're making clears, and if I get hold of any faster ways to do you'll be the first to get the gen.

LRH:js.cden
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

LONDON OPEN EVENING LECTURE
7 July 1960

** 6007C07 LOE-4 Help

Fran Hldrs

CURRENT RUNDOWN

CONCEPT HELP

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

“Get the idea of

The modern version of Concept Help O/W goes:

“Think of helping a

“Think of not helping a

Two-way Concept Help goes:

“Think of a ...helping you”

“Think of you helping a

Five-way Concept Help would go:

- (a) “Think of a ..helping you”
- (b) “Think of you helping a
- (c) “Think of a ..helping others”
- (d) “Think of others helping a ..”
- (e) “Think of a ..helping a ..”

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

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

ALTERNATE CONFRONT

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

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

Creativeness
Consciousness
Order
Control

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Havingness is an objective and somewhat obscure method of confronting and using it as we do objectively, it is a specialized form of confronting, possibly its best form, objective or subjective, even though a series of subjective havingness in Washington in 1955 tended to show that profile gains were not made by subjective confront, a conclusion still subject to further checking.

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

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

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

IDENTIFICATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- (a) “What could you continue to confront?”
- (b) “What would you rather not continue to confront?”

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

At the present moment auditing routine is:

Pre-session
Model Session
Help Processes
Alternate Confront
Havingness

all in every session.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd
Copyright ©1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HCO BULLETIN OF 21 JULY 1960

Fran Hldrs

SOME HELP TERMINALS

ASSESSMENTS

The basic method of finding a help terminal is of course the E-Meter, using an ordinary or dynamic assessment.

A simple and very satisfactory way of making a pc happy and getting results is to ask the pc what he thinks is wrong with him/her and run whatever the pc says—providing it's a terminal—in a general form. If it's not a terminal, get the pc to convert it to one.

Example: Auditor: "What do you think is wrong with you?"
PC: "My wife."
Auditor: "OK, we'll run *a* wife."

Example: Auditor: "What do you think is wrong with you?"
PC: "I'm impatient."
Auditor: "Can you think of somebody who was impatient?"
PC: "My Father."
Auditor: "OK, we'll run *a* Father."

Example: Auditor: "What do you think is wrong with you?"
PC: "Well, I think I am attenuated."
Auditor: "Did you ever know an attenuated person?"
PC: "Yes."
Auditor: "Who was it?"
PC: "George James."
Auditor: (since this is a specific terminal and we want a general one)
"What was George James?"
PC: "A Loafer!" Auditor: "OK, we'll run help on 'a loafer', all right?"
PC: "Fine."

TERMINALS BY PROFESSION

There are however some "professional" terminals you can run which do a lot for a case.

Find out what the pc was professionally in this lifetime and sort out what this profession helped as a terminal and run that.

Then run the beingness of the pc in this lifetime as a terminal and you've cleaned up a lot of track.

Always use, of course, the general form of any terminal—not Aunt Agatha but *an Aunt*. Not "the works mechanic at Pulman" but a works mechanic or a mechanic. The less adjectives the better.

This does much for a case, and rapidly.

ASSESSMENT BY GOALS

A pc also gets very happy when you run a beingness the pc is trying to be or hopes to be or even once hoped to be.

For instance, the pc wants to be a painter or wishes he were a painter or wishes he could be a painter again. Fine, just run help on "a painter".

The pc wanted to be a singer. Run it as "a singer".

The pc is trying to be a good housewife or husband. Fine, run “a housewife” or “a husband”.

In short, when you explore why the pc wants to be processed the pc often is either trying to correct something wrong (see above) or is trying to be something. Your assessment is done when you establish either item and the pc will recover, do better and be very happy with you.

RECOVERY OF PAST SKILLS

When a pc is getting processed to be able to recall Sanskrit or German, *if* the pc is in good shape by reason of other processing as above, you can recover it for him by finding out *what* spoke the language or had the skill and run Concept Help on that terminal.

Example: (typical) Pc can't learn Spanish, desperately wants to learn Spanish. E-Meter will tell you it's overts against the Spanish people (or Iberians) that occludes it all. Overts, run, will improve the situation but *help*, neglecting the overts, should recover the ability. Run “Think of helping the Spanish people (or Spain or whatever falls hardest on the overts)” and “Think of the Spanish people (or same as first command terminal) helping you.” Level it off with a version of Continuous Confront and Havingness on the room and you should attain the goal.

ODDBALL PROCESSES

Some particularly vicious and penetrating terminals can be run on a pc providing his case is already in good shape.

These terminals stem from HCO Bulletin of July 14, 1960. They are run in the order below:

a confusion
an unconscious person
a creative person.

Two other deadly terminals that probably should be used to finish off the last stage before clear on an auditor should be “a victim” and “a practitioner”.

Concept Help is the only known version of help that can be run on the five terminals named here as the first three are the fundamentals of a reactive mind.

“A responsible person” can be run before “a creative person”.

These are all rather deadly, over-the-average-ability-to-run, terminals so they should be reserved for the end of clearing.

By the way, just as a comment, clearing is happening with help processed in various forms and by various auditors, around the 250 hr mark, with no reference to time spent on earlier auditing. This is an early datum, based on two cases. On one of these there was auditor trouble and a change of auditors. The processes used were:

Help O/W
Concept Help
Confront Havingness.

The terminals used on these two cases were selected by myself, which renders this data specialized.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HCO BULLETIN OF 27 JULY 1960

Fran Hldrs

DOUBLE ACTION CYCLES

POLICY ON NEW DATA

Although no change is anticipated on current processes, Regimen 1, Pre-session, Model Session, and Help, since these are making clears very easily when well assessed and letter-perfectly run, I still have a research line running and new facts appear. Thus I will continue to present this data even though it is not for immediate use in processes.

OLD ACTION CYCLES

The oldest cycle of action is of course the early Vedic hymn, probably written by the monk Dharma himself, so far as I recollect. It shows the dawn becoming the day, becoming the night, and out of nothingness a progressive development into a new nothingness. This has been written as, I think, "The Hymn to the Dawn Child", available probably in most libraries as the Vedic Hymn.

The next cycle of action is the Create—Survive—Destroy of early Scientology. The dominant part of this cycle of course appeared in Dianetics as the primary law of Book One—Survive. The Dynamic Principle which motivates most biological life is SURVIVE.

The more fundamental urge of a thetan, as different from biological existence, is Create. Thus, in *Fundamentals of Thought*, the cycle of action becomes Create-Create-Create—No create (or Counter-create).

Survival is the apparency of creating. Creation brings about an effort to continuously create which becomes "Survive".

DOUBLE CYCLES

It is interesting now that behaviour, particularly as applied to work, is easier to understand by a closer viewing of the cycle of action.

There are two "double actions" in the cycle which give a better grasp of the actual value of a worker, as well as other areas of life. These then become valuable, at this time, as an evaluation of human beings.

The lowest double action in the cycle is the most difficult to handle when it is present in an organization. This is "destroy in order to survive".

We see this most easily to-day on the Fifth Dynamic with Eating. One destroys form in order not to die. One kills to live. Of course this involves some very degrading consequences as it is not a duplication. Out of this we can evolve the overt-motivator sequence.

Duplication would be "killing in order to die" or "making survive in order to survive". As soon as one "Destroys in order to Survive" he is in a mis-communication situation. There is no duplication possible. Individuation results. The intention is double and contrary. One destroys something over there in order not to be destroyed over here. The violation of duplication brings about the upset of feeling bad here when one tries to kill there.

There are too many workmen who enter this upon the whole programme of work. Around them machines, structures and people collapse. Such workmen are trying to

survive only by destroying everything around them. And this reaction is not confined to workmen. Anyone in an aberrated state may have some tinge of it.

Another double cycle action is to create in order to survive. This is fairly sane. An artist sometimes will not work unless his survival is threatened. Then he creates. This principle of threatening survival is common to most actions in business and the arts.

The middle ground double is of course making things survive in order to survive. As Survival is translated for processing as Continuous Confront (“What could you continue to confront” + rather not continue, etc) we can find persistences in this category.

We also see “destroy in order to be destroyed” and “create in order to be created” in phases of life.

Probably the worst double is “destroying in order to survive” and the most susceptible to psychosis is “creating in order to destroy”. Science, dedicated to the last as weapons people, go quite mad. And even the farmer’s decline is found here.

Concept running on these doubles is quite interesting. “Destroying in order to survive” is the first concept to be run, being the lowest.

USE IN PROCESSING

All this data is of value in the area of theta clear processing to operating thetan.

L. RON HUBBARD

P.S. I am developing some processes which promise to run out engrams about one thousand an hour for a theta clear while holding havingness up.

P.P.S. I am getting some intensives and am stabilising along the + theta clear level. It’s wonderful. Standard modern processes are being used.

L.R.H.

LRH:iet.rd
Copyright ©1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 4 AUGUST 1960

Fran Hldrs

REGIMEN 1

For some time it has been obvious that we needed an auditing procedure that would serve to train auditors using for the first time Model Sessions.

Some weeks ago I developed "Regimen 1". This was primarily for use in training HGC auditors. It has been so sweepingly successful that it is here given for general field use.

It must be clearly understood that a complete session would consist of pre-sessioning, the exact use of Model Sessions, and the new techniques that are producing Clears. Regimen 1 then is a stop-gap bridge between old style formal auditing and a complete grasp of pre-sessioning and Model Sessions.

It is intended when using Regimen 1 that the auditor come as close as possible to a Model Session but not be critical of it. As Regimen 1 is more and more used by the auditor he should continue to study Model Sessions (HCO Bulletin of February 25, 1960) until he can do one letter perfect.

Once he has the Model Session pat he should then study up on pre-sessioning until he has that perfect.

Naturally all the TRs and knowledge of the E-Meter go into a session. These, with pre-sessioning, the Model Session, give us an auditing form which should be mastered before complete clearing results become inevitable.

REGIMEN 1

(Only Regimen 1 can be used until an auditor has excellent results on several pcs)

- (a) Assessment—ask the pc what is wrong with him. Take the pc's answer, make it into a general terminal. Run that and nothing else. When it's cooled off, assess again, same way, run that. Don't argue or dispute or change what the pc says except to convert it to a general terminal.

Example: Auditor: "What do you think is wrong with you?"
PC: "My wife."
Auditor: "OK, we'll run a wife."

Example: Auditor: "What do you think is wrong with you?"
PC: "I'm impatient."
Auditor: "Can you think of somebody who was impatient?"
PC: "My father."
Auditor: "OK, we'll run a father."

Example: Auditor: "What do you think is wrong with you?"
PC: "Well, I think I'm attenuated."
Auditor: "Did you ever know an attenuated person?"
PC: "Yes."
Auditor: "Who was it?"
PC: "George James."
Auditor: (since this is a specific terminal and we want a general one)
"What was George James?"
PC: "A Loafer!"
Auditor: "OK, we'll run help on 'a loafer', all right?"
PC: "Fine."

When “a loafer” is flat, flat, we do the same assessment again and as above get a new general terminal.

- (b) Use as a process two-way concept help. Example: “Think of a father helping you,” “Think of you helping a father,” etc. Flatten it down to a no reaction on meter. (Lay meter aside for most of sessions. Use only to check.)
- (c) For a quarter of any session time run alternate confront. “What could you confront?” “What would you rather not confront?”
- (d) For a quarter of every session’s time run havingness to end with—”Look around here and find something you could have.”
- (e) Start session with checking for PTPs and ARC breaks. Handle PTP with “What part of that problem could you be responsible for?” only.
- (f) Handle ARC break with “What have I done to you?” “What have you done to me?” only.

Regimen 1 omits pre-sessioning. It does a rough kind of Model Session, as good as one can get but skip being critical of it.

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

Naturally there are some general requirements which make up the background music, or lack of it, in sessions, and while there may be many of these, four of them are vitally important. These are:

1. Handle pc pleasantly
2. Don’t chatter at pc
3. Get pc to execute every command given
4. Run good TRs.

It also goes without saying that one should follow the Auditor’s Code in session as well as the Code of a Scientologist out of it.

So far as the Auditor’s Code is concerned, the only modern error which keeps repeating itself and coming to attention is “evaluation”. Apparently this is because very few newly trained auditors have a good grasp of what evaluation is. Briefly, evaluation consists of telling the pc what to think about his case. This is something an auditor should never do. It is directly contrary to Scientology practice, and enormously inhibits a pc’s gains. Nothing will cause an ARC break like an evaluation. An example of this is to say “Good” with a question mark on it, or to say “All right” as though you don’t believe the pc.

Another difficult point in auditing consists of the auditor thinking he has to *believe* the pc utterly and accept his story completely in order to have any reality with the pc. A little study of this will demonstrate that one acknowledges what the pc believes. He acknowledges it as something which is believed by the pc. The auditor is quite entitled to his own opinion of it and quite ordinarily supposes that the pc will change his idea of it after more auditing, but this does not mean that one should take what the pc says in a state of mind of “Well that’s reality for you, but I have my own reality on the situation.”

There is at this late date, now that we have the various TRs, no excuse for command flubs. An auditor should not make errors. If an auditor is found to be making errors he should get himself run on Op Pro by Dup.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

LONDON CONGRESS ON DISSEMINATION AND HELP LECTURES

London, England
6—7 August 1960

On Saturday and Sunday, August 6th and 7th, 1960, HCO and HASI London sponsored a Congress with the theme of “Dissemination and Help” at the Royal Commonwealth Society Hall in London, England. Attendees co-audited and received the following lectures by L. Ron Hubbard.

6008C07	LCDH-1	Title unknown
6008C07	LCDH-2	Pre-sessioning
** 6008C07	LCDH-3	Plant Research—Sickness—Will to Live—Adjustment of the Cycle of Action in Pre-sessioning (alternative title: Victim & Succumb)

THE LAWS OF ASSESSMENT

The most important part of auditing is assessment.

This became apparent when I realized that I had assessed all the clears of the 20th ACC and most other clears. Therefore, it follows, I must have been doing something in assessing that I had never articulated and with the advent of the 1st Saint Hill ACC, I managed to do this for Dick and Jan. I have reduced a file cabinet of data on assessing, not before co-ordinated, to two primary laws as the common denominators of assessing.

While assessing still requires judgment, we now can check proper assessment and can begin to teach accurate assessment.

This is a preliminary paper on the subject.

The Laws of Assessment are:

- I: A thetan's Reality on a terminal depends upon the degree of outflow a thetan can tolerate from that class of terminals.
- II: A thetan tends to become that on which he has produced non-beneficial effects. A thetan tends to move from source beingness to effect beingness.
- III: A thetan tends to maintain a position on the tone scale where inflows are comfortable and to change that position it is necessary to accustom him by auditing, to higher terminals.

LAW I

The fall registered on the E-Meter, when a terminal is mentioned, registers the amount of inflow the thetan is aware of. When he is not aware of inflow he is totally unreal on it or he is completely aware of the terminal.

Therefore when any terminal is mentioned to a pc it will be:

- (a) Too forceful
- (b) Barely tolerable
- (c) Completely real
- (d) Too weak
- (e) Ignored

The E-Meter registers on (b) type terminals with a fall. It registers on (a) type with a rise or no reaction. It does not register on (c) type.

A pc has no concept of (a) type. Even though he flinches from it (steady needle rise) he does not *know* it. He cannot confront on (a) type but may not even realize it.

A pc reacts to (b) type because it is slightly above his tone scale position but is difficult to confront. Therefore he can be run with moderate success on any terminal that produces a fall.

A pc does not react to type (c) since he can confront it with comfort.

Type (d) is so weak that a thetan at a higher position tends to outflow toward it and thus possibly interiorize into it.

Type (e) terminals are too insignificant to a thetan in any given tone scale position and tend to be ignored. They are still real.

LAW II

A thetan moves from source beingness to effect beingness so therefore any time a fall is noted on an E-Meter, it can be assumed that the thetan has become an effect beingness. It is necessary to find what would create or handle the terminal that caused the fall. This is better to run than the fall terminal, even though it barely checks a rise.

One runs causative terminals always, never effect terminals. But what may seem an effect terminal to the auditor may be a causative terminal to the preclear.

LAW III

Always seek to run terminals that do not clear by two-way comm and which are causative to some slight degree to terminals that produce a fall on an E-Meter.

A TERMINAL IS IMPROPERLY ASSESSED IF IT DOES NOT DURING AUDITING

1. Produce a loosening and a tightening of needle action;
2. Produce a change of position on the tone arm of at least (minimum) three tones of difference up or down per hour of auditing;
3. Produce longer and longer periods of loose needle as the intensives continue;
4. Produce a change of comm lag from command to command in the pc;
5. Produce cognitions; and
6. Improve the ability of the case to confront.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 18 AUGUST 1960

HCO Secs
Assn Secs
Franchise Holders

VITAL INFORMATION

Having developed now a process package which makes Mest Clears, Theta Clears and OTs without further special uses on many cases, I hasten to send you the data and ask that you yourself at once get audited on it and audit those persons who are surest and best around you in order to obtain a "control of areas" with the increased ability.

Nothing in this process discards the main line of theory of Dianetics and Scientology but since results can be obtained so swiftly with it, it must be asked that persons uneducated in Scientology must not be run too far on it, as they will obtain high levels of action without any understanding which would be an overt against them. In short, do not complete this process on any pc beyond the level of Mest Clear unless the pc has been sent for a course. This will save considerable upset and instability in the long run. It is a technical fact having nothing to do with economics of Central Orgs.

The only overt we can do is to fail to disseminate correct data. We can refuse to process without any overt occurring. But we cannot fail to disseminate without an overt. Study it out and you'll see it's true.

I will not give you much theory on this at this writing beyond a statement that all apparent dynamics on people are inverted from their sixth dynamic and that the theory of confusion and the stable datum is paramount here.

In the process we remove the confusion and permit the pc to release the various terminals and ideas.

Later assessment and the running of terminals is probably needful.

The basic process was looked for first in 1951. There was a lecture on it called "Motion and Emotion" and a talk about the "governor" of a pc's speed of advance. Since then I have had to search very hard and it has taken eight years to match up processes to hit at this.

I have now done this.

The rundown is as follows, every session:

Pre-session
Model Session
Help
Alternate Confront
Havingness

The thing on which Help is run is MOTION. The commands are these:

"What motion have you helped?"
"What motion have you not helped?"

Do not run "What motion could you help" or any invent process. Help, being a responsibility process, gives us the only practical way to get the pc to face a non-terminal like Motion.

This is Mest Clear Route, Theta Clear Route, OT Route.

If the pc runs to flat meter, assess for a terminal, run that terminal flat, then run more Motion as above exactly. The assessment is the most difficult part. If the assessment is right one gets a fast run, if wrong, it takes ages.

But start now on Motion.

We're off the launching pad. Glad you're with us.

L. RON HUBBARD

HCO BULLETIN OF 25 AUGUST 1960

Franchised Auditors
Assn Secs
HCO Secs

POWERFUL PRESESSION ADDITIONS

Pre-sessioning had some missing points in it which I have been filling in in order to clear as many 1st Saint Hill ACC students as possible.

Seeing that students were not obtaining as much tone arm action as HGC auditors would for the same amount of auditing it was necessary to study the fact. Students audit each other without altitude and so I had to resolve *altitude* as such.

Altitude is the factor that makes a pc receive and execute an auditing command. Any good auditor in the field and certainly HGC auditors audit from altitude. Therefore they get more tone arm action and faster clearing. Students auditing each other audit without altitude. As one can't build up the altitude of students to one another, it was necessary to reduce the need of altitude on the part of the pc.

I have developed then a new pre-session step at the level of *control* to care for altitude. It turned out to be a possible one-shot clear command.

This step should be run hard on any pc and very hard on pcs who do not have much effect on their banks. Many pcs cannot run a "think" command. The gradient of cases is the increasing ability to affect the bank with new thought. A low level case can't. A high level case can.

As low level cases also cannot execute an auditing command cleanly without alterations, vias or non-execution, it follows that the *process* run is not in question. What is in question is the pc's ability to follow a command.

Therefore if a tone arm on an E-Meter does not swing at least through 3 tones in an hour of auditing the pc is not following the command clearly or the pc can produce small effect on his own bank. If such a condition exists then the pc is allergic to orders and will be a slow case or hangfire in auditing.

The remedy of this is a pre-session process at the level of Control.

The process is Pre-session Control Processing.

The commands are:

- (a) "What order was disobeyed?" or
- (b) "What intention was not followed?"

If (a) does not work go to (b). In any event eventually run both (a) and (b) at the level of Control in Pre-sessioning.

As this is a heavy gain process, if the pc is low scale on a graph, run it instead of help in a Model Session for many sessions.

Pre-session Commands which are now set are:

PRESESSION INTEREST: (Live or Die)

"What is worse than death?"

PRESESSION HELP: (two-way help on auditor-pc)

"How could I help you?"
"How could you help me?"

PRESESSION CONTROL:

“What order was disobeyed?” or
“What intention was not followed?”

PRESESSION COMMUNICATION: Rapid handling of possible overts. There is a set procedure for this that removes life computations which will be expanded later.

As noted, *Pre-session Interest* (Live or Die) belongs actually fourth as *Interest* and may be so placed later.

On the new Pre-session Control Process the tone arm is the clue. If it doesn't shift rapidly (3 tones at least per hour of Help processing) the remedy is the Pre-session Control Process as given above.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.jh
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

NEW DEFINITION OF PSYCHOSIS

After a careful study of cases, based on new data, I have a method of detecting and an answer to psychosis which is simple and useful.

The lower a person is on the tone scale the less they can receive and follow orders and directions.

That person who raves and screams at the very thought of receiving an order is of course completely insane.

That person who obsessively fights an organization that gives him clean instructions to help him is, of course, insane.

All persons who have been too much around a bad military or who have had military fathers are very likely to be subject to a derangement. This derangement multiplying brings an insanity. They rave and scream if even their best friends try to help them.

What is gone is the control level. Help may still be there but on obsessive cause of help only. No help may be received.

Look around you, look it over. The criminal will not receive the orders called law. The psychotic will not receive the orders that bring real help.

This gives you a real weapon.

A psychotic is that person who cannot receive orders of any kind, who sits unmoving or goes berserk at the thought of doing anything told him by another determinism.

Want to know if they're crazy? Give them a simple order.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 26 AUGUST 1960

1st Sthil ACC
HCO Secs
Assn Secs

REGIMEN TWO

Regimen Two requires no assessment.

This regimen is run with pre-session and Model Session and contains a complete set of processes for the Model Session.

MODEL SESSION

It should be noted that the *patter wording* of a Model Session is what is set and fixed. By always using the same words to open, continue and close a session, to begin and end processes, a duplication of sessions is achieved which as they continue, runs them out. The patter wording of a Model Session should be learned by heart and not changed. The commands of regimens of processes used in Model Sessions may change. But not the patter. It is this patter which makes a Model Session a Model Session, not the commands run in it.

ASSESSMENT

No assessment is used in Regimen Two. The E-Meter is employed to determine the advance and stage of case. Advance is determined by change of tone arm position and loosening or tightening of needle, per unit time of processing, the sensitivity knob always being set the same, session after session. The stage of case is judged by the rapidity of the repetitive loosening and tightening of needle action and the width and rapidity of change of the tone arm.

CLEAR INDICATION

When a case has at last a steady tone arm near clear reading for the sex of the pc and when the needle is loose and does not respond to elementary pre-session questions, the person is Most Clear. (See chapter on this in Book I and read it carefully.)

STEPS OF REGIMEN TWO

- Step (a)* “What motion have you helped?”
“What motion have you not helped?”
- Step (b)* “What can you confront?”
“What would you rather not confront?”
- Step (c)* “Look around here and find something you could have.”

Step (a) is run for the bulk of the session and Steps (b) and (c) are given equal times at session end.

Step (c) may be run at any time if pc's havingness drops. Step (c) must however always be run until the pc can have each one the bulk of the objects in the room.

Cases which do not respond to Regimen Two should be pre-sessioned until the tone arm becomes active, no matter how many sessions this requires.

LRH:js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

1ST SAINT HILL ADVANCED CLINICAL COURSE LECTURES

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
8 August—16 September 1960

In order to improve ACCs L. Ron Hubbard brought the 7th London ACC to Saint Hill and made it the 1st Saint Hill ACC. The goal of the ACC was advancing *all* cases.

The last twelve lectures were recorded and contain data on the use of the new preessions and processes that undercut cases. All twelve lectures are listed below. They are also shown on the following pages in chronological sequence with the written materials of the time.

6008C29	1SHACC-1	The Importance of an E-Meter
** 6008C30	1SHACC-2	Circuits and Havingness
** 6008C31	1SHACC-3	Theory 67
** 6009C01	1SHACC-4	Theory 67
6009C02	1SHACC-5	Case I mprovements
** 6009C05	1SHACC-6	Successful Processes for Handling MEST
** 6009C06	1SHACC-7	Correct Use of E-Meter
** 6009C12	1SHACC-8	In-Sessionness
** 6009C13	1SHACC-9	How Havingness Relates to Circuits
** 6009C14	1SHACC-10	Formula of Havingness
6009C15	1SHACC-11	In-Sessionness and Havingness
6009C16	1SHACC-12	Final Lecture—6th and 7th Dynamics

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 1 SEPTEMBER 1960

Franchise Hldrs
ACC Students
Ds of P
Assn Secs
HCO Secs

PRESESSION TWO

A reshuffling of theory during the past few weeks in order to improve all ACC cases and clear as many of them as possible has given us new weapons for the difficult case and new heights for all cases with evidence of increased speed in processing and easier handling of processes by auditors. I have been very busy on this and myself received some eighty hours of processing to iron out commands and get a subjective reality by case synthesis on these new approaches.

I evolved a new basic theory of processing from observation of what did not move some ACC cases and what did.

This has been a strenuous research period and though by no means at end, results should now become much easier to obtain in other areas.

Pre-session Two is not composed of new processes but is a new combination.

In 1956 I discovered that talking reduced a difficult pc's tone level. Now it is obvious that *no* significance process moves a low graph case. Therefore, Pre-session Two is to be used on *all* cases until a pronounced change of tone arm and needle reaction is attained as below.

Pre-session Two cannot be run without a good E-Meter.

When a pc has been steadied at his clear reading by many sessions of Pre-session Two then Regimen Two (or Three as will be issued) may be embarked upon.

PRESESSION TWO

The pre-session is begun by stating to the pc, "If it is all right with you, we will begin auditing." On his assent the auditor says (Tone 40), "Start of session. We will begin by running havingness. Here is the first command," and gives it.

No discussion is begun or permitted with the pc, no rudiments. No chatter. The auditor starts briskly and crisply and invites no discussion of anything and if any is offered by pc, says, "We will take that up later on in processing. Right now we have to begin."

A case can be retarded by talk in its first stages. Therefore, no talk, just processing.

The Havingness Process is "*Look around here and find something you could have.*"

This is run to a loose needle and any closer approach (up or down) of the tone arm to the clear reading. The best action on which to end the process is a "blow down" of the tone arm (or a "blow up" in the low tone arm case), meaning a sudden approach of the arm from a non-optimum reading toward the optimum read. The first "blow down" (or "blow up") is the signal to change to the second process.

The auditor then says, "I will run two more commands of this and end the process if that is all right with you." And then does so. When he reaches the last command he says, "That was the last command of this process. Is there anything you would care to say before I end the process?" He acks whatever pc says, keeps it brief

and then says, “End of process.” At once the auditor adds, “We will now begin alternate confront if that is all right with you. Here is the first command.” And gives it.

The commands of alternate confront are:

“What could you confront?”
“What would you rather not confront?”

This process is run to a relatively tight or sticky needle and, secondarily, to an abnormally high or low tone arm.

As soon as the meter shows the pc is now “getting sticky” the auditor says, “I will run two more commands of this and end the process if that is all right with you.” He does so and says, “Is there anything you would care to say before I end this process?” The auditor acks whatever pc says, keeps it brief and says, “End of process (not Tone 40).”

At once the auditor says, “We will now begin havingness if that is all right with you.” He acks pc’s consent and does so. “Here is the first command. Etc.”

The action of the tone arm is the signal to change processes—loose needle to change from havingness, tight needle to change from alternate confront. This may take three minutes to happen on either process or a half an hour. There is no set time. It is all done by the E-Meter.

One runs these two processes one after the other, on and on, pre-session after pre-session, until the tone arm is stabilized at the clear reading. Then one begins Regimen Two (or Three).

That is the entirety of Pre-session Two. No goals, no check-out on help, control, comm, no PTPs, no ARC breaks handled. It runs out PTPs and ARC breaks anyway.

It is smoothly audited, crisply with good TRs, almost muzzled.

This will move any case that can go through the action of the commands.

Even if the havingness does not seem real to pc, keep pc at it. It will become real by and by.

The alternate confront answers do not have to be subjective but usually will be.

Here is an auditor trick that permits better attention on pc’s answers and less command mistakes on alternate command processes. When you give the plus command (could you) put your thumb on your index finger. Hold it there until it is answered. When the minus command (rather not) is given, put your thumb on the second finger tip until it is answered. This sets up a physical universe tally and keeps one from mucking up the command sequence without having to “hold it in mind”. This permits better observation of the pc. If he fogs out and needs the question again, thumb position tells the auditor which one it is without recall. I have been using this to free up all attention units for observation of pc and meter and find the additional attention helps the pc. The thumb system is done unobtrusively, of course. This may seem a bit silly to propose but your auditing attention is for the pc and the state of the meter, not holding a command like a concept. The mental holding of the command starts some uncleared auditors into self-audit during a session and may be a cause of session self-audit.

A pre-session is ended by the auditor asking after his last “End of process”, “Do you have anything you would like to say before we end this session?” He can now take up whatever the pc says and gracefully ease the session to a close. The pre-session activity is closed by saying, “I am now going to end processing for (this morning) (this afternoon) (today) (tonight). Here it is. (Tone 40) End of session.” He can add, “Now tell me I am no longer auditing you (this morning) (this afternoon) (today) (tonight).”

AN AUDITING PRESESSION

In actuality, a pre-session of this type is a session of sorts, minus rudiments and end rudiments. But in very real actuality I now find a pc isn't enough there before he is consistently reading at clear to do anything but cut up his havingness with talk in session. His postulates aren't sticking well yet. He ARC breaks unexpectedly. Any talk by the auditor invites upsets. And havingness and alternate confront handle PTPs and ARC breaks better for somebody who reads off clear than most other processes. Further, as above, the more pc talk, the more chance for flubs and ARC breaks.

SUMMARY

Pre-session Two is based on the theory that one is taking the 6th Dynamic off the Seventh Dynamic. This is opposed to taking the Seventh Dynamic out of the Sixth Dynamic. There's so much to this and so many mechanical facts involved that I'm going to write a book about it shortly as it's too lengthy for bulletins.

We're going right ahead now and make *lots* of Book One Clears through the HGCs and the field. Only these will be whole track Book One Clears. Pre-session Two and Regimen Three are the first process arrangements I have done which require only repetitive commands, no assessment or judgement of a case beyond E-Meter needle and tone arm readings. As assessment and discussion with the pc have been the major impediments to broad modern clearing by others, I am happy to be able to remove them. It has been quite a feat. As this also gets those stuck arm, stuck needle cases really going, some moving swiftly for the first time, I feel we've achieved something. The processes have been to hand but a new theory of processing had to be evolved to isolate them from thousands of other good processes and to get them run exactly right in the correct order.

Pre-session Two, by the way, is not for HAS Co-audit use or any co-audit use, where meters are not in every auditor's hands. It is vital that they be run by meter. Otherwise these two processes just stall each other. Co-audit people would just get involved in engrams here and there and be unhappy. Use help on supervisor-assessed terminals in co-audits. It's good. Don't run alternate confront. Run havingness afterwards if you like.

One further comment on needle action in running Pre-session Two. The fastest case advance is probably achieved by getting off alternate confront and back to havingness immediately after a consistent needle rise or steady creep downward (for a low arm case) sets in. A steady rise means the pc has just hit something he can't confront (the source of rise or steady slow fall for a low tone arm). It's all no have from there. This requires watchfulness. Be certain to catch it and return to havingness again each time there is a sticky needle coming about.

(All comments on needle and meter reaction in this bulletin are subject to review as the matter is still under study but the above meter data is already proven to be workable and should be used for now.)

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.jh
Copyright ©1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

** 6009C01	1SHACC-4	Theory 67
6009C02	1SHACC-5	Case Improvements
** 6009C05	1SHACC-6	Successful Processes for Handling MEST
** 6009C06	1SHACC-7	Correct Use of E-Meter
** 6009C12	1SHACC-8	In-Sessionness

Fran Hldrs

THE PRESESSIONS OF THE 1ST SAINT HILL ACC

The 1st Saint Hill ACC is being very successful.

The advanced process used on higher cases is Regimen 3. Help on Motion, Alt. Conf., and Havingness done in a Model Session. (Regimen 3/II.)

This has been preceded by Preessions. The preession only is used until pc rides at clear reading with a loose needle during session. Then the preession that cracked the case is combined with Help on Motion as a new Regimen 3. This is designated as follows: Regimen 3/V. This means that a Model Session is run with Help on Motion, the Confront command being that of Preession V, the Havingness command being that of Preession V. In the Model Session, the sequence of processes is the Havingness process, the Help-Motion process, the Havingness process, the Confront process, the Havingness process, the Help-Motion process, etc. The Havingness process is run briefly until Havingness is up. The Confront is run until pc is in p.t. Help-Motion is run until pc gets high on the arm or gummy on the needle.

The following preessions are those that have been effective on one or another of the ACC cases. A more detailed report will be made later.

Preession II is for a fairly easy case. Preessions V to VII inclusive moved, one or another of them, all difficult cases, Preessions VIII and IX have not been used but are included for completeness.

The rule is that if a tone arm does not shift more than one division on a meter dial in an hour of processing, you should try another preession.

If you have the right one for the case, you should get rapid shifts of the tone arm and should flatten it as a preession (pc reading during its use at clear read) and then go into Model Session using your same preession as the Havingness and Confront commands of Regimen 3.

No rudiments, no two way comm of any kind is used while auditing the preession only.

COMMANDS FOR PRESESSIONS II—X

PRESESSION II:

Havingness: "Look around here and find something you could have."

Confront: "What could you confront?" "What would you rather not confront?"

PRESESSION III:

Havingness: "Point out something in this room you could confront."
"Point out something in this room you would rather not confront."

Confront: "What unconfrontable thing could you present?"

PRESESSION IV:

Havingness: "What part of a beingness around here could you have?"

Confront: "What beingness could others not confront?"

PRESESSION V:

Havingness: "Point out something in this room you could confront."
"Point out something in this room you would rather not confront."
Confront: "Point out a place where you are not being confronted."

PRESESSION VI:

Havingness: "Look around here and point out an effect you could prevent."
Confront: "What would deter another?" "Where would you put it?"

PRESESSION VII:

Havingness: "Point out something."
Confront: "Tell me something I am not doing to you."

PRESESSION VIII:

Havingness: "Where is the (room object)?"
Confront: "Recall something really real to you."
"Recall a time you liked something."
"Recall a time you communicated with something."

PRESESSION IX:

Havingness: "Look around here and find an object you are not in."
Confront: "Recall somebody who was real to you."
"Recall somebody you really liked."
"Recall somebody you could communicate with."

PRESESSION X:

Havingness: "Look around here and find something you could have."
Confront: "What beingness could you confront?"
"What beingness would you rather not confront?"

Notes:

By finding the Pre-session Havingness process that moved the tone arm well and the Confront process that moved the tone arm well, the auditor can make a pre-session out of this new pair.

On all "POINT OUT" commands: Have pc hold both E-Meter cans in one hand with a piece of paper, or cardboard, between to prevent shorting out, so pc has one hand free to point with.

Havingness command of Pre-session IV: Unless more than one auditing team present in auditing room, must be run as a walk-about, or in room where pc can see people from window.

Confront command of Pre-session VI: Use either no acknowledgement, or a very light, continuing sort of acknowledgement, between these two questions.

(Data on the use of Pre-sessions as part of Regimen 3 as given in this HCO Bulletin is subject to further study.)

LRH :js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

** 6009C13 1SHACC-9 How Havingness Relates to Circuits
** 6009C14 1SHACC-10 Formula of Havingness

Fran Hldrs

THE TONE ARM

If you haven't got an E-Meter, you can't clear people. That has now emerged as a final datum.

For without an E-Meter you cannot tell, the way it has now developed, whether a case is really moving or not or whether a process is biting.

This startling fact was proven in the 1st Saint Hill ACC (7th London).

In late 1959 I began to study the tone arm as a means of discovering more data about a case.

A year later I can assure you of the following truths:

1. A case which is not registering a rapidly moving tone arm during a session is not progressing well.
2. A case which has no wide tone arm movement during processing has not remedied objective havingness.
3. Extreme low arm and extreme high arm cases only have low objective havingness.
4. A case should move three tone divisions of the tone arm dial up or down in an hour of processing before it can be considered to be running well.
5. If a tone arm doesn't change under processing the case is not progressing.
6. The keys to a moving tone arm are:
 - (a) Havingness
 - (b) Overts
7. No case should be processed on anything else but some form of objective havingness or O/W before the tone arm is moving freely.
8. Extreme high and extreme low tone arm cases alike are unable to *have* the room of the session.
9. Extreme high and extreme low tone arm cases alike cannot have the auditor or people.
10. Until a case is made to read around the clear read, it should not be processed on anything but havingness, O/W, confront (or duplication) processes.

The tone arm tells you, by its motion, the extent of case advance, long before you get another graph. Inadequate tone arm motion during processing means inadequate case gain.

If the case isn't gaining, try another objective havingness process.

LRH:js.cden
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

6009C15 1SHACC-11 In-Sessionness and Havingness
6009C16 1SHACC-12 Final Lecture—6th and 7th Dynamics

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 17 SEPTEMBER 1960

D of Ps
Assn Secs
HCO Secs

GIVING THE PC FULL HOURS

It has come to attention that pcs are sometimes deprived of a part of their full 25 hours in an intensive by including coffee breaks in the auditing time.

As this is one of the most fruitful sources of pc dissatisfaction even when unexpressed, the practice is forbidden.

If the pc demands a break or if the auditor declares one, the time so spent is added to the 25 hours, which is to say the time is made up in actual auditing in the same day it occurred. Careful count must be kept of a break since it must be added to session time and given in actual auditing.

Auditing time is very precious to pcs. Please don't waste it.

HAVINGNESS INJUNCTION

No pc may be run on two-way comm, confront, help or other process until a process has been found that remedies his havingness and brings the tone arm to clear read.

Overt-withhold on the auditor or other terminal may be considered a preliminary process as it assists duplication and therefore havingness. It is not, however, to be considered a havingness process for purposes of running a case.

Havingness processes meant herein are those of the 1st Saint Hill ACC issued in contemporary bulletins.

MODEL SESSION

HGCs will hereafter use Model Session form immediately that a havingness and a confront process are established for a particular pc. Thereafter all sessions shall be in Model Session form.

The purpose of this is to get the rudiments covered to the end of obviating ARC breaks and present time problems, the only two things which can stall a case which has once gotten started.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: dm.cden
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

BPI

CAPTIVE BRAINS

Pity the poor Scientist. He is a captive brain.

Today he has no liberty. He may not, must not utter blasphemy against his captors.

All he is permitted to do is slave.

The cause for which he slaves derives from an accident of geography. If he was born in the "West" he gets to slave for the Extreme right. If born in the "East" he slaves for the Extreme left.

Should he find anything or invent anything, his discovery becomes the boast of Leftist or Rightist.

At once, he has been persuaded, he must *deny all further responsibility* for his creation and sign over the whole thing for a rouble or one dollar to his captors and must remain anonymous.

And then he must also wear his old school tie and belong to the right society. His credentials must always be in order. If he invents or discovers anything his credentials are examined first, its political use is examined next and then he's given his microcosm of security and sent back to his cell.

His government, his society, his employer all have managed to insist that these conditions exist and, more, are normal and fitting.

If he utters blasphemy such as "I feel radiation is not assimilable for babies" or "Science was invented to serve Man", he is sacked. His security is taken roughly away and they tear up his old school tie. They say nasty things about him in the papers and glare at his former fellows hoping they start no nonsense now.

When you make a man grind enough years at the mouldy texts of yesterday's prejudices, he is already on the ropes. He is dimly peeping through bad eyesight at a myopic world. He has been made to feel that if he doesn't treat life like a tightrope, he'll fall.

And so he is piteously grateful to receive his old school tie. He is cringing with gratitude when they offer him anonymous rewards. If he destroys Mankind thereby by dreaming up a bomb, he never finds it out. He forgot Mankind. He denied all responsibility for his creation.

Once scientists stood for Truth and tried to serve humanity. Now they serve economics and political creeds.

Why has no defence been built against fission? Because nobody wrote a cheque to build it. Scientifically it is a problem only slightly more complex than Atom Bombs. Why has no *scientist* started to work on it, cheque or no cheque?

Can it be they gutted scientists of guts when they perverted Newton?

Can it be he or she is a coward, this scientist? Can it be a pay cheque and old school tie mean more to him than life?

Ah yes—I well recall seeking to shame some apple-cheeked young officers, strayed like blinking lambs, into a man-of-war. I graded them on their watch standing with A and B and C and put gold stars on their records on the bulletin board. Such was my irony, so heavy was my hand, as I stood back, that finally I could only weep. They thanked me!

So the product of the group-think, the death of the individual in a university of today, extends further than the scientist.

Slaves it has been said, love their chains. No more so than a scientist who sells his tiny spark of a soul for a pat on the head from a political boss.

And so, as the responsibility of the individual for his creation dies, so we enter in upon a madness of destruction where all human suffering is made available to all.

The man who would destroy all Man for pay, not even vengeance, is so far below contempt he is no longer man but animal, a beast unclean who cares not what he kills so long as he is fed.

You want to end the threat of bombs, then please awake. Politics died with Victoria. Government is no longer done that way. It's done not by appeals to men but appeals to their bellies and their fears. The world is now controlled by economic groups who debase laws and rewrite texts and so make slaves.

For anything to happen now, enough to end this crazy dance, it will be needful to amend Man's pride and confidence and teach him he can stand alone on his two feet. The re-creation of the individual is all that's left, no matter what you would improve.

Man buys his lies from cowardice. Afraid to face the truth he cannot view his death-coming fast, for all Mankind.

In companies, in every path of life, show men they can be free and you'll have courage back for them.

How do I know this about Scientists? For thirty years I've been a maverick, an iconoclast. Each old school tie they sought to hang me with I painted its stripes comically. And I have watched in thirty years almost every other maverick go down. I've seen them denied security, given bad notices. I've seen them produce brilliant work and have it lie neglected even though their nation bled.

America had the V-2 in 1932. Why did she have to import a foreign Scientist to "recover its secret"?

America had helicopters in 1936. Why did she copy a German machine, the Focke-Wulf, ten years later?

America had a thousand things she would not buy from men who would not wear the old school tie and bow their heads in abandonment of their creations.

I was myself once threatened with expulsion from a university because I said that students should be allowed to think. A terrible crime.

We go into the teeth today, we Scientologists, of the greatest slavery of them all, the slavery of thought. The battle is not ended yet—but listen, we've broken through!

We today are the only group on earth that is not owned by either camp or any creed. We serve no flighty masters.

Once there was only me, sickened sometimes by Lying press inspired because I

would not be a slave. But now there's you and you and you. Sometimes we've lost a man or a girl but only because they were not brave enough to stand upon a mountain top and say "I'm me! I think. I feel. I am no slave. Come on! Be free!"

But even in our very trying days, we still kept most of us and now we grow into a crowd whose mutters shake the cornerstone of prisons.

And we've won technology. Why should I give you sales talks now? Upon every continent an HGC is turning people into clears.

We're winning or why should the press begin again to growl? On one hand on the stands we read that a grayayayt university now believes that IQ can change, while in the same day a huge scientific group says we are no good.

Our hands lie heavily on destiny, yours and mine. We've turned a downward trend upward again. And so as we mount higher, be clever and understand what's happening.

Attacks in press and elsewhere will mount up. Upon me. Upon us. No. No violence. Just entheta. And money, lots of money will be sent to scream out more and more. Be gratified. Their hysteria is our index of win, nothing less.

Pity the poor slave master! There in his Extreme Right or Extreme Left den, he's penned successfully the cream of brains and wit. And just as he licks his chops to say, "You're now all slaves!", a mighty host cries back, "Who us?" and strikes the fetters from his prey. Poor fellows. Commissar Gulpski and Capitalistic Grab will have to unite to have a quorum in their caves.

Oh no. It's no mad dream. Politics is dead. Economics now dominates the world. And we sit laughing with technology to undo all their buttons and their charms.

As we improve organisations, we will improve people. And as we improve people we make men brave. And then at last the slave looks down and says, "Why, what *are* these chains?" and shakes them off.

The vested interest of the world, since its beginning, made but one mistake. They thought that punishment and hard duress were all that made Man work. But Man just worked so long as he could help. And when his wares were turned to bringing hate and death, he struck. Until someone, you and me, give back his willingness to help, the world, like tired wheels, will grind down to a stop.

It is an overt act by you and me to leave in power any group that denies men freedom, knowing what we know. Therefore, attack.

We are the only men and women left on Earth who are no longer slaves.

And we are now all past the point in knowledge and in numbers where we will wear their chains.

The men who need us most are the slave masters.

We will get around to them last, I think. It is more fitting so.

P.S. And *now* do you wonder why the mutter grows: "Scientologists are *dangerous*". But Scientology is the only game where all dynamics win!

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd
Copyright ©1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 19 SEPTEMBER 1960

D of Ts
D of Ps
HCO Secs
Assn Secs

ACC LECTURE TAPES

The 1st Saint Hill ACC lecture tapes, selected package, should be in your possession for staff use.

These contain the data on the use of the new precessions and processes that undercut these cases.

There are twelve lectures in this package each from 35 to 45 minutes long.

These should be played to your HGC staff auditors and the staff. They contain all the odd bits that aren't in bulletins.

This is the easiest way we can get the data to you.

Therefore we are shipping these tapes at once. They are billed to you through customs at cost of tape. There are three 1,800 ft. reels with four lectures on each.

They cover what is known as *Scientology Theory 67* completely with all tips of assessment and case handling. As this is the most important advance in recent years, and as these tapes give it thorough and concise coverage, you need them.

We will bill you for air express and other charges, invoice them for customs at tape cost. This classifies as technical data.

To Whom Tapes Are Played

As these tapes are for advanced auditors only, they may *not* be played to field auditor gatherings, or at Congresses.

They may be played to Central Org and HCO staffs, to HGCs and to HCS or higher level classes, and may be played at HCA/HPA level at the D of T's discretion.

A tape recorder with earphones in HCOs should be available to break in newly hired staff auditors who meanwhile may run simpler processes as per earlier issues. The tapes should be kept in HCO and not let out to individuals to be taken outside the Org.

The tapes are numbered 1 to 12 although in fact they are the last 12 lectures of the 1st Saint Hill ACC. They may be played in any order.

This is my immediate programme for faster HGC gains. You have been given bits and pieces of this. It will work better if you have the whole story given as it was worked out as the only other full rundown will be a book.

You are doing very well already with what you have. For that I thank you. You will do even better with these tapes.

LRH:js.nm
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HGCs

ORDER OF TEST OF HAVINGNESS AND CONFRONT COMMANDS

Based on data of the 1st Saint Hill ACC which I have now tabulated for what moved cases it is possible that the following processes should be tested on pc in the given order.

The Havingness Processes should bring needle down or up toward clear read for pc's sex with a loosening needle.

The Confront process should move the tone arm at least 3 tones per hour of processing. The test should at least move arm and change needle pattern. While testing Confront processes run the Havingness process already found between tests until the needle is free and back at clear read.

In testing, first find the Havingness Process that suits the pc. If you can't get one on the list to return the tone arm to clear read, use CCH 3 or 4 or both until Tone Arm is at clear read with a loose needle.

O/W also assists obtaining a clear read, so does a PTP run with O/W or an ARC break run with O/W. A PTP or an ARC break can stop or prevent a process from being found or from continuing to work when it has already worked before. Get off the PTP or the ARC break and the former workable Havingness will work again. If pc ARC breaks too easily to permit a cleanup with O/W, use Havingness XXXI (two objects) or CCH 3 or 4 or both. If pc still can't be handled use CCH I and CCH 2, then get run what pc wouldn't run.

A dozen commands is enough to show if a Havingness process is going to work or not. If the needle fails to free and the Tone Arm starts to go away from clear read, stop at once and bridge to next test process.

Only when the Havingness process is found should the Confront process needed be searched for.

When the two have been found, this is the pair which should be flattened. When they seem flat, combine them with a Help O/W process and run a regimen in this order:

The pc's Havingness Process.

Help O/W on a terminal assessed or on a factor of Mest (Matter, energy, space, time, form or location as assessed per Regimen 6). (For Regimen 6 hear ACC tapes.)

The pc's Havingness process.

The pc's Confront process.

The pc's Havingness process.

The pc's Help O/W process.

The pc's Havingness process. Etc. Etc.

A Havingness process is always run to Tone Arm clear read with a freed needle. The Help process is run to a sticky needle and off Tone Arm. The Confront process is run to present time if possible.

Don't run anything else on pc until you have found pc's Havingness process or proved out what he says it was according to last auditor.

By definition:

A pc's *Havingness process* is one that returns the Tone Arm to clear read and frees the needle.

A pc's *Help process* is one that moves the Tone Arm at least 3 tones per hour and brings the reading always a bit closer to the clear read. (5 to 6, 5 to 6 on and on won't do.)

A pc's *Confront process* is defined in the same way as his *Help process*, except that it should move pc on the track, going further and further into the past and easier and easier into present time. Pc's pictures should improve on a confront process.

Run all tests and processes in Model Session Form in HGCs now.

Here are the commands in possible order of likelihood they will locate the pc's Havingness process and Confront process.

Havingness Commands in Order of Test for Pcs

- VII "Point out something."
- VI "Look around here and point out an effect you could prevent."
- XIX "What is the emotion of that (indicated object)?"
- XI "Notice that (indicated object)." (No acknowledgement) "What aren't you putting into it?"
- XIII "Look around here and find something you could have."
"Look around here and find something you could withhold."
- XXIV Outside Process. "What is the condition of that person?"
- XXXI (Two *small* objects in auditor's hands.) Exposes them alternately to pc, with as little motion of arms and hands as possible.
"Look at this." (No acknowledgement) "What around here isn't this duplicating?"
- VIII "Where is the (room object)?" (Pc points.)
- IX "Look around here and find an object you are not in."
- XII "Look around here and find something you can agree with."
- XVI "Point out something around here that is like something else."
- XVII "Where isn't that (indicated object)?"
- XX "What is that (indicated object) not duplicating?"
- XXI "What scene could that (indicated object) be part of?"
- XXVI "What bad activity is that (indicated object) not part of?"
- II "Look around here and find something you could have."

Confront Commands in Order of Test for Pcs

- VII "Tell me something I am not doing to you."

- X “What beingness could you confront?”
 “What beingness would you rather not confront?”
- IV “What beingness could others not confront?”
- XVI “What is something?”
 “What makes sense?”
- XVII “What unkind thought have you withheld?”
- XI “Tell me something you might not be confronting.”
- VI “What would deter another?”
 “Where would you put it?”
- III “What unfrontable thing could you present?”
- XXIV “What is a bad object?”
- XXVI “How would you not duplicate a bad person?”
 “How would you not duplicate a bad thing?”
- V “Point out a place where you are not being confronted.”
- IX “Recall somebody who was real to you.”
 “Recall somebody you really liked.”
 “Recall somebody you could really communicate with.”
- XIX “What intention failed?”
- XXII “What would be a betrayal?”
- XV “What would you rather not duplicate?”
- XII “What is understandable?”
 “What is understanding?”
- XIII “What have you done?”
 “What have you withheld?”
- XXI “What past beingness would best suit you?”
 “What past thing would best suit you?”
- II “What could you confront?”
 “What would you rather not confront?”

The following *Havingness* Pre-session Process may be considered nul:

XXII.

The following *Confront* processes may be considered nul:

XX; XXIII; XXV.

None of the above four moved cases in the 1st Saint Hill ACC.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:aecjs.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Central Orgs
HGCs

TIPS ON HOW TO CRACK AN HGC CASE

Run lots of "What question shouldn't I ask you?", and get them *all* off.

Find and solve all PTPs with O/W on the terminals involved.

Lots of O/W in general.

Lots of discussion about failed help. Have pc check over many help failures.

Then check for havingness process.

Here are some good tips.

"Look around here and find something you can have" always works on any pc if the rudiments are *done*, done, done thoroughly.

New Experimental Havingness Processes:

"Look around here and find something you don't have to make duplicate you."

"Feel that (indicated room object)."

"How could you have that (indicated room object)?"

"How could that (indicated room object) make somebody guilty?"

"Notice that (room object). How long can you be absolutely sure it will be there?"

"What problem could that wall be?"

Confront Processes:

"What unworkable situation could you confront?"

"What unworkable situation would you rather not confront?"

"What sexual activity could you confront?"

"What sexual activity would you rather not confront?"

"What sound (or other perception) could you confront?"

"What sound (or other perception) would you rather not confront?"

"Think of a problem."

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:aec js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Franchise holders

HAVINGNESS AND DUPLICATION

After several years of trying to find the precise mechanics of havingness, I think I've come very close.

Havingness is apparently the willingness and ability to duplicate in all senses of the word. It also has many lesser connotations but the havingness ability of a pc apparently depends upon his willingness and ability to duplicate, again in all senses of the word.

That which makes *communication* work in processes is the duplication part of the communications formula (Axiom 28).

The position of a being on the tone scale is determined by his willingness and ability to duplicate. The lower the tone of the being the less willing the being is to permit similar incidents to happen again. This outlaws the experience factor and leaves the being with an "experience-scarcity" which causes him to refuse further experience.

All this is remedied by objective havingness processes (objective duplication increase). The bank additionally must be adjusted by subjective confront processes (subjective duplication increase).

A case will not advance appreciably until the being can remedy objective havingness. Objective havingness, the ability to remedy it, determines the entrance point of a case. Before a process to improve a pc's objective havingness is well established, the case *will not* advance, no matter what else is run. After a process that remedies objective havingness is sufficiently established to bring the E-Meter tone arm down to the clear read for the pc's sex, the case will advance on confront and help and other processes so long as objective havingness is re-established frequently.

Objective havingness is probably incapable of making a case totally stable in the absence of other subjective processes.

As havingness is the willingness to duplicate room objects (Axiom 28), then anything which improves the pc's ability to duplicate improves his or her havingness.

If a verbal process, after considerable test of various verbal command objective havingness processes, fails to work, the pc may be run on the new Pre-session XXXI or CCH 3 or CCH 4 or both CCH 3 and CCH 4.

Various old mimicry processes have some workability and we now know why. They are duplication processes and work only because they raise havingness.

I feel sort of slow on this one. It took me six years to find and establish it. But it gives us now the entrance point of all cases. *This is* why they did or did not make gains. They could or could not remedy objective havingness. Possibly (by 1st Saint Hill ACC case standards only) some 25 out of 40 pcs are *not* able to run "Look around here and find something you could have" and successfully remedy their havingness without havingness undercuts being used. Therefore this is a critical point in cases and demands care at the very start of a case.

An objective havingness process must be found for every case which will reduce or increase the tone arm to clear read for the pc.

Thirty-seven new havingness processes now exist. Use them.

People go out of present time because they can't have the most of present time. That's it. Present time is the only referral point that exists. In its absence all becomes "bank".

(Revision in this type style)

Remimeo

THIRTY-SIX NEW PRESESSIONS

The following material was developed for the 1st Saint Hill ACC. All cases of this ACC were well started toward clear, 25 of them started for the first time. These new presessions were employed. Two of the cases started with two-way comm on failed help only after which some of the presessions following worked.

NOTE: These presessions are subject to revision after my further study. Their numbers will not be changed. I will probably change some of the processes and commands. They are given here exactly as developed and in the order of development, not workability.

NOTE: The assistance of Dick and Jan Halpern, ACC Instructors, is gratefully acknowledged for the discussion and testing of these presessions.

NOTE: Pre-session I is to be found in HCO Bulletin of 25 August 1960 and is not actually part of this series, not being a havingness confront pre-session.

PRESESSION II:

Havingness: "Look around here and find something you could have."

Confront: "What could you confront?" "What would you rather not confront?"

PRESESSION III:

Havingness: "Point out something in this room you could confront."
"Point out something in this room you would rather not confront."

Confront: "What un-confrontable thing could you present?"

PRESESSION IV:

Havingness: "What part of a beingness around here could you have?"

Confront: "What beingness could others not confront?"

PRESESSION V:

Havingness: "Point out something in this room you could confront."
"Point out something in this room you would rather not confront."

Confront: "Point out a place where you are not being confronted."

PRESESSION VI:

Havingness: "Look around here and point out an effect you could prevent."

Confront: "What would deter another?" "Where would you put it?"

PRESESSION VII:

Havingness: "Point out something."

Confront: "Tell me something I am not doing to you."

PRESESSION VIII:

- Havingness: "Where is the (room object)?"
- Confront: "Recall something really real to you."
"Recall a time you liked something."
"Recall a time you communicated with something."

PRESESSION IX:

- Havingness: "Look around here and find an object you are not in."
- Confront: "Recall somebody who was real to you."
"Recall somebody you really liked."
"Recall somebody you could really communicate with."

PRESESSION X:

- Havingness: "Look around here and find something you could have."
- Confront: "What beingness could you confront?"
"What beingness would you rather not confront?"

PRESESSION XI:

- Have: "Notice that (indicated object)." (No acknowledgement.)
"What aren't you putting into it?"
- Confront: "Tell me something you might not be confronting."

PRESESSION XII:

- Have: "Look around here and find something you can agree with."
- Confront: "What is understandable?"
"What is understanding?"

PRESESSION XIII:

- Have: "Look around here and find something you could have."
"Look around here and find something you could withhold."
- Confront: "What have you done?"
"What have you withheld?"

PRESESSION XIV:

- Have: "Notice that (room object). Get the idea of making it connect with you. "
- Confront: (First ask: "Is there anything around here that is absolutely still?" If the answer is yes, continue. If no, use another pre-session.) "Look around here and find something you could stop," (to change of needle pattern or tone arm) then: "Look around here and find something you could start," (to change of needle pattern or tone arm) then, when neither command unsettles needle pattern or tone arm any more, use 5 or 6 commands of "Look around here and find something you could change." Then return to "stop".

PRESESSION XV:

- Have: "Look around here and find something you could withhold."
- Confront: "What would you rather not duplicate?"

PRESESSION XVI:

Have: "Point out something around here that is like something else."

Confront: "What is something?" "What makes sense?"

PRESESSION XVII:

Have: "Where isn't that (indicated object)?"

Confront: "What unkind thought have you withheld?"

PRESESSION XVIII:

Have: "What else is that (indicated object)?"

Confront: "What would make everything the same?"

PRESESSION XIX:

Have: "What is the emotion of that (indicated object)?"

Confront: "What intention failed?"

PRESESSION XX:

Have: "What is that (indicated object) not duplicating?"

Confront: "What two thoughts aren't the same?"

PRESESSION XXI:

Have: "What scene could that (indicated object) be part of?"

Confront: "What past beingness would best suit you?"
"What past thing would best suit you?"

PRESESSION XXII:

Have: "Duplicate something."

Confront: "What would be a betrayal?"

PRESESSION XXIII:

Have: "What is the condition of that (indicated object)?"

Confront: "Describe a bad case."

PRESESSION XXI V:

Have: "What is the condition of that person?"

Confront: "What is a bad object?"

PRESESSION XXV:

Have: "What aren't you putting into that body?"

Confront: "What beingness would it be all right to confront?"

PRESESSION XXVI:

Have: "What bad activity is that (indicated object) not part of?"

Confront: "How would you not duplicate a bad person?"
"How would you not duplicate a bad thing?"

PRESESSION XXVII:

Have: "Where would that wall have to be located so you wouldn't have to restrain it?"

Confront: "Describe an unpleasant environment."

PRESESSION XX VIII:

Have: (a) "What around here would you permit to be duplicated?" or,
(b) "What is the safest thing in this room?"

Confront: "Describe a removal."

PRESESSION XXIX:

Have: "Who would that (indicated object) be a good example to?"

Confront: "What would that person be a good example to?"

PRESESSION XXX:

Have: "What would you have to do to that (indicated object) in order to have it?"

Confront: "Spot a change in your life."

PRESESSION XXXI:

Have: (Auditor holds two *small* objects, one in each hand. Exposes them alternately to pc, with as little motion of arms and hands as possible.)
"Look at this." (No acknowledgement.) "What around here isn't this duplicating?"

PRESESSION XXXII:

Have: "How could you deter a?"
"What have you not given a?"

Confront: "What could you own?"
"What have you denied owning?"

(To clean up Scientology auditing or instruction run on "auditor", "pc", "instructors", "student", as indicated.

*"What would a.....own?"
"What would anot own?"')*

PRESESSION XXXIII: (This is used as a "post-session" to clear up an intensive at the end.)

Have: Whatever havingness runs best on pc, as havingness command.

Confront: "What have you done in this room?"
"What have you withheld in this room?"

(To clean up all auditing, use "an auditing room".)

PRESESSION XXXIV:

Have: Whatever pc runs best, as havingness command.

Confront: "Who have you overwhelmed?"
"Who have you not overwhelmed?"

PRESESSION XXXV:

Have: "Notice that (indicated room object)." "How could you get it to help you?"

Confront: "Whom have you failed to help?"

(This will fish up a case who is out the bottom with ARC Breaks. Corrects alter-ismness.)

PRESESSION XXXVI:

Have: "Notice that (room object)." "How could you fail to help it?"

Confront: "Think of a victim."

Replace Havingness of Pre-session XXV with:

Have: "Notice that body."
"What aren't you putting into it?"

3 Versions of—Regimen 6 O/W Commands:

1. "Get the idea of doing something to"*
"Get the idea of withholding something from"*
2. "What have you done to ?" *
"What have you withheld from?"*
3. "Get the idea of having done something to"*
"Get the idea of having withheld something from"*

*Assessed 6th Dynamic terminal.
(Number 3 runs regret.)

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.esc.ntm.jh
Copyright © 1960, 1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[The 8 May 1974 revision of Pre-session XXXII simply incorporates a correction previously issued on 20 October 1960. Pre-session XXXI has been corrected above per HCO B 23 September 1960, page 151.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 10 OCTOBER 1960

BPI
Central Orgs
Post copy
HCO Secs
Assn Secs

CURRENT NEWS

Two weeks ago tomorrow I arrived in South Africa to review and assist the situation.

The Central Org in Johannesburg is amongst the best we have and Scientology interest is way up in South Africa.

Further, I am fairly sure now that in South Africa we have a starting point for broader activities. Our first action here is to put in a magazine for newsstand circulation. Another magazine for native consumption will probably follow.

It has become obvious to me that we must seize or create communication lines if we ever hope to advance rapidly. Newspapers and governments have been our stumbling blocks. Therefore we recently created a Dept of Govt Relations in each HASI. Its job is to get comm lines out and help governments.

All such activities will be handled under HCO which is just now attaining limited status. We should be able to acquire a few millions worth of public comm lines in the coming years.

The problem of South Africa is different than the world thinks. There is no native problem. The native worker gets more than white workers do in England!

Russia wants South African diamonds and gold, oil and uranium. Russia starts trouble here whenever she can. The South African government is not a police state. It's easier on people than the United States government!

The South African government is under raid by Russia. Radio broadcasts slam in here nightly trying to incite riots. The South African government is dismayed because it can't believe anybody—like Russia—could tell so many lies.

We, as Scientology, are in good shape here. As a lasting tribute to Peggy Conway's early work, that of other auditors, and in particular Jack and Alison Parkhouse, the South African organization is strong and able and good friends with everybody. That makes it an ideal springboard.

With magazines, radio and TV stations we are going to consolidate here and move north with action.

If you look at a globe of the world you can trace our most direct forward thrusts. By using similar patterns of approach we will eventually get to every other country, consolidating each in turn.

Your area is on our work list. Your job is to hold your area and support our forward push until we get to you. The advance has already begun here and by that we have already started in your direction.

This jump-off coincides with a wrap-up of cases. I am also writing new texts for a new Basic Course any auditor can teach. This will, by about next April, be a requisite for HPA/HCA. An ms. edition will first be available from HASI South Africa and

printed editions will be available to you in your area sometime later. The book is called: *The Anatomy of the Human Mind*. It's the first large book since 1951.

In South Africa we are shaping up properties and comm lines to the value of several million pounds. I have often said our subject would go as far as it worked. It is now working thoroughly. It will go anyway. But we are backing its thrust hard. Did you ever try to control a pc with no comm line? We won't control society without one either.

I am personally getting along fine. The Org here is wonderful. We have a lovely home. Mary Sue and the children will be here soon.

Have patience and support our push. We have only one major problem. Who's to be Assn Sec for Moscow?

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Fran Hldrs

SCRIPT OF A MODEL SESSION

A Model Session is a Model session because of its “patter”, not because of specific processes. This is a handy script of the “patter of a Model Session”. Use it. Don’t vary it. Know it by heart. It’s the mark of a well trained auditor. By making all patter the same later sessions run out earlier sessions.

This does not enjoin against two-way comm. But keep auditor comments and chatter out of sessions if you want smooth results and no ARC breaks.

TO START SESSION:

Auditor: “Is it all right with you if we begin this session now?”

Pc: “Yes.”

Auditor: “All right. Start of session!” (Tone 40)

Note I: If pc says “No”, Auditor two-way comms concerning objections, then asks again, “Is it all right with you if we begin this session now?”

Note II: If pc doubtful as to whether session has started:

Auditor: “Has the session started for you?”

Pc: “No.”

Auditor: “All right, *Start of session.*” (Tone 40)

RUDIMENTS:

1. Goals:

Auditor: “What goals would you like to set for this session?”

Pc: Sets goals.

Auditor: “All right. Any goals you would like to set for life or livingness?”

Pc: Answers.

Auditor: “Good.”

2. Environment:

Auditor: “Is it all right to audit in this room?”

3. Auditor Clearance:

Auditor: “Is it all right if I audit you?”

4. Present Time Problems:

Auditor: “Do you have any present time problem?”

STARTING A PROCESS:

Auditor: “Now I would like to run this process on you.” (Name it.) “What would you say to that?”*

Pc: “All right.”

Auditor: (Clears command with pc) then—

Auditor: “Here is the first command.” (Gives command.)

Pc: Answers. Auditor: Acknowledges.

**Note I:* If, after discussion, it seems that the pc will not be able to handle the

announced process, auditor says, "According to what we have been talking about then it would seem better if I ran (names another process)."

ENDING A PROCESS:

Auditor: "If it is all right with you I will ask the question two more times and end the process."
Pc: Answers.
Auditor: (after last command) "Is there anything you would care to say before I end the process?"
Pc: Answers.
Auditor: "End of Process."

REPEATED COMMANDS:

Auditor: (Gives command.)
Pc: "I don't know, I can't find any answer."
Auditor: "All right, I'll repeat the auditing command." (Repeats command.)

COGNITION:

Auditor: (Gives command.)
Pc: (not having answered command yet) "Say, that mass in front of my face just moved off."
Auditor: "Very good." (Repeats command without announcing that it is a repeat.)

END RUDIMENTS:

1. Present Time Problem.

Auditor: "Do you have a present time problem now?"

2. Auditor and ARC Breaks:

Auditor: "How do you feel about my auditing in this session?" (needle twitches)
Auditor: "I am going to run some (name of process) on you, so here is the first command."

3 Auditing Room:

Auditor: "Look around here and see if you can have anything." (needle twitches)
Auditor: "I am going to run a bit of havingness on this. Here is the first command."

4. Goals:

Auditor: "Do you feel you have made any part of your goals for this session?"

FINAL COMMANDS OF SESSION:

Auditor: "Is it all right with you if we end the session now?"
Pc: "Yes."
Auditor: "All right. Here it is. End of session." (Tone 40)
Auditor: (optional) "All right. Tell me I am no longer auditing you."
Pc: "You are no longer auditing me."
Auditor: "Good. "

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[This HCO B is changed by HCO B 11 November 1960, *Change on Model Session*, page 172.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 18 OCTOBER 1960

Originally issued from Johannesburg
HCOs
Central Orgs

TERMINAL STABLE DATA

Terminal chosen must:

Fall on meter

Fit pc's case (interest)

Must cover lots of track

Avoid adjectives

If *Man is* run, then sometime in the future, *Woman* and then *human being* must be run, then *body* must be run.

Run any terminal assessed flat before *any* reassessment.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.cden
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Franchise Holders

THEORY 67

Midway in the 1st Saint Hill ACC it became obvious to me that cases would not move adequately on significances.

As all cases (and banks) are an inversion of the 8 dynamics into the Sixth Dynamic and that they then invert into the Seventh Dynamic, it seemed better sense to me to take the Sixth Dynamic *off* the Seventh rather than the Seventh off the Sixth.

This is Theory 67.

It at once produced results. The new precessions and then the new definition of havingness came out of Theory 67.

Several correlative data were observable. If you exteriorize a pc he does not remain stable but goes back sooner or later into his head. Only a theta clear would remain out. Therefore taking the Seventh out of the Sixth has limited workability. If a thetan were to be able to stay out it would be because he was used to Mest. Therefore the way to make a theta clear would be to handle the Sixth to obtain a straight Seventh Dynamic.

Also, pcs permitted to talk too long go down tone scale.

Therefore to clear a circuit, don't strip the thought out of it. Take the motion and Mest off the thought.

The target of Theory 67 is Mest. Mest has six parts—Matter, energy, space, time, form and location.

Get the pc to handle Mest and you can clear him easily.

Some pcs are further inverted so that the Seventh is the Sixth (see "modern" science). In such one has to handle the Seventh first, then the pc finds the Sixth. Thus the new precessions have some beingness havingness commands.

Theory 67 revolutionized Scientology. It was first announced at the beginning of the fourth week of the 1st Saint Hill ACC 29th August, 1960.

It has ended failed cases according to the results of the 1st Saint Hill.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Franchise Hldrs

REVISED CASE ENTRANCE

I am having no technical difficulty in South Africa getting cases started. As these have included the roughest cases in Scientology, you can see that my confidence in processing as it exists right now is well taken.

The only difficulty I am having is compliance with auditing rundown and this is not much of a barrier as, in general, the South African staff auditor is very good. -So D of Ps, be warned. If cases aren't moving today with the following rundown in use, look for *gross* auditing errors.

This is what I am using on all cases:

Check for the Havingness process. If the one that works is found it will *loosen* the E-Meter needle and bring the tone arm *toward* (not necessarily *to*) the clear read for the pc's sex. The right Havingness process will do this in a dozen commands. So only use a dozen commands to test each Havingness process. If the process doesn't work in 12 commands (which is to say, doesn't loosen the needle), then skip it and go to the next for test.

If you have found the Havingness process for the case, and it ceases to work after a session or two, look for ARC Breaks, PTPs between sessions. With these cleaned up the Havingness process will start working again.

Rule: The Make-Break Point of any case is getting the case to run consistently on an Objective Havingness process. No gains will be stable unless an Objective Havingness process is established for it and used often in sessions.

Rule: When a Havingness process ceases to work, ARC Breaks and PTPs must be cleaned up before the Havingness process will work again.

In clearing up PTPs and ARC Breaks use only O/W on related terminals which is the havingness version.

Rule: A case must be prepared and repaired with O/W to make a Havingness process work.

Exception: If a Havingness process is not clearly established in a few hours (not more than ten) revert to "Failed Help" only.

To prepare a case to run a Havingness process, I have been "shaking the case down" for withholds as follows:

Run "What question shouldn't I ask you?" until needle no longer quivers in response even though meter sensitivity is increased to 16.

Run "What have you done", "What have you withheld" (general form) until needle is unresponsive and tone arm moves toward clear.

If case does not respond well, if case gives thinkingness answers for mass, I at once go to Failed Help.

Failed Help

This is the best case-cracking process now known. I have worked with it since 1957 as a line of examination and it emerges as the *lowest verbal entrance* process. Therefore this process is a very important one.

Help is actually the most effective version of taking responsibility. When O/W will not run well, when the case just doesn't respond on the meter even though giving out with hair-raising overts, the responsibility button is out. This is recovered by "Failed Help".

Failed Help is run in this fashion, alternately.

"Who have you failed to help?"
"What have you failed to help?"

Two-way comm on failed help is not always well handled. The auditor should not direct the pc's attention to time periods or terminals. The process is run permissively.

All cases will run on Failed Help. It is a one-shot clear process. But used exclusively it introverts too hard. Havingness must be discovered as a process and run, as havingness is the make-break point of the case.

To go further, here is the proceeding so far:

For Average Cases

Try for Havingness.

If you find it go on to locate the right Confront process.

If you have the Havingness and the Confront, assess for a good, general whole track terminal. Using the Havingness and the Confront liberally, run Alternate Help on the terminal found.

Typical session thereafter is run with Model Session Form (all in one session).

1st Process	—	Objective Havingness.
2nd Process	—	Alternate Help on the assessed terminal.
3rd Process	—	The Objective Havingness process.
4th Process	—	The Confront process.
5th Process	—	The Objective Havingness process.
6th Process	—	Alternate Help on the terminal.
7th Process	—	The Objective Havingness process.
8th Process	—	Alternate Help.
9th Process	—	The Objective Havingness process.

How long to run each? Run Havingness always to a loose needle and TA nearer clear. Run Alternate Help or Confront process to a tight needle and pc near present time (cyclic aspect). If needle gets very sticky and TA ceases to move well on the Confront or Help, get over to Havingness fast. Run Havingness only until needle is loose and case feels better. Don't run Havingness as the process that solves the case. Run Havingness only as the process that stabilizes the case. Havingness runs to loose needle. All other processes run to a tight needle. All processes (except Objective Havingness) if they are working make the TA move. If the TA doesn't move, the process isn't working. Run Havingness and try again.

Poor Cases

If Havingness cannot be found at once, go into "What question—" and O/W. Then try to find Havingness. Be very careful to keep ARC Breaks and PTPs cleaned up.

Find the Confront process and proceed as in an average case.

Low Cases

If pc is diffident about having auditing, if pc critical of others, if pc ARC Breaks easily, if pc favours significances over objects, start in with Failed Help as above and try as above to get case up to Havingness.

Patch up case frequently with Failed Help, O/Ws. Keep the case running and the Havingness established and effective.

The difference between average/poor cases and low cases is that one keeps up the Havingness with O/W in the average/poor and in the low case keeps Havingness running with Failed Help and O/Ws.

This should get some understanding around.

I believe as of now that there are no impossible cases.

If a case won't talk or be audited as a chronic condition (not just as a result of ARC Breaks) we still have the CCHs.

The lions say to tell you hello.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js. rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Franchise
Holders

FAILED HELP

Probably the most sensational case cracker of all time is Failed Help.

In that the pc has many times tried to help his own case and failed, the most accessible button is failed help.

This is run as “Who have you failed to help?” “What have you failed to help?” alternately. More difficult cases run on either one or the other. It can be distracting when the pc hits an automaticity on who or what. However even the alternate version will win.

This flattens PTPs and ARC breaks, so on a very low case whose havingness is down, the rudiments may be omitted the first few sessions.

Failed Help may also be run on a terminal. If the pc is always having PTPs with a certain type of terminal (woman, man, etc) then failed help can be run in a specific or general fashion. How have you failed to help your wife? This is run repetitively. Or: How could you fail to help a woman?

A lower dichotomy could be run in this fashion. How could you prevent help? How could you fail to help? This last pair are experimental. They would be run alternately.

While running failed help one should attempt every now and then to find the pc’s havingness process.

If the pc’s havingness process cannot be found even with overts off, run failed help as above, but continue to search for the havingness process at least once a session. If failed help is running very well indeed do not chop into it to search for the havingness process. Do that toward the end of the session.

A quarter of a division of the Tone Arm in three hours auditing is a good shift for a low case on failed help. Do not expect big changes at first.

As any failed help run is good, it’s all right to make an error and use it on cases that could have better gains on something else. Cases that don’t need it move the least on the Tone Arm with it.

No one has yet run 75 hours of failed help on a previous CCH case. So I cannot tell you how much it will take or how far it will go. But I would be prepared to run 75 hours of it of the Who—What version on a case before it could run a havingness process.

This is a marvellous process. I thoroughly recommend it. Just be careful not to lay in ARC breaks and try to keep the case coaxed along and I think you’ll make it with some version of failed help on cases we found hard to start before.

LRH:js.cden
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 10 NOVEMBER 1960

Franchise
Holders

FORMULA 13

I am having very good luck undercutting beginning or old unmoving cases in Scientology by using a new formula called Formula 13. This consists of running failed help as the confront process and O/W on specific present time terminals as the havingness process.

Failed Help is almost the lowest rung of help processes. It is run with the commands "Who have you failed to help?" "What have you failed to help?" alternated. There's a lower help process than this. That is "Who have you intended not to help?" "Who have you helped?", but this is not Formula 13.

Overt Withhold is a havingness process. This comes about since havingness is duplication and one will not care to duplicate what he has overts against. Therefore the source of low havingness is overts against people and mest. It might be commented that overts against mest are more important than against people in the reduction of havingness, but this again is not Formula 13.

The essence of running Formula 13 is running in model session form a little failed help, with O/W on a present time terminal. It is done in this fashion. One opens the session, even uses Pre-session I if needed, does rudiments using O/W to clear PTPs and ARC breaks, and then does about ten minutes on failed help. Then he makes an assessment from a prepared list of people the pc knows in PT, and assesses for a needle fall on one of these. Then O/W is run on that specific person until the fall vanishes regardless of TA position, and returns to failed help for ten minutes or so, then reassesses for a PT terminal from his list until he finds one that falls, and flattens O/W on this, and then runs failed help and so on.

It will be found that this is the best case undercutter for general use I have so far developed. It is generally recommended and urged for all HGCs.

Formula 13 is followed by finding the havingness process then the confront process, and then Regimen Three is used, assessing for a general terminal and with the havingness and confront process running alternate help on the general terminal.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.cden
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 11 NOVEMBER 1960

All Orgs
Franchise Holders

CHANGE ON MODEL SESSION

A gross typographical error is found in HCO Bulletin of October 13, 1960, "Script of a Model Session", under "Starting a Process".

The line, "Auditor: (Clears Command with pc) then—", is completely incorrect and in error. This at the most would be done on a vague pc and then only once in his auditing career. Delete the line.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.nm
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HCO BULLETIN OF 12 NOVEMBER 1960

Rush to all
Central Orgs
From S.A.
Sthill reissue as
HCO B 8 Dec 60

CLEARING ROUTINE

It is urgent that the following clearing routine be adhered to if clears are to be made. These are *musts*. Some are new, some are old. Some of the old ones are being ignored grandly.

1. Get the pc in session. Definition: Interested in own case and willing to talk to the auditor.
2. Use Model Session script exactly and continuously. (Delete command clearing except once on low graph cases.) Learn the script *exactly*.
3. Clear PTPs with O/W on connected terminals. Never neglect a PTP.
4. Clear ARC Breaks whenever they occur with O/W on the session's auditor ("me").
5. Get case started with Pre-session One or a Formula.
6. Early in auditing don't scout for more than 15 minutes without running Who/What Failed Help or some version of it.
7. Early in auditing don't run any O/W for more than 15 minutes without running 10 minutes of Failed Help or a new help version.
8. When case knows improvement has occurred on a Formula and E-Meter is changing—(not clear reading), check for Havingness process.
9. Don't scout for more than 15 minutes for the Havingness without running more Failed Help for 10 minutes.
10. When Havingness is found, use it and Failed Help while looking for the Confront process.
11. When both Havingness and Confront processes are found, run them one after the other until case seems stable. (Two hours to two sessions.)
12. Regardless of the clear read on the TA run Havingness and Confront while scouting for the help terminal.
13. Regardless of later data than July, 1960, find the help *terminal* by doing a dynamic assessment, find the dynamic that changes needle pattern, then ask pc what represents that dynamic. Search around for terminals associated with what pc said on same dynamic you found until you get one that drops most. This must take in lots of whole track, be without adjectives and understood by pc.
14. Start Regimen 8. Using Havingness, Confront and Help on the terminal found.
15. Put the most time in sessions in on Alternate Concept Help or Help O/W on this terminal found. Get in some of the Confront and run a bit of Havingness often.
16. Run the help terminal for at least 75 hours regardless of needle action freeing, tone arm movement or lack of it. DO NOT CHANGE THIS TERMINAL for 75

hours of sessions. Graphs demonstrate poor gains when terminals are changed because they are “flat”. Graphs demonstrate high stable gains if the terminal for help is run *at least* 75 hours. It’s an auditing error to change a help terminal once begun. It’s *help* that clears, not the terminal.

17. You can change the Havingness process, change the Confront process in Regimen 8 but *never* the help terminal.
18. Havingness is only required to loosen the needle. It need not shift the TA. It is run only until it loosens the needle. This may be 5 to 12 commands. A good test for loose needle is to have the pc squeeze the cans before the 1st command of Havingness, squeeze the cans after 5 commands. If the drop is greater on the second squeeze, the Havingness is working. If Havingness tightens the needle after an overrun like 10 minutes pc has picked up an ARC Break.
19. Don’t overrun Havingness. It is only to stabilize the gains and the pc.
20. The Confront process must move the TA. If it consistently doesn’t, find a new Confront process.
21. The Havingness and Confront process may be changed in Regimen 8, the help terminal never.
22. The way help is being run may be changed in Regimen 8 from, say, Alternate Concept Help to Help O/W or Two Way Help on the terminal, but the terminal may not be changed.
23. End a long period of auditing such as several intensives with O/W on the auditor, the room, Scientology, etc.
24. New Formulas of getting cases started do not alter the above stable data.
25. From Mest Clear to Theta Clear requires an address to the 6th Dynamic with help processes.

One assesses for the greatest fall on Matter, energy, space, time, form or location and runs help on it in the same pattern as Regimen 8.
26. OT requires all parts of the 6th and 7th to be cleared on help and responsibility using a Regimen 8 pattern.

The above are musts if you want to make clears.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:aec.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Franchise Holders

STARTING CASES

It should be remembered that most *processes* and routines for auditing require first that the pc be in session.

This is a factor often lost in processing.

Unless an auditor is aware of the definition for “in session” and uses it, very low, slow results will occur. The key to fast, high results is “pc in session”.

There are various degrees of being out of session. The most severe of these is the person who refuses auditing. The answer is usually old Pre-session One (Help, Control, Communication, Interest). The next degree is sitting in the chair but refusing to answer questions. Pre-session One or its Two-Way Help part is generally the answer. Failed Help is a useful tool here. The next degree is sitting in the chair and being uncooperative or even choppy. The best answer is Pre-session One or Two-Way Help.

Now in all the above “out of sessions” is meant the pc coming to have processing for the first time. There are similar aspects from different causes during session.

A pc used to processing can go out of session in varying degrees. A pc who refuses to answer questions is suffering from an ARC break or has a withhold.

If it's an ARC break, then run O/W on “me” (the auditor) or, better, run O/W on *an auditor*. If the pc appears vague or nervous, it's probably a PTP, and the specific terminal or terminals connected with it should be run on O/W. The withhold case can be handled with “What have you done?” “What have you withheld?” alternated.

The definition of “in session” is (a) Interested in own case, (b) Willing to talk to the auditor. When either of these is violated the pc is “out of session” and is receiving no benefit from processing.

For the beginning pc, these two factors must be established. If the above remedies do not suffice, then the auditor must run by definition. The auditor must find something in the pc's case in which the pc is interested and something about which the pc will talk to the auditor. An E-Meter will fall on things that the pc is interested in and will talk about.

If a case already accustomed to processing goes out of session, the rudiments long ago were designed to get the pc running again. Rudiments can be used at any time during a session.

All the clever processes in the world will fail if the pc is out of session.

It is a high sign of auditing skill to get the pc into session—which is to say, interested in own case and willing to talk to the auditor.

There is an exception to case interest—when the pc goes upscale on any one process he or she will hit boredom before enthusiasm. Don't stop at that point. Go on even if pc infers it will slay him or her with boredom. The period of time they hang up in this is brief—a few minutes or at most a session.

Discussions of people the prospective or out of session beginning pc has failed to help usually solves this difficulty. Here is a lower point—people the pc intended *not* to help.

But however they get started, start them and get them *into session* before you worry too much about what's wrong and what's to be run. It pays off in results.

L. RON HUBBARD

BPI
Franchise Hldrs

HAS CO-AUDIT ENDED

After a long trial, HAS Co-Audit is suspended.

While it did do well on procurement and in its original state, got good results (communication processes), it has been abused and has caused some to blow Scientology.

Unreported to me for a long while, HAS Co-Audit and Franchise Holders have been converting any individual process released into an HAS Co-Audit process.

This has worked great hardship on many cases. First, newcomers to Scientology in crowded rooms have not dared to get off their overts and auditing became stagnant. Further, the very processes that could clear them have thus been abused and nulled.

Formulas and Regimens were never for co-audits, yet many instructors have been putting into effect in co-audits anything released for individual use.

Thus, HAS Co-Audit has been abused and has stalled some cases. The idea is good, in many places the results were good and if we had no better ideas I would go on with it, stating only not to use Formulas and Regimens on it but only communication processes and Pre-session One.

The facts are that for new people, Group Auditing from Group Auditor's Handbooks One and Two were better for early mass case gains.

I have just completed a repatterning of all PE type activities which I will give you in due course and which stampede the people in. HAS Co-Audit is omitted from the rundown for the above reasons as well as the strength of the new pattern.

But HAS Co-Audit deserves by itself a special mention with its decease. Run by careful instructors on the original rundown it has done some wonders.

It would still be used, and may be used in the future if I had any idea that instructors would not go crazy enough to run individual clearing processes on it and make rash promises or have ambitious hopes for clearing on it.

HAS Co-Audits are out because:

- a. They may mess up the only processes known that will clear people at individual processing level, thus barring the road;
- b. Instructors have not noted or realized the stress done cases when they had to hold on to heavy overts, thus making the person blow Scientology;
- c. They do not procure well in comparison to other activities now under development by me in Johannesburg;
- d. They develop a false sense in attendees of knowing all about Scientology when they have not begun;
- e. They slow clearing by making individual auditing seem like a Co-Audit and therefore lacking value;

f. They have not resulted in large numbers of people getting clear.

The new Johannesburg routine for PE courses is easier to run, makes more informed people, paves the road to clearing, and tends to keep people with us.

Furthermore, now that I can guarantee that any trained auditor can crack *any* case (a fact borne out daily for months now), I am turning Scientology activities all the way up. We will shortly have thousands where we had one.

The new programme for Central Orgs and Franchise Holders procures at a fantastic rate never before known. It is the largest administrative-procurement development since the PE and is thousands of times as effective. *25 new* people a *day* are enrolling in the Central Org in Johannesburg.

So stand by to re-organize. A first step is to shift HAS Co-Audit to one hour early type group auditing sessions.

More will be sent on this. But meanwhile groove group auditing in.

Any Group Auditing session begins, by the way, with the group auditor explaining what he means to do and why. Otherwise some newcomers think it is pointless. Then he opens session and runs the random type processes of 1953 and onward.

But a final salute to HAS Co-Audit—if instructors hadn't been so fixated on turning every individual process issued into an HAS Co-Audit process, it might be in the line-up still—and if people learn this lesson, may be with us again in a more exact form.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.nm
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Franchise Holders

THE UNMOVING CASE

Formula 13 will move almost all cases satisfactorily up to finding the havingness, finding the confront, help O/W terminal and thus clear.

But there remain certain very few cases that do not move on Formula 13 as such. A variation is required. These are:

1. The hyper-critical case
2. The big withhold case
3. The case that wants no processing

Case 1 does not move because he is continually chopping Scientology, Auditors, the Org, etc behind the auditor. This should be suspected when Formula 13 does not work. The chopping is severe to prevent ordinary Formula 13 from working. The answer is to run Formula 13 with assessment on Scientology terminals for the O/W PLUS any Scientology invalidative person or persons our pc is in contact with in PT.

Case 2, the Big Withhold, has a crime of magnitude when it will not move on Formula 13. "What question shouldn't I ask you?" may not remedy this if it's big. "Think of something you've withheld" interspersed with the casual question, "Is there anything you'd like to tell me?" every half dozen O/W questions should produce an unburdening of the withhold to the auditor. There may be more than one withhold of this nature.

Case 3 is the person who has never had processing and wants no processing but sits in the chair and runs off answers misemotionally. The oldest approach was "Tell me why you shouldn't have processing." Pre-session One is more modern. The latest experimental process is "Tell me something you don't want," repetitively.

All cases above are followed by Formula 13 when willing to be audited or make gains.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.cden
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 1 DECEMBER 1960

Franchise Holders

NEW FORMULAS

A Formula is a method of getting a case started. The numbers are in order of development, not case level.

Formula 13: Model Session. Run 10 minutes or so of Who/What Failed Help. Make a list of everyone pc knows in pt. Assess from list until needle drops. Run O/W on that terminal only until drop is off (10-20 mins at most). Run 10 minutes Failed Help. Assess from list (add to it if new names come up) only until one gets a drop. Run drop off with O/W, 10 minutes Failed Help, etc, etc. When pc's condition warrants go on to locate Havingness process, running Failed Help between tries.

Formula 14: Same as 13 except one uses the present time mest objects of pc instead of people for O/W. Failed Help and O/W handled the same as 13.

Formula 15: Case (1) of HCO Bulletin of November 24, 1960. List Scientology, Scientology terms and Org and persons instead of pt people as in Formula 13. This is for hypercritical unmoving pcs. It is also used for other reasons on students and old time Scientologists.

REGIMENS

A Regimen is the workhorse combination of processes that boosts the case to clear after it has been started.

Regimen 3: Alternate Help on a terminal, Alternate Confront, Factual Havingness.

Regimen 8: Find Havingness process from the preessions while running Failed Help between tests for 10 minutes or so. When established (loosens needle), find Confront process from the preessions, (changes TA well). Use Havingness process between Confront tests. When established, run these two found processes, the Confront to a tight needle or pt, the Havingness to a loose needle (as little as 8 commands, rarely more than 20). When pc reads around his clear reading, assess for a terminal to run Help O/W upon. When found, run session as follows: Havingness, long time on Help O/W, Havingness, Confront, Havingness, Help O/W, Havingness, Confront, Havingness, Help O/W, Havingness, etc, etc.

All Formulas and Regimens are run in Model Session form with the exact patter wording.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :j s.msp.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Franchise Holders

PRESESSION 37

A pre-session is run without a model session.

Pre-session 1 and 37 are the only pre-sessions now in regular use.

Pre-session 37 is a method of getting off withholds. This problem is the primary case problem. Pre-session 37 resolves it. This pre-session is now the proper way to run "What question shouldn't I ask you?"

The auditor runs "What question shouldn't I ask you?" for a few times.

Then the auditor runs "Think of something you've done." "Think of something you have withheld." Alternated for a short time (maximum five minutes).

Then the auditor runs "What question. . ." a few more times.

If the pc develops an evasion system such as "You shouldn't ask me if I have murdered anybody," the auditor asks it. The pc says, "No, I never have," etc. Then the auditor must reword "What question. . ." to "What question would embarrass you?" or "What would you hate to have the police or your husband or whatever find out about you?" Vary "What question" so that you get off the withholds.

Always run Pre-session 37 until you have a no-response to question needle with E-Meter sensitivity at 16.

The O/W on this is to keep up the havingness.

FORMULA 16

A formula is always run in model session early in the case or to get it moving again.

Formula 16 is as follows:

Failed help is run with:

"Whom have you intended not to help?"

"Whom have you helped?"

This is run for about 10 minutes, then the following is run for about twenty commands or so:

Assess PT terminals. Take first one that falls. Assess every time. Run:

"What unkind thought have you had about (terminal)?"

Then switch back to the above failed help version.

This is for cases that don't respond well on ordinary O/W.

FORMULA 17

Help is run as two-way failed help on an assessed terminal which has to do with a healing profession or religious or mystic person.

Then “What unkind thought have you withheld from a person?” is run for havingness.

This is for the person who has been to healers, hypnotists, spiritualists, psychologists, ministers, religious family members, psychoanalysts, etc, etc. This also works on doctors, psychologists, etc.

One makes the assessment list from general terminals and specific persons connected with pc’s past. One assesses each time from the list and takes the first one that drops. The drop is barely run off before switching to the thought O/W on “a person”.

Two-way failed help is run as follows:

“How could you fail to help a ?”
“How could a fail to help you?”

Positive failed help:

“How could you help a ?”
“How could a help you?” should also be run if indicated. (If pc insists they helped.)

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 19 DECEMBER 1960

SAL'burg—Durban
—Capetown
All Central Orgs

PE CHANGE

(Disregard PE Free Course data in the HCO Bulletin December 29, 1960
Other materials in that HCO Bulletin are valid)

We are going to try a new type PE beginning course and a new type of test Evaluation in Johannesburg.

I am trying to groove in the PE Foundation to give maximum returns. Therefore you can expect changes to be laid out on this line as my data increases. I am not happy with PE free course returns into the old co-audit or the organization. I feel that at least in Johannesburg we should test out a change. It is not mandatory for other Orgs to follow right now.

We are having no trouble getting people to be tested. We are having trouble getting any high percentage to buy the Anatomy Course. Therefore, as soon as a new evaluation system is ready we will handle test evaluation this way. We keep the Test Section open from 1:30 to 9:30 daily. We give the IQ, the Personality Analysis (OCA, APA, whatever) and an E-Meter check all at the same time (omit aptitude). The meter check gets definitions, tone arm and needle reaction to the five basic buttons plus Money, Marriage and Health, making a simple, fast test from which we can read future.

The Test Section marks the test and makes 2 copies of the graph. Then it goes to Letter Registrar Section for a new type of automatic evaluation which will be available in a week or two. Make no changes until this evaluation system is complete. It is a slip system that obviates dictation and typing except for a transmission letter. It is being set up so that a clerk can handle evaluation with enormous accuracy and completeness.

Until this system is ready, test evaluation should go on with live evaluation.

The original test sheets and a graph are held in Test Files. An address plate is cut from the test card. One copy of the graph, the original of the analysis sheet and three duplistickers from the plate go to the Letter Registrar who has it packaged and mailed.

The Test Analysis and a graph copy are grouped with a transmission letter (the contents of which are merely indicated on a form for typing) and some literature. The letter states that the organization is here to help and that individual processing or other service is available if the person calls on the Registrar (this is the Body Registrar) who is there to advise. (PE Registrar is relegated to PE Administration, book sales and evening course sign-ups which must not be neglected just because of the test line.)

Attached to the package going to the person who was tested is a prominent piece of literature which stresses Do It Yourself Processing. This says that by five evenings of preparation in one week (PE Course) at a cost of (very small—£1 in Johannesburg) one can be coached up to giving and receiving PROCESSING, the remedy of the graph, IQ and the future, can learn to communicate better and can continue on in the Co-audit. For this five evening course (2 weeks) one receives an HAS Certificate and is eligible to engage in the HAS Co-audit, *the world's least expensive processing*. The Co-audit is described but that it costs anything is only hinted at. Three free test tickets for the person's friends are added to the package.

PE then becomes a dissertation in Scientology and a Comm Course to teach one to Communicate and process. Two hours per night are given, one hour of Training drills and one of tape or live lectures.

Before end of course Address gives out the HAS cert to the instructor for handing to the students at course end—last night.

A new cert will be designed for the Anatomy Course. Meanwhile give an HAS.

The student is *expected* to appear on HAS Co-audit all during the PE Course.

Of course the person who was tested is also informed of other services. Some will come in and sign up for straight processing and should not be locked out. Some will sign up directly on HCA/HPA. Some will go to Anatomy.

My theory is that if they receive a complete evaluation by mail without being called in for it, they will enroll in a very cheap course very easily, even if from curiosity. The idea is to get them to pay on a gradient scale, to make them at least spend a tiny amount. This should keep them on course (few blows) because they did pay for it.

That we give an HAS for a PE is old policy but the cert keeps getting barriered. Examinations, so many weeks required on Co-audit, etc, all prevent the new person from belonging to the Org easily. We don't want non-certified people auditing even on a Co-audit. A *big* point can be made of this in certificate presentation. HAS certs are confetti. The idea is to get them in, separate them from at least a tiny amount of money (£1.0.0—£1.10.0, \$3—5, some such amount) and get them to belong by reason of a cert. If we can do these 3 things—get them in, get them to pay a little, get them to belong, we will be developing new people. It is better to develop a few new ones than to handle thousands without developing many or to get big payments from a very few.

I also think some basic good quality tapes in the second hour of each PE would save us some strain. I am gathering up all our old Hi Fi Congress tapes to make Hi Fi copies for tape play evenings. Maybe I should also do five special PE tapes of excellent quality. But I haven't made them yet so don't hold your breath. I want the lines and promotion good first.

The new PE can occur before the new evaluation system is being used and Registrars can sell it as soon as the PE Director has it running.

I also have a new accounts-cashier procedure for all these PE activities. The applicant buys two cards for a fee. No invoicing. He writes his name on both, gives one back at once, presents the other for punching on the edge each night he attends the course. A different colour is used for each activity. The cards are "sold" to the PE Director by Accounts and invoiced in mass, one invoice for each colour, by Accounts when the money is turned in by PE. Fast selling-collection is needed by PE, rapid checking to be sure all have paid. I will write this up further when samples exist in Johannesburg. The public buys cards. The cards are numbered. The release is on the back of the card. There is no invoice line. The Instructor collects cards. They unobtrusively get pattern-punched with a conductor's punch, are returned at the break, have to be surrendered to get a cert. The Extra card turned in in advance is for Address and in case a student loses a card. A Forgotten Card slip is filled out if an attendee forgets to bring his. Ltr Reg via Address also has to know who didn't finish, hence the two cards.

One can handle dozens of people fast with cards rather than invoices and PE Accounting becomes simple *and* the money gets collected, a fact often neglected in PE Foundations.

This is an adaption of a theatre system.

The PE Foundation now needs two rooms of size every night to give HAS Co-audit on Mon, Weds and Fri, PE 5 nights and Anatomy on Tues and Thurs. Group Processing is not being attended in Johannesburg and so is being dropped. A tape play will be instituted instead at some future date.

Two other rooms are needed for the night HPA which is now enrolling almost every Monday and has two units only.

Thus four large rooms are required at night for activities in a Central Org.

I am thus scaling PE personnel down to Test-in-Charge, test marker, PE Admin, two evening instructors and of course PE Director. No test evaluators will be necessary after the slip system is working. The regular registrars are competent to handle those who, having been tested, demand training or processing. PE Director or Admin can sell Anatomy or PE Courses to newcomers as well as old-timers as the newcomer will have been sold, we hope, by literature before coming in again.

Address must know the right name and address of every person who enrolls in any PE activity and every person who completes that activity.

These are separate categories. The Ltr Reg will know where ARC breaks exist if an enrolled category stays enrolled but doesn't become a complete.

PE Foundation in Johannesburg is successful. I am trying to increase returns, decrease admin and make it possible to handle the traffic easily.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 22 DECEMBER 1960

Franchise (Merry Christmas)

HAS CO-AUDIT RESUMED

I am testing a new series of processes I have developed to replace all former processes used on HAS Co-Audit.

Co-Audit stalled cases when:

1. HGC Processes were used (ruining the process for the pc because of its being run against heavy O/Ws still on case) and
2. Pcs on Co-Audit felt unable to get off their overts amid so much company (the processes would not bite and even upset cases since the pc was not free to run his withholds), and
3. Rudiments were not used or were badly used to the end of driving people away.

I have remedied these matters and as soon as I have any bugs out, probably by next week, I will release the new Co-Audit processes.

Co-Audit will only be permitted if the new routine is followed and no other. I dislike losing people we could help and messing up cases.

The new series by-passes the need of rudiments, O/W or HGC processes, yet gives, by a startling new advance and process type, very good results—better than the average obtained two years ago in individual auditing. I am sure they will keep the people coming and advancing.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.nm
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Franchise

O-W A LIMITED THEORY

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

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

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

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

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

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

The cycle is this:

INDEPENDENT BEINGS
COMMUNICATION
MIS-COMMUNICATION
CONTROL
MIS-CONTROL
HELP
FAILED HELP
OVERTS AND WITHHOLDS
OVERTS AND WITHHOLDS BY TRANSFER
WORRYING OTHERS
WORRYING ABOUT OTHERS
BEING CRITICAL
BEING CRITICAL OF SELF

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

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

When Help comes up, O-W as a mechanism drops out. We *could* run a full case, it would appear, with Help. However, in practice it is better to run lots of O-W with

failed help as they complement each other and move the case faster. By running O-W we disclose many new failed helps. Why? Look at the cycle above and see that O-W occurs only when Help has failed.

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

Get the idea of worrying something. Get the idea of not worrying something. Get the idea of something being worrisome.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: pe.cden
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

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

Franchise Holders

THE NEW PE AND THE NEW HAS CO-AUDIT

The new HAS Co-audit takes company in a PE Foundation with the free PE Course, the new Anatomy of the Human Mind Course (requisite for HPA/HCA) and a tape play.

The PE Course can run 3 nights a week or 5 nights. The Anatomy Course (consisting of 20 lectures) should run 2 nights a week. HAS Co-audit can run 3 to 5 nights a week but might work better running the same nights as free PE. The tape play can be run at any time—5 nights or two hours on Saturday afternoon or Sunday.

As to materials, I am now assembling these. This HCO Bulletin gives the backbone of the HAS Co-audit. I am readying up full texts of the Anatomy Lectures. PE Text will shortly be more fully released. I have installed a new PE Foundation in HASI Johannesburg and it is successful at the rate of 30 new people a day. But to smooth it out and make it economical is taking me a bit longer.

An HAS Co-audit should be run only for people who have been “trained” on a PE free Course. The PE free Course should consider itself a training activity for the Co-audit, rather than a selling activity for Scientology. One should assume in teaching a PE that the student wants to help people and get help for himself. Elementary (very) Comm Course TRs should be sketched in and a touch assist taught. The only selling is defining Scientology and saying that to know the parts of the mind one should take an Anatomy Course.

The following is conditional, subject to review:

People who take a Free PE and an Anatomy Course get an HAS Certificate. It is also required that they spend 3 weeks on the Co-audit. Free PE is the only requisite for Co-audit attendance.

The HAS Co-audit consists of the same elements as always. The people come in, show the Instructor their paid invoices, are put in their chairs and auditing started by the Instructor. Cans can be held by the pc if a switchboard E-Meter rig exists. But individual E-Meters are not used.

At the end of the first period of auditing, the teams are shifted but not just exchanged. People are not audited by their pcs. They are started again by the Instructor. The session is ended by the Instructor.

Extreme muzzle is used. The auditor needing help puts his hand back of his chair for the Instructor to arrive.

The commands are written on one or two boards for the auditors to see. They are also issued on sheets of paper.

The pc faces outward into the room. The auditor inward.

The fee should now be per evening, perhaps 5s. or 50 ¢ per person.

There are just two processes to be used. These are to be called the HAS Co-audit Process I and HAS Co-audit Process II. They are complicated enough to hold interest. HAS Co-audit Process I runs ARC breaks, PTPs, Somatics, the bank and the room and hits all case levels. Leave standard O/W, help and other clearing processes alone, no matter the temptation. The HAS Co-audit processes are what the attendee can do, not what the Instructor can do in individual session. The Instructor runs all cases present, and he needs something that bites just enough to improve the case but not enough to make a bog.

The HAS Co-audit Process I, I developed from the 1950 ARC triangle. A new process type that is permissive between bank and room makes this new development unique.

HAS CO-AUDIT PROCESS I

The commands are as follows:

- “Find something you disagree with”
- “Find something you agree with”
- “Find something you would rather not communicate with”
- “Find something you would communicate with”
- “Find something that seems unreal”
- “Find something that is real”

HAS CO-AUDIT PROCESS II

The commands are as follows:

- “Get the idea of attacking”
- “Get the idea of not attacking”

HAS Co-audit Process I is of course a fundamental way of raising tone. It also has a taste of Rising Scale (8-8008) in it. This is the confront process. If the pc gets sticky or dopey or choppy, one shifts to II but HAS Co-audit I is the workhorse—it is done longer than II.

HAS Co-audit Process II is of course the havingness process. If a pc looks too belligerent or too mild, the Instructor should run II heavily on the pc. The worse off a case is, the more automatic the attack factor is and the less the pc can attack anything. All psychosis is is dramatized attack, so this process runs from low to high. Naturally you can see that it is an O/W version, but no withholds need be announced.

In HAS Co-audit Process II the Instructor may substitute “think” for “get the idea” at his discretion with cases that have trouble with “Get the idea”, but a higher percentage of cases, I believe, bog on “think” than on “get the idea”. In II the Instructor may in some cases at his option assess a generalised terminal and add it after “attacking” in the command.

Process II may be run on a case before I. But a little II goes a long way. If a central meter switchboard is used, cases that get sticky on I can be shifted to II. Try to end a session on I, not II.

I think you will find that II makes roaring tigers out of pcs and I makes them into serene angels.

Both processes are unlimited. I and II could be run for 500 hours. They might actually clear people if used long enough but the fact is not yet known.

If a pc continually stays in PT and uses only the room on I, shift the pc to II for he is afraid of his bank, just as some are afraid of past lives.

These are both new, powerful processes. I think you will find Co-audit attendees very happy with them.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js. rd
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[Free PE Course data in this HCO B is to be disregarded per HCO B 19 December 1960, *PE Change*, page 182.]

ANATOMY OF THE HUMAN MIND CONGRESS LECTURES

Washington, D.C.

31 December 1960—1 January 1961

At the end of December 1960, L. Ron Hubbard traveled 20,000 miles round trip from Johannesburg, South Africa, to Washington, D.C., to give the Anatomy of the Human Mind Congress and to open and conduct the first week of the 22nd American Advanced Clinical Course.

** 6012C31	AHMC-1	The Genus of Dianetics and Scientology
** 6012C31	AHMC-2	The Things of Scientology
** 6012C31	AHMC-3	A Talk on South Africa
** 6101C01	AHMC-4	Dianetics 1961 and the Whole Answer to the Problems of the Mind
** 6101C01	AHMC-5	The Field of Scientology
** 6101C01	AHMC-6	Scientology Organizations

22ND AMERICAN ADVANCED CLINICAL COURSE LECTURES

Washington, D.C.

2 January—10 February 1961

Immediately following the *Anatomy of the Human Mind Congress* L. Ron Hubbard opened the 22nd American ACC and during the first week gave ten lectures to the students. Lectures 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9 give very detailed data on the E-Meter and particularly Pre-session 39, the Dianetic Assist. On February 17th LRH said, "These five tapes wrap up Dianetics. Every HGC must have and study them."

** 6101C02	22ACC-1	Present Time Problems—Why Cases Don't Move
6101C02	22ACC-2	Present Time Problems and Withholds
** 6101C03	22ACC-3	E-Meter
6101C03	22ACC-4	Withholds
** 6101C04	22ACC-5	What a Reactive Bank Is—The Mechanics of the Reactive Bank
6101C04	22ACC-6	Clearing Procedure
6101C05	22ACC-7	Dianetics and Present Time Problems
** 6101C05	22ACC-8	Methods of Clearing Technology—Finding of Havingness and Confront Processes—Pre-session 37
6101C06	22ACC-9	Dianetic Assist and Pre-session 38
6101C06	22ACC-10	Clearing Routine

Franchise

NEW HELP DATA

Failures to help on the various dynamics can bring about confusion of identities.

This is normally resolved by a thetan by obsessive efforts to individuate (blow phenomena or merely insistences upon individuation).

The end product of failures to help is aberrated self-determinism.

At an overt-withhold level, the thetan is trying to individuate and is therefore proceeding to individuate after failing to help. Thus a thetan is at obsessive cause while trying to do overts or get motivators.

As I have stated before it makes little theoretical difference whether help is run two-way or on an O/W basis.

I also promised to inform you when more data was to be had on this.

Apparently there may be some virtue (in terms of case gain and saved time) in running help on a pan-determined basis.

The theoretical look at this (see recent table in HCO Bulletin of January 5th, 1961, "O-W A Limited Theory") is that overts are below help and that when one enters upon an improvement in help, obsessive individuated cause falls out and pan-determinism moves in.

Possibly, very early in running help at Regimen 3 level one could run Help O/W but after a few hours on the same terminal could shift to two-way help, and after a few more hours could change to 5-way help and finish the bulk of the 75 hours of run of help on the same terminal with the 5-way version.

I think not doing this is slowing clearing.

In other words, when the pc starts on his help on a terminal, he is still rather in the O/W band. Very soon he is moving higher and into pan-determinism. And shortly after this should move very broadly into pan-determinism.

My evidence on this is technically light at the moment but I do know of at least one case that needed this. So let's shift now and run this gradient for a while and see if it isn't generally faster.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.cden
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Franchise

ADDITIONAL HAS PROCESSES

HAS III

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

HAS IV

“Get the idea of changing.”
“Get the idea of not changing.”

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

HAS V

“Get the idea of solving a problem.”
“Get the idea of not solving a problem.”

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

HAS VI

“Communicate with (body part).”
“Don’t communicate with (body part).”

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

HAS VII

“Tell me something worse than a (body part).”

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

HAS VIII

“Get the idea of making people friendly.”
“Get the idea of making people unfriendly.”

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

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

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

ANATOMY CONGRESS LECTURES

Johannesburg, South Africa
21—22 January 1961

After giving the Anatomy of the Human Mind Congress and first week of the 22nd American ACC, L. Ron Hubbard flew back to South Africa where he addressed his first South African Congress. The six hours of the South African Anatomy Congress are more detailed on the Anatomy Course data than the Washington Congress

* 6101C21	ACSA-1	Opening Lecture
** 6101C21	ACSA-2	The Parts of the Mind
** 6101C21	ACSA-3	Aberration and the Handling of
** 6101C22	ACSA-4	Evolution of Early Research—Prehav Scale
** 6101C22	ACSA-5	Cycle of Action, Time Track, Terminals, Stable Datum, Reactive Thought
6101C22	ACSA-6	Johannesburg Staff Intros, Lecture: Clearing, Certs for Clears

3RD SOUTH AFRICAN ADVANCED CLINICAL COURSE LECTURES

Johannesburg, South Africa
23 January—17 February 1961

The 3rd South African Advanced Clinical Course was actually the first one personally conducted by L. Ron Hubbard. The 1st and 2nd South African ACCs were conducted by an assistant, using taped lectures made by LRH at previous ACCs.

Writing on the last day of this ACC, L. Ron Hubbard said, "The best clearing series to date, extremely comprehensive, are the 17 hours made for the Joburg ACC. Very little data on Pre-session 38 is given but the entirety of the three scales for Havingness, Confront and 'Pre-Havingness' (or Doingness) Scale and their uses are on these tapes."

Later, on March 19, he said, "You may have gathered that a new attitude has entered Scientology. For many years I have been trying for technology that in the hands of other auditors would get *all* cases started to their entire satisfaction. The 3rd South African ACC achieved it All graphs improved and one Clear was made. In effect, we had one Clear and the rest Releases with the road wide open to becoming Clear.

"These cases were all rough cases, long in processing and training without adequate gain. The 3rd South African ACC got them all going again."

** 6101C23	3SA ACC-1	HAS Co-audit Processes and E-Meter
6101C24	3SA ACC-2	Pre-session 38
** 6101C25	3SA ACC-3	Model Session Revised

The list of lectures given to the 3rd South African ACC continues on pages 196, 201, 204 and 205 in chronological sequence with materials issued at the time.

Fran Holders

HANDLING OF RUDIMENTS

On goals, the preclear should never be challenged as to what he establishes as his goals. The auditor accepts and acknowledges any and all goals the preclear has for the session and for life and livingness.

In handling the environment, if there is charge on the E-Meter after asking, "Is it all right to audit in this room?" and if charge does not blow with a little two-way comm, then run TR 10, "Notice that_____." However, if you have already located the Havingness process for the case, you would run that Havingness process until there was no longer any charge as far as the auditing environment is concerned. Only be careful in using TR 10 to flatten any somatic turned on while running it.

Auditor clearance is the most important of the rudiments, because if the auditor is not cleared, negative results will be obtained on the profile of the preclear. To handle charge on the auditor, TR 5N should be run, if charge does not blow on a little two-way comm. TR 5N is:

"What have I done to you?"
"What have you done to me?"

Overt-withhold on the auditor is far too accusative and invalidates the pc.

If the relationship between the auditor and pc is one of long standing then you would run TR 5N as follows:

"What have I done to you in this session?"
"What have you done to me in this session?"

On asking "Are you withholding anything?" under auditor clearance, you can say, "What did you think when the needle dropped? There it is again. What did you just think?" This can blow the charge on this question; however, if the charge does not blow, Pre-session 37 ("What question shouldn't I ask you?") or Formula 19 ("Who have you failed to help?" "Who has failed to help you?" "What have you failed to help?") with General Overt/Withhold can be run.

As regards a Present Time Problem, the first thing you want to know is whether it is a problem of long duration or a problem of short duration. Only short duration problems are handled. If the pc has a problem with regard to the fact that he promised to call his wife at 4:00 p.m., and it is 4:00 p.m., the best way to handle this problem is to end the session and let him call his wife. When the session is resumed, you start the session again and go to where you were in the rudiments and ask, "Do you have a present time problem?" If the pc has a present time problem of being excused, you would not in this case end the session, as he will remain in the building and be back shortly.

The process of handling the present time problem of short duration and one which cannot be handled as above, is: "What part of that problem have you been responsible for?"

Problems of long duration are run on Pre-session 38, as will be given. These problems of long duration are not handled as a part of rudiments, but these long duration problems tell the auditor what it is he will have to process on the case.

Overt/Withhold on the auditor, or on an auditor, or on a practitioner, may also be used in Auditor Clearance, if considered advisable—see Note 17, HCO Bulletin of 21 March 1961, "Script of a Model Session".

LRH :jl.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 26 JANUARY 1961

Franchise

THE “ULTIMATE” PROCESSES

The “ultimate” processes—*when* they can be run on the pc—now exist. And they can be run providing the pc is first brought up into the vicinity of Mest Clear by the current rundown (Pre-session 37, Formula 15, 14, 13 or 16 as needed, Regimen 3 derived from Pre-sessions 2 to 36—SCS and Connectedness also for some—with the Regimen being run with Help on a terminal for at least 75 hours without changing terminals).

If all this is gotten out of the way, the pc should be in very good shape indeed. Then, after perhaps another process or two, these ultimates could be attempted.

It is very important to remember these as they wipe out any liability of having been active in mental “healing” on the whole track, or, more importantly, having abused the field of the arts.

Remember, however, that, just as it says in *Creation of Human Ability*, there is a lot of agony attached to running “a thetan” or some allied word. Unless havingness is away up and stable, as is achieved in Regimen 3, it can’t be done.

With these warnings, here are the basic versions of the processes:

ULTIMATE 1

“Get the idea of doing something to a thetan.”
“Get the idea of not doing something to a thetan.”

and

ULTIMATE 2

“Get the idea of doing something to a thetan’s pictures.”
“Get the idea of not doing something to a thetan’s pictures.”

and

ULTIMATE 3

5 way help on a thetan

and

ULTIMATE 4

5 way help on a thetan’s pictures

and

ULTIMATE 5

“Get the idea of allying oneself.”
“Get the idea of not allying oneself.”

and

ULTIMATE 6

“Get the idea of creating.”
“Get the idea of not creating.”

These processes should probably be run with a Regimen 3 form, certainly with model session.

Each should be flattened in turn several times around.

This is our nearest data approach to OT at this time. Only Ultimate 5 could be run without having brought the pc to Mest Clear first.

The word “picture” is used instead of “creation” because of Step 6 phenomena and for other reasons.

Responsibility could be run afterwards on all items mentioned in these “Ultimates”.

Although you get this at a much later date, this HCO Bulletin was written on Christmas Day, 1960, in Johannesburg. So it's a Christmas present. And I hope *all* of you, regardless of any fancied differences, had a Very Merry Christmas and will have a very fine and successful AD 11.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

3RD SOUTH AFRICAN ACC LECTURES

Johannesburg, South Africa
26—27 January 1961

6101C26	3SA ACC-4	Difference Between Dianetics and Scientology— Presession 38
** 6101C27	3SA ACC-5	Creative Ability

HCO BULLETIN OF 28 JANUARY 1961

Continental HGCs
Copy to Sthil
Eventual Franchise

NEW ASSESSMENT SCALE

I have developed a new assessment scale which takes in most possible formulas and regimens.

The scale and its use follows:

The Pre-Havingness Scale

Havingness
Failed Havingness

Interest
Failed Interest

Communication
Failed Communication

Control
Failed Control

Help
Failed Help

Overts
Failed Overts

Withholds
Failed Withholds

Importance
Failed Importance

Leave
Failed Leave

Protect
Failed Protect

Abandon
Failed Abandon

Inverted Help

Inverted Control

Inverted Communication

Inverted Interest

Obsessive Can't Have

This scale may have other points I have not located yet.

ITS USE

The use of the Havingness Scale in auditing is as follows:

Havingness is the make-break point of a case. Before havingness can be tested for, all heavy areas on the lower part of the scale must be flat.

The most elementary use of the scale and the one recommended at this time is to assess the points on the scale upwards until a fall is observed and then to run this fall out. Then to assess again from the bottom until a fall is observed and run it out.

All auditing to be done in Model Session form. The assessment follows either after the rudiments or after a discovered button has been flattened.

The upper nine points of the scale are best run as Regimens (from Help upwards).

I have not accumulated cases using this type of approach on this scale but I feel, by past experience, that it should catch even those cases that "failed help" hasn't reached.

I do not know how long it should take to flatten one button on this scale. I would guess, from failed help down, that it would take a few hours per button.

Probably this will develop into running pairs as in all formulas but until it is established how that should be done, the above simple system should be used.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:acjh
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[This HCO B was later reissued from Saint Hill Manor on 9 March 1961 with the distribution, 'Continental HGCs, Franchise'.]

HCOs
HGCs
ACCs

**COMMAND SHEET
PRE-HAVINGNESS SCALE**

The following commands have been conditionally developed for use with the Pre-Havingness Scale.

It should be noted that "Endure", "Failed Endure" are added to the scale just below "Failed Abandon" and that "No Effect" is added to end of scale.

It should be noted that the commands are given in reverse order to Scale.

NO EFFECT

What would you rather not have a bad effect upon?

OBSESSIVE CAN'T HAVE

Tell me something others don't want.

INVERTED INTEREST

What would you consider interesting?
What would another consider uninteresting?
What would you consider uninteresting?
What would another consider interesting?

INVERTED COMMUNICATION

What communication would you consider bad?
What communication would another consider good?

INVERTED CONTROL

What control would you consider bad?
What control would another consider good?

INVERTED HELP

What help would you consider bad?
What help would another consider good?

FAILED TO ENDURE

What continued?

ENDURE

What have you endured?

FAILED TO ABANDON

Who couldn't you abandon?
What couldn't you abandon?

ABANDON

Who have you abandoned?
What have you abandoned?

FAILED PROTECT

Who have you failed to protect?
What have you failed to protect?

PROTECT

Who have you protected?
What have you protected?

FAILED LEAVE

Who wouldn't you let leave?
What should another keep?

LEAVE

Where would you rather not be?
When would you rather not be?

FAILED IMPORTANCE

Who has been considered unimportant?
What has been considered unimportant?

IMPORTANCE

Who did another consider important?
What did another consider important?

FAILED WITHHOLD

What have you failed to withhold?

WITHHOLD

What have you withheld?

FAILED OVERT

To whom have you failed to do something?
What have you not done?

OVERTS

What have you done?

FAILED HELP

Who have you failed to help?
What have you failed to help?

HELP

Who have you helped?
Who has helped you?
What have you helped?
What has helped you?

FAILED CONTROL

Who has failed to control you?
Who have you failed to control?
What has failed to control you?
What have you failed to control?

CONTROL

Who have you controlled?
Who has controlled you?
What have you controlled?
What has controlled you?

FAILED COMMUNICATION

Who has failed to communicate to you?
With whom have you failed to communicate?
What has failed to communicate to you?
With what have you failed to communicate?

COMMUNICATION

Who has communicated to you?
With whom have you communicated?
What has communicated to you?
With what have you communicated?

FAILED INTEREST

Who has failed to interest you?
Who have you failed to interest?
What has not been interesting?
What have you failed to make interesting?

INTEREST

How have you interested another?
How has another interested you?
What could you make interesting?
What could another make interesting?

FAILED HAVINGNESS

What should another not have?

HAVINGNESS

The havingness command for the pc.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:aec.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[This HCO B was later reissued from Saint Hill Manor on 9 March 1961 with “Franchise” added to the distribution. The commands for “Communication” above are replaced by commands given in HCO B 2 March 1961, *New Pre-Hav Command*.]

3RD SOUTH AFRICAN ACC LECTURES

Johannesburg, South Africa
2—8 February 1961

** 6102C02	3SA ACC-6	Auditor Failures
6102C03	3SA ACC-7	Regimen and Prehavingness—Advances
6102C06	3SA ACC-8	Making Formulas Out of the Prehav Scale
6102C07	3SA ACC-9	What Are You Auditing?
6102C08	3SA ACC-10	Case Behavior Under Processing

Franchise

UK CASES DIFFERENT

In finding the bugs in running the South African case, I also had a chance to study the UK case somewhat as the country is full of English people fresh from home and I've already had years of experience with it in England.

I believe that clearing a UK case easily requires between finishing off the Formulas and starting the Regimen a lot of S-C-S or 8C + the Havingness found effective for the case.

Control seems to get inverted on a UK case more easily than on some other nationalities and I think the inversion must be cleared up before Help (as in Regimen 3) can be effectively run.

This isn't a criticism on the UK case. It's just an effort to speed up clearing. A close study indicates that the UK case tends strongly to alter-is a command. It's no wonder, looking over the country's history, that commands got dangerous.

Therefore, in the HGC in London, I am now going to require an addition to procedure for clearing as follows:

When the Formulas are gotten out of the way and, while still running Failed Help between tests for havingness, the Havingness is found, a period of at least forty-five hours is instituted where the pc is run on S-C-S or 8C interspersed with a few commands of his Havingness every half hour. The last five hours will be run on Op-Pro-by-Dup.

Only when this is done will the auditor locate the Confront and then continue with Regimen 3.

If a test by the auditor, on any case, regardless of nationality, shows that the pc is poor on control, the above routine should be followed.

This data is backed up by enormous success with S-C-S and Op-Pro-by-Dup in England and the general success of 8C.

I have been looking for the bug in UK clearing for some time and feel that this is its remedy.

S-C-S

S-C-S now has four stages, instead of three. It has been found that at least one pc never flattened *start* because the body was "already started" being in constant motion and so the pc never could start it. The added command is "When I tell you to stand still, I want you to make that body stand still." "All right?" "Stand still."

The remainder of S-C-S is as always.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jms.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Ability

Issue 125

[1961, ca. February]

The Magazine of
DIANETICS and SCIENTOLOGY
from
Washington, D.C.

Personal Integrity

L. Ron Hubbard

WHAT IS TRUE FOR YOU is what you have observed yourself
And when you lose that you have lost everything.

What is personal integrity?
Personal integrity is knowing what you know—
What you know is what you know—
And to have the courage to know and say what you have observed.
And that is integrity
And there is no other integrity.

Of course we can talk about honor, truth, all these things,
These esoteric terms.
But I think they'd all be covered very well
If what we really observed was what we observed,
That we took care to observe what we were observing,
That we always observed to observe.

And not necessarily maintaining a skeptical attitude,
A critical attitude, or an open mind.
But certainly maintaining sufficient personal integrity
And sufficient personal belief and confidence in self
And courage that we can observe what we observe
And say what we have observed.

Nothing in Dianetics and Scientology is true for you
Unless you have observed it
And it is true according to your observation.
That is all.

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 9 FEBRUARY 1961

Franchise

NEW PRESESSION DATA AND SCRIPT CHANGE

Preessions

The use of Preession 37 should be limited to about 2 hours at the most.

As a case progresses it becomes conscious of more withholds. Therefore Preession 37 can be run at intervals as a case goes along, briefly each time.

Model Session Script Change

For the purpose of getting all the withholds off a case, a new line is now added to the Model Session.

Immediately after "Is it all right if I audit you?" insert the line "Are you withholding anything?"

With the discovery that many non-progress cases are not progressing because of heavy undisclosed withholds, the subject of withholding is graduated up to take permanent residence in the rudiments as above. Therefore it could be said that Preession 37 is actually repeated in the rudiments but, of course, remains itself.

Formula 19 is a better thing with which to slug a case than long runs of Preession 37. If you suspect withholds you can't rapidly get, Formula 19 speeds up the whole case and gets real gains at the same time.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.bh
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

(Note: Formula 19 is described in HCO Bulletin of February 16,1961.)

3RD SOUTH AFRICAN ACC LECTURES

Johannesburg, South Africa
9—15 February 1961

** 6102C09	3SA ACC-11	Mental Healing: Sanity and Insanity
6102C10	3SA ACC-12	Organization Lines
** 6102C13	3SA ACC-13	The Three Therapies of Earth
** 6102C14	3SA ACC-14	Fundamentals of Auditing
** 6102C15	3SA ACC-15	Havingness and Confront Scales

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 16 FEBRUARY 1961

Franchise

FORMULA 19

Formula 19 is developed to give a general form to Failed Help and O/W running.

It is better to use this than Pre-session 37 for long runs. Pre-session 37 must be done. Formula 19 is, however, a better case digger as it improves case up to where pc realizes he has withholds. As a case improves it becomes more aware of overts and withholds since the overts “unlessen” and the case responsibility rises.

Formula 19 improves responsibility and brings up awareness of withholds *and* improves the case.

Formula 19 consists of Who/What Two Way Failed Help and general O/W, about a ten minute or a to present time run for each.

The commands are:

“Who has failed to help you?”
“Who have you failed to help?”
“What has failed to help you?”
“What have you failed to help?”

The above commands are run consecutively.

“What have you done?”
“What have you withheld?”

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

3RD SOUTH AFRICAN ACC LECTURES

Johannesburg, South Africa
16—17 February 1961

** 6102C16	3SA ACC-16	Machines and Havingness
6102C17	3SA ACC-17	Case Conditions

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 18 FEBRUARY 1961

HCO Secs
Assn Secs
Ds of P
All HGC Personnel
All Auditors
Auditing Staff
All 22nd American
ACC Students
All 3rd S.A.
ACC Students

S.O.P. GOALS

**Marvellous New Breakthrough
BE—DO—HAVE Coordinated**

On all staff cases without exception the following Goals Standard Operating Procedure will be used.

This data I developed for the 3rd S.A. ACC is a major breakthrough. I want it run on all staff cases *now* no matter what was being run before. Take note of what was being run for later application or for use as terminals after Goals Assessment if they fit and are only partially flat on older processes.

S.O.P. Goals Intensives

Use Model Session throughout. Heavily stress Rudiments. Use “What part of that problem could you be responsible for” for PTPs. Use TR 5N for ARC breaks (“What have I done to you”, “What have you done to me”).

1. Go over *Rudiments* carefully .

2. Do a *Goals Assessment*.

Find out every goal the pc can recall ever having. Make a list. Get in particular any secret goals, or withheld goals. Go over list with a meter. Take goal that falls the most.

3. Convert goal to a *terminal*.

Get wording of terminal simple but make sure the version you select falls as much as possible on meter. HCO Bulletin of February 2nd, 1961 (some issues were dated March 9, 1961, from HCO Saint Hill), gives sample general commands to which terminal can be added.

4. *Assess* this *terminal* on the *Pre-Havingness Scale* from bottom to top.

Take level that falls the most.

5. Develop an auditing command, preferably two-way, that uses terminal and pre-havingness level.

The right commands fall as much as goal or terminal did.

6. *Run* the *command* until tone arm becomes less active.

7. *Go one down* on the Pre-Havingness Scale.

Develop a command for next level that falls.

8. *Run* the *command* until the tone arm becomes less active.

9. *Return to first commands* and run them (the first level found).

Alternate the higher and one-down level commands, ten minutes of one level, ten minutes or so of the other level.

10. When the tone arm loses its action on these two commands and tends to stick, no matter whether high or low arm (one half hour is a good test), REASSESS TERMINAL ON PRE-HAVINGNESS SCALE from bottom up until a level falls hard.
11. Proceed as in Steps 5 to 11.
12. When the first terminal selected, run at several levels of the scale and the one just below, seems flat, return to Goals Assessment, REASSESS GOALS. Proceed from Steps 5 to 12.
13. When tone arm stabilizing around clear read (two or three terminals run), LOCATE HAVINGNESS PROCESS from the 36 Presessions.
14. Add the havingness process into the processes run, using it at appropriate places (certainly at session end) while continuing Goals S.O.P.
15. When havingness process has been used for a couple of sessions to help Goals S.O.P., find the CONFRONT PROCESS.
16. Add the Confront Process into the Model Session.
17. If you run out of goals, get a NEW LIST OF GOALS from the pc and proceed as above.

Beingness, Doingness and Havingness must be balanced. Each must be flexible in the pc for a stable gain.

Goals processing finds the beingness and the mind's doingness toward it (Pre-Hav Scale) and results in Havingness.

On Assessments you may find, going from bottom toward top of the PreHavingness Scale (No Effect upwards), that after several levels the pc's needle begins to rise consistently. It is probably useless to go higher on the scale as a rising needle means "no confront". A quicker way than assessing the whole scale would be, then, to assess upwards to a rising needle action and then go back down until the needle stops rising. Hunt from that point down for the biggest fall and you won't go very wrong.

Tone arm movement is the keynote to Case gain—No tone arm action = no gain. 1 to 2 Divisions of the Six Divisions of the Tone Arm Circle movement per half hour is good movement.

If a pc does not respond well to Goals S.O.P. (about 15% won't) do the following: Go over Rudiments with high sensitivity setting on meter. Clean up the withholds.

If that doesn't work, run the following for a few hours (it's the lowest but most general process now known):

What was your attention concentrated upon? When was your attention shifted?

This should get the tone arm moving. When tone arm is moving well for a few hours move back into Goals S.O.P. Step 2 and get the case going. It may be necessary to run Formula 15 and/or Formula 13 on some cases if Goals S.O.P. still finds a quiet tone arm.

Cases don't move when heavy withholds or PTPs are present. Cover Rudiments and End Rudiments carefully every session.

Example

Model Session is begun. Rudiments well covered. Goals Assessment shows up strongest goal to be “to get over having a painful body”. Terminal is chosen, “Painful Body” is shown to fall most as terminal wording.

“Painful Body” is assessed on Pre-Havingness Scale. Endure falls most.

Auditing command is developed which falls on meter, “What should a painful body endure?” No additional command developed for Endure.

Developed command is run (heavy somatics) until the tone arm ceases to get 2 divisions of action, gets only one. Process ended.

Command is developed for Failed Endure, next lower level, “What has a painful body failed to endure?” This starts heavy tone arm action again.

When action cooled, same “endure” command is run again.

After three runs of *Endure* and two of *Failed Endure* command tone arm stiffens at 5 on the scale. A 15 minute test of both commands fails to get it moving; “Painful Body” is reassessed in the Pre-Havingness Scale and is found now to drop at Withheld.

Command is developed for Withheld that falls on meter (the command causes the fall), “What should be withheld from a painful body?”

This new command run and tone arm again in motion. TA motion gets less.

Dropping down one level of Pre-Havingness Scale to Failed Withhold, command is developed that falls on needle—“What have you failed to withhold from a painful body?”

Command is run and restores motion to tone arm. When motion dies down a bit, Withhold command is resumed.

After 2 runs of Withhold and two of Failed Withhold, tone arm became slow at 3.

“Painful Body” reassessed on Pre-Havingness Scale, is now found at *Inverted Communication*. “Painful Body” added to command given on HCO Bulletin, 2nd February, 1961, for *Inverted Communication*. This run for 1 hour. Then *Inverted Interest* run on “Painful Body”. Etc. Etc.

Data on all this will be found on the 17 hours of tape lectures of the 3rd S.A. ACC. This condensation is not on the tapes.

The Pre-Havingness Scale referred to has been the subject of two February 1961 HCO Bulletins. (Some issues were dated March 9, 1961, from HCO Saint Hill.)

An expanded scale will shortly be released. The shorter scale works, however.

As this is the fastest road to Clear, I want all staff members to be processed on nothing else, from scratch, former auditing not to be taken into account. We want clear staffs. They deserve it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:aecjs.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[This HCO B is modified by HCO B 31 March 1961, *S.O.P. Coals Modified* .]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO Secs
Assoc Secs
Ds of P
All HGC Personnel
All Auditors
Auditing Staff
All 22nd American
ACC Students
All 3rd S.A.
ACC Students

HCO BULLETIN OF 20 FEBRUARY 1961

IMPORTANT DATA ON GOALS S.O.P.

It is vital to know that cases run on Goals S.O.P. or the Pre-Havingness Scale may slump between sessions and become misemotional even out of session until the scale is flat—flat—flat on any assessed terminal.

It is also important to know that a case run on the Pre-Havingness Scale in such a way as to leave a level unflat may hang-fire thereafter and will move only when that process is completed.

This scale is hot and fast, *but* its very workability can unstabilize cases during an intensive.

Use the scale. But use it intelligently. Do not permit it to be used by untrained unsupervised Auditors.

Flatten Terminals

Flatten *every* level started, get tone arm and needle to a stick or no action before assessing another level for the terminal.

It is all right to alternate two levels, running the one assessed and the one below, back and forth. But do not leave either level unflat before assessing again.

When is a Goals Terminal Flat?

An assessed terminal taken from the heaviest reacting goal of the pc *must* be run, reassessed and run at various levels of the scale until the goal terminal has no reaction on a cranked up sensitivity needle for any level of the Pre-Havingness Scale. If a reaction is found, run it off and check again.

Don't quit a terminal because the pc wants to. Quit it only when meter has no reaction.

Use the Pre-Havingness Scale.

Don't be disturbed by the misemotion of a pc during or between sessions.

Run any goals terminal you assess flat on all levels of the scale before going on to assess new goals.

LRH :js.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

Franchise

PT PROBLEM AND GOALS

It will be found that PT Problems are often disclosed by the goals announced by the pc.

A PT Problem can wholly stall a case. Only withholds, PT Problems, and ARC Breaks (gross auditing errors) can stop a case now.

Definitions: A *problem* is an intention counter intention that worries the preclear.

A *Present Time Problem* is a problem that exists *now* in the physical universe.

The pc often announces a PT Problem when asked for his goals.

Example: Asked for goals, pc says he wants to improve his memory. Memory is a PT Problem to him. Until something is done about this, the case stalls. Auditor runs "Something you wouldn't mind forgetting," so long as pc is happy with it and unhappy with memory. This may be 25 hours or more.

Example: Pc says his goal is to get rid of paralysis in his leg. This is his PT Problem. Auditor runs "Tell me something worse than a leg" until it is no longer a problem to the pc.

The Dianetic Assist is Pre-session 38. Finding an engram or secondary and running it, but only to resolve pc's PT Problem and only as a prelude to formulas, takes care of the goal-PT Problem situation in most cases. In any event you have 11 years of technology to handle these PTPs that exist as goals.

I'm happy to have found this data and to have found new ways of handling engrams. But it does not supplant Formulas and Regimens as announced.

Most of this modern rundown will be found on the 22nd American ACC tapes, January 1961, 10 hours, now being used to train Central Org Personnel.

Research wise, I am trying to find a way to resolve the goal-PT Problem situation with new ways of handling failed help on the basis that *whatever* the pc thinks is wrong he has failed to help.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.cden
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 2 MARCH 1961

HCO Secs
Assn Secs
Ds of P
All HGC Personnel
All Auditors Auditing Staff
All 22nd American ACC students
All 3rd S.A. ACC students

NEW PRE-HAV COMMAND

Here is a new command for Communication on the Pre-Hav Scale.

It comes as a surprise to me to find a new Comm process after Comm being in prominence 11 years, but that's what's happened. Also this process is foreshadowed by the Code of Honor.

It replaces the Pre-Hav Command in HCO Bulletin of February 2, 1961 (dated March 9, 1961 from Saint Hill).

The basic command from which the others are derived is:
"RECALL NOT WANTING TO COMMUNICATE."

The full commands that can be run in sequence are:

"Recall not wanting to communicate."
"Recall another not wanting to communicate."
"Recall not wanting another to communicate."
"Recall another not wanting you to communicate."
"Recall another not wanting others to communicate."
"Recall a communication."
"Recall a no-communication."
"Recall a communication."
"Recall a no-communication."
"Recall a communication."
"Recall a no-communication."

The command structure, having so many possibilities, has only been partially sorted out. The first five commands of the above or the last six commands of the above or all of the above may be run. The last six, of course, handle loss incidents.

It just may be that the first line as a process underlies all withholds and gives later withholds power. This may then, just as a process, considerably ease the task set in getting off withholds on secretive cases.

Using all the first five lines in sequence is probably easiest on the pc, afterwards flattening the last six commands.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: ph.rd
Copyright ©1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 2 MARCH 1961

CenOCon

USE OF S.O.P. GOALS PROCEDURE

(HCO Area Secs—IMPORTANT to ENFORCE)

Staff Auditors may use S.O.P. Goals Procedure on paying preclears the moment they have the procedure well understood and have passed a thorough hat check on its Bulletins and continue its study through the 17 hours of lecture tapes.

I don't want this one goofed up (and it very well can be) before its use is understood thoroughly. Nor do I want HGC pcs getting disturbed and upset through being left with levels unflat on terminals.

The 17 hours of lecture of the 3rd Johannesburg ACC are on this subject. Only field auditors who have attended and passed a course using these tapes and skills (no evening briefing course for field auditors may play these tapes) may use S.O.P. Goals Procedure. The odd numbered hours of the 10 22nd American tapes on Pre-session 38 are also part of this series of study.

This is very far from ordinary technology even in Scientology. It's good. Learn it before using it.

Its power is too great for slapdash use. Don't wait until you've upset some pcs before you believe me.

Teaching of S.O.P. Goals Procedure and the Pre-Havingness Scale is forbidden in Academies for the HCA/HPA and practical courses. HCS/BScn training level only may be taught S.O.P. Goals Procedure.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Franchise

FORMULA 20

Formula 20 is an effort to run Control on a thought level. It is relatively experimental.

It is for cases that have much alter-is as represented by inability to duplicate commands. Also for cases that have unsteady engram banks that shift.

The commands are:

“Who has failed to control you?”
“Who have you failed to control?”
“What has failed to control you?”
“What have you failed to control?”

and

“Who have you helped?”
“Who has helped you?”

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :js.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 20 MARCH 1961

Issue II
CenOCon
D of P
All Staff Auditors
HCO Area Sec: Hat Check
thoroughly and often
and on all new auditors

BASIC STAFF AUDITOR'S HAT

(This applies mainly to the relationship of the Staff Auditor to the pc and the D of P and does not modify existing policies but bears directly on Case Assessments and SOP Goals. This hat is needed to smooth out its use and Admin of SOP Goals on pcs.)

The staff auditor is directly responsible for the HGC preclear assigned to him. Results, lack of results, ARC breaks, recovering the pc after "blows", getting the pc to the D of P for interviews, getting the pc to the D of P and Registrar for after intensive interviews and handling all matters relating the pc to the Org during the delivery of auditing are all up to the staff auditor.

The staff auditor may refuse to accept a pc and may refuse to release a pc from auditing. The staff auditor may also refuse to give a particular session if in giving one the Auditor's Code is violated as to the pc's need for food, rest or the lateness of the hour.

The staff auditor is to deliver *all* the hours of auditing purchased by the pc. Case Assessments and Goals Assessments are part of the pc's auditing time when done by the staff auditor. No time spent on the case by the D of P in conferences, interviews or assessments are part of the pc's auditing time.

Any time missed by reason of auditor lateness, unavailability of rooms, breaks, travel to see the D of P, etc, must be made up on the pc by the staff auditor.

Case Assessment

(See HCO B of Nov 18, 1960 for exact form)

The first action of an auditor with a pc new to him is to fill in the Case Assessment Form. This is done on the pc's auditing time.

If a Case Assessment has already been done and is part of the pc's record, but was not done by the same auditor, it may be checked over with the pc by his new auditor. In any event the staff auditor's first action with a new pc is Case Assessment, whether done from an existing completed form or on a new Case Assessment Form. This does not apply to assists. This does apply to staff cases as well as outside pcs.

First Auditing

The first formal auditing that the pc receives is given at once when the Case Assessment Form is complete.

ALL sessions given in an HGC except those devoted to Assists, CCH sessions or "Coffee shop" auditing (inevitably done casually out of auditing rooms by staff on staff or students on friends and students even when you try to prevent it) are done in Model Session form (HCO Bulletin of March 21, 1961). To repeat, Assists and CCHs are not done in Model Session form. ALL Assessments even are done in Model Session form in an HGC. Assists or CCHs can be explained first and the pc should be started in such a way as not to cause ARC breaks, but are not Model Session.

A Goals Assessment should now be done in Model Session. This permits the auditor two cracks at withholds, PTPs and ARC breaks twice in every session, using Model Session HCO B of March 21, 1961, which includes withholds in End Rudiments as well as Beginning Rudiments. This makes a smoother picture than trying to get off withholds with no ARC and no session properly going. Further, even a Goals Assessment really puts the pc *in* session in Goals SOP, so a Model Session is better all around.

The first formal session, then, is run by Model Session.

The staff auditor takes off ARC breaks, a few withholds and any PTP and then, in lieu of a process, does an SOP Goals Assessment.

When the assessment is completed, even down to terminal Pre-Hav level and finding the auditing command that falls, the staff auditor takes the pc to the D of P and has the assessment checked. The D of P, at this time, does not touch rudiments, but only sees that goal falls more than other listed goals and that terminal and command fall at least as much as the main goal.

Unless only a few minutes remain of the day's auditing, the auditor then takes the pc back to the auditing room and starts the second session.

Second Session

In this session as in all remaining sessions the staff auditor runs SOP Goals in Model Session form.

The auditor must allow, always, enough time to end the session for the day. He makes a nice judgment on this. Half an hour is often spent on End Rudiments. Early in the first intensive, the withholds and ARC breaks take precedence in End Rudiments. PTPs, ARC breaks and Withholds take precedence in Beginning Rudiments. A session cannot be gotten going with a PTP unhandled. And a session cannot be ended with an ARC break in full bloom. However, a session *can* be ended with a PTP unhandled, and this is the most lengthy item usually encountered in rudiments.

Thus if only one hour remained in the first day's schedule for the second session, the staff auditor would run Beginning Rudiments, then End Rudiments with no process run in the middle of the Model Session.

Third Session

This session like any other is run in Model Session form.

If the pc is still falling on the meter when asked about withholds, even with sensitivity raised, at least half an hour should be spent getting them off. Even if the needle still falls a bit after that half hour, one goes on to run the PT Problem and then the process of SOP Goals, which is run exactly according to its bulletin. This process occupies the bulk of the auditing period. Then in the last half hour, one runs the End Rudiments and of course has another crack at withholds.

Fourth Session

Runs the same as the Third Session.

In a 5-day intensive, the 3rd and 4th Sessions probably occurred on same day.

Fifth Session

During this auditing day or before the Fifth Session, the pc is taken by the staff auditor to the D of P, who checks the pc out on rudiments.

The D of P finds out what is being run from the pc, and checks out but does not run anything on the Rudiments.

The whole record of the pc including the Case Assessment and SOP Goals Assessment Sheets are in a folder along with all session reports. The folder is in the hands of the staff auditor before the D of P interview, the last session report on top.

The D of P adds any and all advices and comments to the last session report.

The staff auditor takes the pc back to the auditing room. The Fifth Session is then begun. If the interview took place after the session was started, the Model Session was of course completed before the interview.

The auditor follows the D of P's advices in the next session after the interview. This may be, then, the Fifth Session or the Sixth Session.

A difficulty may now occur in the next session after the interview. The pc, because of D of P altitude, may have "transferred" to the D of P, which is to say, may now consider the D of P his auditor.

Therefore, in the next auditing after this D of P interview, heavy attention must be given to No. 3 of the Beginning Rudiments. A new process could be used here in lieu of TR 5N to correct this. The process is “Who should I be in order to audit you?” or “Who am I?” This, run briefly, takes off any “transfer” to the D of P and is a good basic rudiment type process anyway. A little of it goes a long way, however.

The SOP Goals terminal (or the D of P’s advice) is run in Model Session form.

Subsequent Sessions

In subsequent sessions the case is continued on up the line, with reassessments for new level each time the tone arm stops moving well and for a new goals assessment, adding to the old list any goals the pc now has as a result of auditing.

When the First Terminal is Flat

When the first terminal gets no *needle* reaction on any part of the Pre-Hav Scale, it is flat. If needle action is still found, take the level with heaviest reaction, put together a command that falls also and go on with the terminal at that level. But when this no longer occurs, the first terminal is said to be flat. This may take a few or many hours. But the thing is to be sure it’s flat.

Now and now only the auditor is to find the Havingness Process and the Confront Process of the pc in accordance with earlier bulletins. He then runs these enough to stabilize them. He now does his next complete Goals Assessment.

The auditor now uses the Havingness and Confront Processes along with his new Goals Terminal. This is like old Regimen 3 except that the Goals Terminal and Pre-Hav Scale are used instead of Help. The bulk of auditing is spent, of course, on the PreHav Terminal on the Pre-Hav Scale in accordance with SOP Goals.

The Third D of P check-out occurs when the Havingness, Confront and new Goals Terminal are all found. The D of P checks each one of these and, briefly, the Rudiments. The D of P does not run any of these.

When this is done, the staff auditor goes back to the auditing room and starts his next session, remembering to again give attention to the “transfer” possibility and to again use at level 3 of the Beginning Rudiments “Who should I be in order to audit you?” or “Who am I?”

The Intensive or new intensives continue. The D of P must check out rudiments at least every 10 hours of auditing time and, until toward the end of the pc’s clearing, must *check* all new goals and terminals.

The D of P is not permitted to do Goals Assessments except for demonstration or when the staff auditor completely fails. The D of P is not permitted to *audit* rudiments for the staff auditor, only to check them.

Pcs Priorly Audited

Pcs who have been audited before in the HGC but not by the present staff auditor are handled much in the same way as a new pc.

The whole record and all auditor reports are taken into the auditing room. The staff auditor looks for the Case Assessment. If he or she doesn’t find one, a new one is made. If the Case Assessment is present, the staff auditor reads it all off, verifying each point with the pc.

This done, the staff auditor checks in the reports for any terminals that were run on the pc or any Goals SOP run or Goals Assessments done before.

Only if a Goals Assessment has been done does he pay much attention to the records. If one has been done (but never run) the staff auditor checks it over with the meter. He or she accepts it or rejects it and uses his or her own assessment. If it was ever run, the staff auditor cannot reject it but must carry on.

If any Goals SOP has been run, the terminal that has been run is thoroughly meter checked on the Pre-Hav Scale. Any reactions found are flattened as per SOP Goals, in Model Session form. In short, the staff auditor, locating unflatness on the terminal first

found by some other for SOP Goals running, starts his Model Session, does the rudiments *thoroughly* and then assesses the first terminal ever run on the Pre-Hav Scale again (as he did before he started session), finds the level accurately, gets a command that will work and carries on.

The new auditor on the old case checks out and flattens on the whole Pre-Hav Scale, as indicated by meter reaction for any level, every Goals Terminal ever found by any other auditor before he does his own Goals Assessment.

If the staff auditor finds a Havingness and Confront Process already listed as found in the records he or she may use it or find new ones as best judgment seems to indicate on inspection.

If Help terminals or Dynamic Assessment terminals are listed as run in the days before Pre-Hav, they can be neglected.

Clearing

When all terminals seem flat and the assessments find terminals only to “blow” almost at once, the pc is near-Clear. SOP Goals is carried right on until no assessments register on the meter, but the meter remains free.

Old Help and Dynamic terminals from the pc’s file or memory are now checked out and run like Goals terminals.

When all this is done, the pc is Clear.

Things That Prevent Clearing

If the pc is run with a *PTP* in full bloom, or if a goal is really a long time *PTP* and is not audited, the pc will not change toward Clear. Remedy: Reduce any *PTP* that produces needle reaction during Beginning Rudiments. Run as the first goal the one which assesses best on the meter, whether you agree with it or not—if in doubt choose by meter the goal which is the *reason* the pc is being audited according to the pc.

If the pc has heavy *ARC breaks* registering he will not only not progress, he may worsen the graph. Reduce all *ARC breaks* found by meter falls in the Beginning and End Rudiments of the Model Session.

If the pc has heavy *withholds* which register on the meter and yet the pc will not give them, the case will not progress.

If a *terminal* being run on Goals is left unflat (if it registers on the needle for any part of the Pre-Hav Scale and that is not flattened) the next terminal addressed will not run well and pc will not clear. Check over every level of Pre-Hav by needle reaction and flatten any residue, before you go on to assessing another terminal.

Overts or overt thinking on Scientology Orgs or personnel can prevent Clearing.

Always follow the *Auditor’s Code*.

Pc Blows

A pc is most likely to blow (leave) if *withholds* are not given good attention and pulled. If *withholds* still register, and pc after several hours of auditing still won’t give, run a Joburg Security Check on the pc as part of Model Session Rudiments 4.

A pc will blow if *ARC breaks* are not repaired properly when they happen. An *ARC break* can be repaired at any time in the session by TR5N. Only repair *ARC breaks* that fall on the meter.

A *PTP* unhandled can cause a no-gain and therefore an eventual blow.

If the pc blows, his or her staff auditor alone is responsible for getting him or her back into session. If all else fails the D of P can help. It’s a black mark for a staff auditor if a pc blows.

The whole prevention of blowing is contained in this section if we add that the staff auditor’s air of competence and facile command of his tools are sufficient to inspire pc confidence.

Auditing Maxims

Follow the Code. Particularly Clauses 1 and 2.

Get an answer for every question asked before asking another question.

Ask a question or give a command for every answer you expect. Don't expect two answers for one auditor question or command.

Assess and run only what the pc says and the meter says. Don't write script and try to audit your own troubles out of the pc or avoid the pc's troubles because you have an aversion for them.

Follow the Model Session Script and the TRs *exactly*. These are the badges of a skilled auditor.

The clearer you get the better you will audit. But case is no excuse for bad auditing.

Always be real. Don't have big withholds on the pc. Tell the pc the truth without violating 1 and 2 of the Code. If you are tired, carry on but say so. If the pc wants to see the meter read show it to the pc briefly. Only cover a meter during an assessment as pc will start pushing at it. Tell the pc what he wants to know about the meter reads.

Don't try to educate the pc on Scientology while you're auditing him or her. Tell the pc to be sure to take a PE if they haven't.

Newcomers

Getting a pc started who has never been given any data on Scientology is simple now. Just do the sessions of Goals SOP as given above. They respond to Case Assessment and Goals Assessments with total interest.

A pc is *in session* when he or she is interested in own case and willing to talk to the auditor.

Cases Not On SOP Goals

About 3 out of 22 cases cannot be started with SOP Goals.

The test is only this: Does the needle move enough, even on high sensitivity, to do a Goals Assessment? If it can, do one.

If totally stuck run the concentrate—shift attention process in regular Model Session in lieu of Goals Assessment until the Tone Arm is moving well, at least 3 tone arm dial divisions per half hour. This process, coupled with heavy rudiments, will start most cases so that they can then be assessed.

If the case is incapable of answering sensibly various questions, run the CCHs. By answering sensibly is meant "an intelligible response dealing at least vaguely with the question".

CCHs are not run in Model Session.

Stopping Processes

Processes are run as long as they produce Tone Arm change. Processes which do not produce Tone Arm change are then stopped. If a process doesn't produce a Tone Arm change in a half an hour, it *must* be stopped. Processes which freeze a needle and do not free it *must* be stopped.

A process is *never* stopped on the recommendation of the pc or because of the pc's objections. Such objections in SOP Goals always precede huge gains on the process. A process is stopped only when it no longer produces meter change.

A process that produces change must be flattened.

The process that turns on a bizarre or unwanted condition will always turn it off. If in doubt, flatten the process.

Don't "Q and A". That is where the change in the pc causes the auditor to stop or change the process. If the pc changes, continue the process. If the pc isn't changing, change the process.

Stop processes and sessions on the auditor's determination, never the pc's. The auditor's determination is established by meter reaction, never pc reaction. If the meter doesn't act, change the process or end the session according to session time. If the meter is acting, don't change the process and don't stop the session unless time is up.

Before Giving Up

Before chucking in your hand on a trying and unchanging pc and leaving it up to the D of P or the Org, do the following:

1. Thoroughly check rudiments with high sensitivity and get them flat on the needle with the Model Session Rudiments Processes.
2. Run a Johannesburg Security Check on the pc and clear every drop of the needle fully.
3. Run Formula 16.
4. Run Formula 13.
5. Run Formula 15.
6. Run “Concentrate—shift attention” process from SOP Goals until Tone Arm is very active.
7. Keep rudiments cleared while doing the above.

If you do all these and still get no action, see the D of P. Of course, it’s impossible to do all the above well on a case and not get it going providing only that you *do* do them well with good TRs.

End of Intensives

At the end of the intensive be sure, if the pc is continuing, that all is in order with the Registrar and D of P before you continue on into the next intensive.

At the end of all the intensives the pc has bought, be sure the pc sees the D of P and the Registrar before the pc leaves the Org.

These actions are wholly up to the staff auditor.

A Completed Pc

Be sure, when all the intensives given are over, that the pc’s complete record, with all its papers, assessments and session reports are turned in, in a folder, to HGC Admin for filing. You may add to this file your own summary and recommendation on the case if you wish so the next auditor who gets it will be assisted.

Additional Staff Auditor Duties

Other staff auditor duties are assigned by the D of P only. No other executive may issue direct orders to a staff auditor about his duties or cases.

Reports

All staff auditor reports go to the D of P. Copies go to myself at HCO WW via the HCO Area and HCO WW Technical Secretary.

Nothing gets as much attention from me as the results, graphs, reports and comments of the staff auditor.

The whole future stability of the Org rests on the technical skill of the staff auditor.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jl.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 21 MARCH 1961

Franchise Holders
Central Orgs

SCRIPT OF A MODEL SESSION
(Cancels HCO B of October 13, 1960, same title)

I have brought the Model Session up to date, including “withholds” and changing “we” to “I” and “the” to “this” session throughout to reduce randomness. I have also added the proper processes to run at Rudiment level.

A Model Session is a Model Session because of its “patter”, not because of specific processes. This is a handy script of the “patter of a Model Session”. Use it. Don’t vary it. Know it by heart. It is the mark of a well trained auditor. By making all patter the same, later sessions run out earlier sessions.

This does not enjoin against two-way comm; but reduce auditor comments and chatter in sessions, if you want smooth results and no ARC breaks.

START OF SESSION

Auditor: “Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?”

Pc: “Yes.”

Auditor: Acknowledges. “Start of Session!” (Tone 40)

Note 1: If pc says “No”, Auditor two-way comms concerning objections, then asks again, “Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?”

Note 2: If pc is doubtful as to whether the session has started:

Auditor: “Has this session started for you?”

Pc: “No.”

Auditor: Acknowledges. “*Start of Session!*” (Tone 40) Then, “*Now* has the session started for you?” If pc still says “No”, the Auditor says, “We will cover it in the Rudiments,” and continues the session.

RUDIMENTS

1. Goals

Auditor: “What goals would you like to set for this session?”

Pc: Sets goals.

Auditor: Acknowledges. “Are there any goals you would like to set for life or livingness?”

Pc: Answers.

Auditor: Acknowledges.

2. Environment

Auditor: “Is it all right to audit in this room?”

Note 3: If not, use TR 10 (see Note 15) or pc’s Havingness process.

3. Auditor Clearance

Auditor: "Is it all right if I audit you?"

Note 4: If not, clear objection, or use TR 5N (see Note 16) or "Who should I be to audit you?" or "Who am I?" depending on nature of difficulty. If TR 5N seems to worsen the ARC break, run O/W on Auditor (see Note 17).

4. Withholds

Auditor: "Are you withholding anything?"

Note 5: If so, get withhold off or run Pre-session 37 (HCO B Dec 15, 1960).

5. Present Time Problem

Auditor: "Do you have any present time problem?"

Note 6: If so, clear problem, or use "What part of that problem have you been responsible for?"

START OF PROCESS

Auditor: "Now I would like to run this process on you (name it). What would you say to that?"

Pc: Answers.

Auditor: Acknowledges. Clears the command for pc only for the first time the command is used.

Note 7: If, during clearing of the command or failure of needle to react, it seems that the pc will not be able to handle or do the announced process profitably, Auditor says: "According to what we have been talking about, it would seem better if I ran (name another process)."

END OF PROCESS

1. Cyclical

Auditor: (Wishing to end process) "Where are you now on the time track?"

Pc: Answers.

Auditor: Acknowledges. "If it is all right with you, I will continue this process until you are close to present time and then end this process."

Pc: Answers.

Auditor: Acknowledges. Auditor continues the process, asking after each pc answer, "When?" until the pc is close to present time.

Pc: Answers close to present time.

Auditor: Acknowledges. "That was the last command. Is there anything you would care to say before I end this process?"

Pc: Answers.

Auditor: Acknowledges. "End of process."

2. Non-Cyclical

Auditor: "If it is all right with you I will give this command two more times and then end this process."

Pc: Answers.

Auditor: Acknowledges and gives the command two more times.

Pc: Answers.

Auditor: Acknowledges. "Is there anything you would care to say before I end this process?"

Pc: Answers.

Auditor: Acknowledges. "End of process."

Note 7a: The cyclical ending is only used on terminals that exist also in present time, or when pc is going into the past in his answers. It is not used after pc says he is in present time. Non-cyclical is used when the pc is running terminals which do not exist in present time or when the cyclic aspect can be neglected.

REPEATED COMMANDS

Auditor: Gives command.

Pc: "I don't know. I can't find and answer."

Auditor: Acknowledges. "I will repeat the auditing command." Repeats the command.

Note 8: If pc still cannot answer, two-way comm to discover why.

COGNITION

Auditor: Gives command.

Pc: (Not having answered command yet) "Say, that mass in front of my face just moved off."

Auditor: Acknowledges. Repeats command without announcing that it is a repeat.

END RUDIMENTS

5. Present Time Problem

Auditor: "Do you have any present time problem now?"

Note 9: If so, run "What part of that problem have you been responsible for?"

4. Withholds

Auditor: "Are you withholding anything?"

Note 10: Pulls withhold or runs Pre-session 37.

3. Auditor Clearance

Auditor: "How do you feel about my auditing in this session?"

Note 11: Use only TR 5N or O/W on present auditor, "What have you (done to) (withheld from) me in this session?"

2. Environment

Auditor: "Look around here and see if you can have anything."

Note 12: Run TR 10 or pc's Havingness process.

1. Goals

Auditor: "Have you made any part of your goals for this session?"

Note 13: Auditor may remind pc of session goals if pc can't remember them.

END OF SESSION

Auditor: "Is there anything you would care to say or ask before I end this session?"

Note 14: Auditor may show pc relative TA positions reached in session or tell pc what he cares to know about session.

Pc: Answers.

Auditor: Acknowledges. "Is it all right with you if I end this session now?"

Pc: Answers.

Auditor: Acknowledges. "Here it is. End of Session!" (Tone 40)

Auditor: (Optional) "Tell me I am no longer auditing you."

Pc: "You are no longer auditing me."

Auditor: Acknowledges.

Note 15: Commands of TR 10: "Notice that (room object)."

Note 16: Commands of TR 5N: "What have I done to you?" "What have you done to me?" alternated. "In this session" may be added if auditor-pc have long known each other.

Note 17: Commands of O/W: "What have you done to me?" "What have you withheld from me?" or in general form if pc berates auditors, "What have you done to an auditor?" "What have you withheld from an auditor?" or if the pc has been psychoanalyzed heavily, "What have you done to a practitioner?" "What have you withheld from a practitioner?"

Note 18: Present Time Problem for the purpose of rudiments must be what is called "a problem of short duration". A problem of long duration (such as a goal or psychosomatic difficulty) is not handled as in rudiments but in proper session and will emerge in the normal course of assessing S.O.P. Goals.

Note 19: If any rudiment difficulty can be blown with a very small amount of two-way comm, no process is run.

Note 20: Only the meter reaction shows if the environment, ARC break, withhold or PTP is still in existence. In all questions of whether something is blown or not or if a terminal is flat or if the process is flat, take what the meter says if it is different from what the pc says. The meter knows even if the pc says something else.

Note 21: After running a process on a rudiment because a meter reaction showed it should be run, always ask the rudiment question again before bridging to end the process. If it still reacts, audit the process further. Do not abandon a rudiment until the meter gives no reaction to the question.

Note 22: Always get an answer to every auditing command.

Note 23: Never expect two answers for one question even in doing an assessment.

Note 24: It is not obligatory for the pc to actually set goals. He must always be asked. He cannot be forced to do so. Ordinarily when he does not care to set goals for this part of the rudiments, he is suffering from an ARC break.

Note 25: Follow the Auditor's Code.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jl.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Franchise

S.O.P. GOALS

(This is the Franchise Issue, slightly rewritten, of S.O.P. Goals
HCO Bulletin of February 18, 1961. Do not issue HCO Bulletin of February 18th,
only this one to Franchise.)

This is Standard Operating Procedure Goals, the technology that made history in the 3rd S.A.
ACC.

Caution: There is a great deal to know about S.O.P. Goals. It is the right way to use the Pre-Hav Scales. With skilled use this can produce Releases and Clears. With fumbling use it can upset a pc thoroughly because it is so fast.

HCOs in all Central Orgs are running Special Events Courses to instruct in this procedure and to let the student hear the 27 hours of taped lecture that gives its basics and background.

With this we are on our way to making Clears in quantity with speed. So don't mess it up by failing to flatten what you start with it.

This is called "Standard Operating Procedure" because it has proved itself in skilled hands on the toughest of cases. You can safely put in a long time studying its use. It can clear some in only 18 hours. It can clear all but CCH cases in under 175 hours. It is valuable. Don't mess it up for a pc.

Enormous efforts are being made to make everything known about this available to you in Central Organizations.

We're off the launching pad. Use this well. It's the technology you've needed for eleven years, that you can use to get them clear.

S.O.P. Goals Intensives

Use Model Session throughout. Heavily stress Rudiments. Use "What part of that problem could you be responsible for" for PTPs. Use TR 5N for ARC breaks ("What have I done to you", "What have you done to me").

1. Go over *Rudiments* carefully.

2. Do a *Goals Assessment*.

Find out every goal the pc can recall ever having. Make a list. Get in particular any secret goals, or withheld goals. Go over list with a meter. Take goal that falls the most.

3. Convert goal to a *terminal*.

Get wording of terminal simple but make sure the version you select falls as much as possible on meter. HCO Bulletin of February 2nd, 1961 (some issues were dated March 9, 1961, from HCO Saint Hill), gives sample-general commands to which terminal can be added.

4. *Assess* this *terminal* on the *Pre-Havingness Scale* from bottom to top.

Take level that falls the most.

5. Develop an auditing command, preferably two-way that uses terminal and pre-havingness level.

6. *Run* the *command* until tone arm becomes less active.

7. *Go one down* on the Pre-Havingness Scale.

Develop a command for next level that falls.

8. *Run the command* until the tone arm becomes less active.
9. *Return to first commands* and run them (the first level found). Alternate the higher and one-down level commands, ten minutes of one level, ten minutes or so of the other level.
10. When the tone arm loses its action on these two commands and tends to stick, no matter whether high or low arm (one half hour is a good test), REASSESS TERMINAL ON PRE-HAVINGNESS SCALE from bottom up until a level falls hard.
11. Proceed as in Steps 5 to 11.
12. When the first terminal selected, run at several levels of the scale and the one just below, seems flat, return to Goals Assessment, REASSESS GOALS. Proceed from Steps 5 to 12.
13. When the tone arm stabilizing around clear read (two or three terminals run), LOCATE HAVINGNESS PROCESS from the 36 PreSessions.
14. Add the havingness process into the processes run, using it at appropriate places (certainly at session end) while continuing Goals S.O.P.
15. When havingness process has been used for a couple of sessions to help Goals S.O.P. find the CONFRONT PROCESS.
16. Add the Confront Process into the Model Session.
17. If you run out of goals, get a NEW LIST OF GOALS from the pc and proceed as above.

Beingness, Doingness and Havingness must be balanced. Each must be flexible in the pc for a stable gain.

Goals processing finds the beingness and the mind's doingness toward it (Pre-Hav Scale) and results in Havingness.

On Assessments you may find, going from bottom toward top of the PreHavingness Scale (No Effect upwards), what after several levels the pc's needle begins to rise consistently. It is probably useless to go higher on the scale as a rising needle means "no confront". A quicker way than assessing the whole scale would be, then, to assess upwards to a rising needle action and then go back down until the needle stops rising. Hunt from that point down for the biggest fall and you won't go very wrong.

Tone arm movement is the keynote to Case gain—No tone arm action = no gain. 1 to 2 Divisions of the Six Divisions of the Tone Arm Circle movement per half hour is good movement.

If a pc does not respond well to Goals S.O.P. (about 15% won't) do the following: Go over Rudiments with high sensitivity setting on meter. Clean up the withholds.

If that doesn't work, run the following for a few hours (it's the lowest but most general process now known):

What was your attention concentrated upon? When was your attention shifted?

This should get the tone arm moving. When tone arm is moving well for a few hours move back into Goals S.O.P. Step 2 and get the case going. It may be necessary to run Formula 15 and/or Formula 13 on some cases if Goals S.O.P. still finds a quiet tone arm.

Cases don't move when heavy withholds or PTPs are present. Cover Rudiments and End Rudiments carefully every session.

Example

Model Session is begun. Rudiments well covered. Goals Assessment shows up strongest goal to be "to get over having a painful body". Terminal is chosen, "Painful Body" is shown to fall most as terminal wording.

"Painful Body" is assessed on Pre-Havingness Scale. Endure falls most.

Auditing command is developed which falls on meter, "What should a painful body endure?" No additional command developed for Endure.

Developed command is run (heavy somatics) until the tone arm ceases to get 2 divisions of action, gets only one. Process ended.

Command is developed for Failed Endure, next lower level, "What has a painful body failed to endure?" This starts heavy tone arm action again.

When action cooled, same "endure" command is run again.

After three runs of Endure and two of Failed Endure command tone arm stiffens at 5 on the scale. A 15 minute test of both commands fails to get it moving; "Painful Body" is reassessed in the Pre-Havingness Scale and is found now to drop at Withheld.

Command is developed for Withheld that falls on meter (the command causes the fall), "What should be withheld from a painful body?"

This new command run and tone arm again in motion. TA motion gets less.

Dropping down one level of Pre-Havingness Scale to Failed Withhold, command is developed that falls on needle—"What have you failed to withhold from a painful body?"

Command is run and restores motion to tone arm. When motion dies down a bit, Withhold command is resumed.

After 2 runs of Withhold and two of Failed Withhold, tone arm became slow at 3.

"Painful Body" reassessed on Pre-Havingness Scale, is now found at *Inverted Communication*. "Painful Body" added to command given on HCO Bulletin, 2nd February, 1961, for Inverted Communication. This run for 1 hour. Then Inverted Interest run on "Painful Body". Etc. Etc.

Data on all this will be found on the 17 hours of tape lectures of the 3rd S.A. ACC. This condensation is not on the tapes.

The Pre-Havingness Scale referred to has been the subject of two February 1961 HCO Bulletins. (Some issues were dated March 9, 1961, from HCO Saint Hill.)

An expanded scale will shortly be released. The shorter scale works, however.

As this is the fastest road to Clear, I want all staff members to be processed on nothing else, from scratch, former auditing not to be taken into account. We want clear staffs. They deserve it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jl.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[See also HCO B 31 March 1961, *S.O.P. Goals Modified*, on the next page.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 31 MARCH 1961

CenOCon
Fran Holders

S.O.P. GOALS MODIFIED

A slight modification to make S.O.P. Goals easier to run is made herewith:

As I am expanding the Pre-Hav Scale with several new levels and as these levels are not necessarily in exact position, it is no longer possible to derive an exact formula using two levels. Only one level will be run for each assessment.

Strike out Steps 6, 7, 8 and 9 of HCO Bulletin of February 18, 1961.

Strike out the word "two" in Step 10, first line.

At Step 11, add: "omitting Steps 6, 7, 8 and 9."

At Step 12, first and second line, omit "and the one just below". Add to end of step: "omitting Steps 6, 7, 8 and 9."

Adjust example accordingly.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ph.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 31 MARCH 1961

Assn Sec
HCO Sec
D of P
All Staff Auditors

Mimeo Directions: Mimeo whole report as a Policy Letter.
Then mimeo each form separately for D of P. Then have
them letterpressed on flimsy paper.

THE DIRECTOR OF PROCESSING'S CASE CHECKING HAT

A system has been set up whereby a double check of every case at its most difficult crossroads in processing can be done.

While the staff auditor does all of the basic work and actual assessments, the D of P thoroughly checks each decisional step which would commit the case to an erroneous track or which would permit the case to continue less swiftly than is possible.

This checking system does not arise because staff auditors are unskilled. It arises from the fact that two points of view on a case are better than one. As an example of this it can occur that a staff auditor has the same withhold as the pc resulting at times in the staff auditor unconsciously avoiding that withhold. As another example, the pc terminal may be one to which the staff auditor has an antipathy resulting in an avoidance of that terminal. But in addition to these unlikely instances the pc will very often give up something to the D of P, thinking in terms of altitude, that he will not say to the staff auditor.

Our whole interest here is case speed of advance. The more accurately assessments are done and the more accurately rudiments are handled the more rapidly the case progresses.

The D of P only checks. The D of P does not actually audit the pc. It can happen that the pc gives up withholds to the D of P rather than the staff auditor. This is quite in order but the D of P may not drum for them the way a staff auditor would.

There are eight types of checkouts that the D of P does on a pc. Each one of these as below is the subject of a technical report form. These forms should be mimeoed out at first and later printed on flimsy paper by letterpress. They are in red ink on white paper.

We are not now checking arbitrarily every five hours. We are checking only when the pc has reached certain stages. Now that SOP Goals is proving itself we must smooth out every possibility of error in its running. It is a complex process but it is invariable. It has many steps but these are unchanging. Very little if anything in it is equivocal. Its answers are all in the black and white of being right or wrong once one actually reads the meter with precision.

CHECK TYPE ONE

HCO WW Form CT1

Pre-Intensive interview and Pre-Goals Assessment Check.

Before the preclear is audited in an intensive where SOP Goals may be employed the following check sheet is filled out by the D of P and passed by pc before a Goals assessment is made.

Name of Pc.....Date.....

Location of HGC

The Pc is put on the Meter.

The following statement is read to the pc: "You are about to receive Hubbard Guidance Centre Processing. Your auditor will do your case assessment in your first session. All I am going to do here is test your meter reaction for technical purposes."

TA..... Needle Character.....
 Have you ever received mental treatment of any kind?.....
 TA..... Needle Character.....
 How do you feel about help?.....
 TA..... Needle Character.....
 Do you wish to attain the state of release?.....
 TA..... Needle Character.....
 Does any of your family oppose Scientology?.....
 TA..... Needle Character.....
 How do you feel about control?.....
 TA..... Needle Character.....
 Are you prepared to answer your auditor truthfully when he or she asks you questions about your past?

 TA..... Needle Character.....

“This is the end of this check out. Please be sure to get good food and plenty of rest during the time of your processing. I will see you again from time to time to make certain your processing is going well. Best of luck to you.”

Adjudication (No other significance than TA and needle are given heed at this time): (given to auditor):
 Did TA move during questioning?

Did needle move during questioning?

If both moved, the auditor is to go right on and assess with a case assessment and then SOP Goals assessment in accordance with staff auditor’s partial hat. If TA did not move but needle moved, the auditor is to run the concentrate-shift attention process given in SOP Goals and come back for this type check again. If neither TA nor needle moved during questioning auditor is to run: “How have you tried to change a person?” “How have you failed to change a person?” “How have you tried to change yourself?” “How have you failed to change yourself?” If pc gave no intelligible answers to the questions, regardless of TA and needle motion, tell auditor to run CCHs.

Assess.....Attention Process
 Change Process.....CCHs.....
 Signed.....D of P.....

Repeat this form without reading beginning and end to pc but reading only questions when the auditor says TA is moving well and comes back for recheck. If CCHs were assigned tell auditor to now do Change Process. Auditor returns for recheck when TA moving well. When Change Process doing fine, assign Attention Process. When Attention Process doing fine assess for SOP Goals.

Use new check type one sheet for every D of P check on above.

Include this sheet in pc folder.

CHECK TYPE TWO

HCO WW Form CT2

Assessment Confirmation

Name of Pc.....Date.....

Location of HGC

Check by D of P to confirm case assessment, Goals Assessment, Terminal level and command.
 Done before any of these are run on pc. Questions are made to pc with pc on the meter.

Has the auditor asked you all about your family and former life?.....

About how many goals did you find?.....(Should be 50 or more).....

Did the auditor cover secret or withheld goals too?.....

Did you cover childhood goals as well?.....

What was the principal goal found?.....

(D of P looks at assessment sheet): Was.....the
principal goal found? (Note number of meter divisions it falls).....

What was the terminal found for this?.....

(D of P looks at assessment sheet): Was.....the
principal terminal found?(number of divisions it falls on meter).

If the number of divisions the terminal falls does not equal or exceed the number of divisions the goal fell auditor must reassess.

If reassessment ordered end check here. Sign and put in folder.

What level of scale was found for this terminal?.....

(D of P looks at assessment sheet): Was.....
the level of scale found for the terminal?.....

Meter must fall the same number of divisions for the level as for the goal and the terminal. If this does not happen even when terminal and level are repeated by D of P to Pc, tell auditor to reassess and end check at this point.

What command did you evolve for this?.....

(D of P looks at assessment sheet): Was.....
the command evolved for this? (Notes divisions of fall).....

If the command does not fall as much as the goal, terminal and level the D of P may try a better command remembering to take into account the phenomena of stuck flows and putting the pc at cause.

New command evolved which falls as much as Goals, Terminal and Level.....
.....
.....

Auditor told to.....

Signed.....D of P.....

CHECK TYPE THREE

HCO WW Form CT3

***General Check-up on a Session
May be done at any time or
when D of P unconvinced of Case Progress***

Name of Pc.....Date.....

Location of HGC.....

All questions are addressed to pc who is on a meter.

What processes are being run on you?.....

Do you have any ARC breaks with your Auditor?.....

Are you worried about something in your life?.....

Have you done anything while you have been in the HGC you shouldn't have done?.....

Do you think what we are doing with you is in error?.....

Is your auditor doing anything that upsets you?.....

If needle did a marked dip on any of the above the D of P should continue the question until the dip vanishes, using various different forms of the question until he gets the whole story to his satisfaction.

D of P findings:

Recommendation to Auditor:

Signed.....D of P.....

CHECK TYPE FOUR

HCO WW Form CT4

Rudiments Check

Name of Pc.....Date.....

Location of HGC.....

After eight or ten hours of auditing on processes that were in Model Session (not CCHs) the D of P checks rudiments to make sure that they are cleaned up.

Check done on Pc who is on a meter.

What goals have you been setting for your sessions?

Do you have any upset with your auditor about anything at all?

Are you withholding anything from us about yourself or your processing?

Do you have any present time problems?

Is there anything you dislike about your auditing?

Is there anything you would like to change about your auditor?

Is there anything it would embarrass you to tell us about?

Is there something you wouldn't want known?

Is there anything in your life right now that is very upsetting to you?

D of P sorts out any needle fall until he is sure that there is something there that needs attention and either it has cleared by his asking or he gives the auditor an alert to it so it can be handled.

Recommendation to auditor:

Signed.....D of P.....

CHECK TYPE FIVE

HCO WW Form CT 5

Flat Check

When the staff auditor states that the terminal he has been running is now flat the D of P makes a very careful check before he permits a new assessment to be started. The TA does not have to be on clear read for a terminal to be flat.

Name of Pc.....Date.....

Location of HGC.....

Terminal that has been run "flat" according to auditor.....

Check terminal on every level of the Pre-Hav Scale against the *needle only*. Check from bottom to top of scale then back to bottom of scale.

Needle changed characteristic or fell on the following levels.....

.....

If any change or fall noted, send auditor back to flatten that level, or those levels and do his own recheck and flattening before returning.

Use this form for D of P recheck.

If no level reacted on the terminal, take the Goal which the terminal represented and check it out thoroughly on the meter.

Goal Terminal Represented.....

Reaction of the Goal:.....

If Goal had a reaction send auditor back to find another terminal that reacts as much as the Goal reacts, flatten that terminal on any and all levels and return for recheck on this same form.

1. Return for recheck.....or

2. Do new Goals, Terminal, Level, Command Assessment.....

Signed.....D of P.

CHECK TYPE SIX

HCO WW Form CT6

Bog Check

Name of Pc.....Date.....

Location of HGC.....

When the Auditor reports or D of P thinks case is not progressing well the following check-offs are done: (This is a "When all else fails" check-off.)

D of P does check type one without the message to the Pc:.....

D of P does check type three:.....

D of P orders Johannesburg Security Check. Done:.....

D of P does check type four:.....

If SOP Goals has been "flattened" on one or more terminals D of P does check type five on all SOP terminals run to date:.....

Only when all of this has been cared for according to each check type listed and the Johannesburg Security Check has been fully cleared on all questions does the D of P make further recommendation to the Staff Auditor:

Recommendation:

Signed.....D of P.

CHECK TYPE SEVEN

HCO WW Form CT7

A "Release" Check Sheet

Name of Pc.....Date.....

Location of HGC.....

The following may be made out on the pc at any time but preferably at a time when the pc is to receive no further intensives at the moment or is leaving the HGC.

This whole check sheet is rechecked by HCO Area as indicated:

Pc is put on a meter and asked:

Are you happy with the auditing you have had?

D of P.....HCO Area Sec.....

Do you think you will get any worse?

D of P.....HCO Area Sec.....

Do you intend to get more auditing?

D of P.....HCO Area Sec.....

Did they find your Havingness process?

D of P.....HCO Area Sec.....

Did they find your Confront process?

D of P.....HCO Area Sec.....

Do you think you can handle life any better?

D of P.....HCO Area Sec.....

Do you think Scientology works?

D of P.....HCO Area Sec.....

If satisfactory meter reaction (fairly free needle) and if Tone Arm is not abnormally high or low, and if pc answers "Yes" to above, a D of P sends the pc with this form to HCO Area, and HCO Area again checks it out, has Address prepare a Certificate, HCO Continental gets Certificate and this form and signs, and Certificate is handed to or mailed to the pc. A pin is also given or sent when available, denoting pc is a "Release".

D of P.....HCO Area Sec.....

CHECK TYPE EIGHT

HCO WW Form CT8

Clear Check

D of P checks out this form and then sends it to HCO Area Sec for a second check out. The whole pc file folder with all filed forms, Assessments, various sheets and auditor's reports are to hand when this check out is done.

Check over all goals listed on the Goals Assessment Sheet and any subsequent additions. Look for a fall of the needle on any of them.

Any fall disqualifies the pc.

Check over all terminals listed in all auditor's reports and note any fall on any of them with high sensitivity.

Any fall disqualifies pc.

We find the needle without reaction and pronounce this person to be clear.

D of P.....HCO Area Sec.....

Give letter to HCO Continental and send bracelet to pc.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 5 APRIL 1961

CenOCon

S.O.P. GOALS GOOFS

Having examined the reports of several HGCs I must assume the following:

1. That the many situations arising in Admin and staff in some HGCs stem directly from an unconscious avoidance of clearing or of running SOP Goals.
2. That getting SOP Goals run properly is my one and only goal for HGCs at this time.
3. That I have no interest in *reasons* why it is not being run properly.
4. That all organization and staff problems will resolve with the attainment of successful clearing of staffs.
5. That problems blow into view as this is being attempted and should get no more attention from me than a pc's protests would in a session.
6. That we can and will win out in getting SOP Goals properly applied.
7. That sooner or later staff auditors will realize it is a simple procedure with many steps and apply it bravely.
8. That auditors will suddenly realize it does work and clear and is to be used.
9. That staff auditors will read *and* follow the bulletins and policy letters on SOP Goals.
10. That my job is to insist that it be run, whether people on staff are trained or not trained.
11. That all difficulty stems from lack of successful *technical* application and that technical, fully repaired, solves all Admin problems.
12. That we can and will get SOP Goals in proper use, not only through existing staff but new staff as they arrive.
13. That neither you nor I can Q and A with reasons it is not being run.

I am very, very earnest about these matters.

Typical goofs: Terminal started at Pre-Hav level run for a while with good TA motion. Motion of TA vanishes (as it should). Auditor non-plussed. Promptly starts Attention process and does 20 hours of it, where he should have reassessed same terminal for new level.

Auditor finds goal dips only one division. Decides it isn't enough (which it is), runs off and runs Change process.

D of P does assessment in 45 minutes (D of P shouldn't, and also it takes *me* 2 hours for a goals assessment), gives it to auditor. Auditor runs with no Model Session or rudiments for *100 hours* with pc going mad from PTPs. Never changes level. Never checks rudiments. Nobody ever re-checks for level. E-Meter ignored.

Auditor has goal, terminal, level, command, all set to roll, and D of P says, "Needle seems a little sticky, run the Attention process." SOP Goals promptly abandoned in favour of wasting 4 days of auditing.

Goofs like this are just a dramatization of wasting auditing.

It's in the bulletins. There's no reason to goof. It's just a question of *doing it!*

As soon as somebody, anybody on staff gets clear or near clear on SOP Goals, this situation will change. The more that get clear or near clear, the more effective the Org will be, the better SOP Goals will run.

My policy then is clearly to get SOP Goals run in every HGC on every pc, staff and outside, not waiting "until staff are trained" or "when we get a new Admin", or "as soon as staff auditors can read an E-Meter".

My brand-new idea on SOP Goals is "Do It". Only familiarity will beget confidence.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ph.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HCO BULLETIN OF 6 APRIL 1961

CenOCon

S.O.P. GOALS GOALS ASSESSMENT PROBLEMS SORTED OUT

A D of P confessed she could not get a goal to fall whenever an auditor did an assessment. The auditor would do an assessment, bring the pc in for D of P check, but the goal would not fall again.

This, of course, is improper assessment.

HOW TO ASSESS A GOALS LIST

The auditor should get a *full* list of goals including childhood goals, withheld goals, anti-social goals, and (by meter reaction on question) "Any goal you have not told me about".

Auditor gets every possible goal until the meter is nul on the question of goals the pc might have.

Then the auditor reads the whole list of goals to the pc and writes in divisions and fractions of divisions of fall for each. One division on the meter dial is marked "I" after the goal. One half a division is marked "1/2", etc after the written goal.

The auditor then covers the whole list again, reading them to the pc.

Pc does not have to answer verbally any of these questions, "How do you feel about (goals)?" And auditor can tell pc so. The meter does it all.

On the second read the auditor lightly crosses out all goals that get *no* response or marks in the amount each goal *now* falls.

The auditor does a third read of only those goals that fall on the second reading and marks down how much they fell by a division figure and crosses out all those goals that now no longer fall.

By this time the list will be getting pretty short. Goals keep going nul. They blow, in other words.

The auditor now does end rudiments, picks up any PTPs and ARC breaks and gives the pc a short break and copies off only those goals that still fell on a new sheet of paper.

The auditor now returns the pc to session, runs beginning rudiments and goes over this new short list noting divisions of fall for each goal on it.

It is probable that these remaining goals are all the same goal or are opposite goals (if one can't do one, he does the other sort of thing).

Once more the auditor writes down the divisions of fall as he goes over the list again with the pc.

More of these goals can be expected to fall out and go nul.

The *preliminary* goal now becomes unmistakable as having the consistent largest fall.

The pc *may* suddenly re-define this goal with great interest. That is fine. Note the re-definition or re-definitions as such. Re-check the last list and take the greatest consistent fall. Take the wording of the goal that falls most.

The auditor now has the *principal goal*. He writes it on a new piece of paper and puts the date of the assessment on it.

The auditor now starts his search for a terminal with considerable attention to what the pc says it is and finally finds one that falls as much as or more than the goal fell and that continues to fall.

The auditor now finds the Pre-Hav level of this terminal and its command and, noting all this on the new sheet, saving *all* papers in the pc record, goes to the D of P for a re-check.

This goal will always fall. This level will always fall. This command will always fall. Each right up to the instant the pc starts to get audited.

Most goals, all off-beat terminals, any incorrect level goes nul on the two-way comm incident to assessment. Only the goal, terminal, level that have to be *audited* remain.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: ph.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

CenOCon

S.O.P. GOALS
REPAIRING A CASE

An auditor, after a proper assessment, was afraid to let the TA go too tight on running any Pre-Hav level.

He ran, then, four levels worth of processes in the first two hours of S.O.P. Goals running.

The pc bogged and no further assessment for Pre-Hav level could be done.

REMEDY

An auditor must keep his pc's record in full including all assessments and even rough notes and lists.

The auditor above should return to the process of the first level he ran and run it again until the Tone Arm is fairly motionless and looks like it is going to remain so after a 20-minute additional test.

Then the auditor should take the second process he had run and run it until the Tone Arm is motionless and remains so for 20 minutes.

Then the auditor should take the third process he had already run and run it until the Tone Arm remains motionless for 20 minutes.

Then the auditor should take the fourth process and run that until the TA remains motionless for 20 minutes.

Now the auditor should find he can reassess for a new Pre-Hav level. Before doing such, however, he should cover Rudiments with great care, cleaning up every possible ARC break and getting any withhold that shows.

Just as a series of unflat levels on a terminal may have to be gone over again in sequence, so may a list of terminals previously run have to be taken up one after another if the case hangs up late in processing—as too many terminals can also be run too fast.

Further, the Attention and Change process will loosen a needle but not be used before the above remedy is done.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: ph.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 7 APRIL 1961

CenOCon
D of P
Staff Auditors
Franchise

**ASSESSING FOR GOALS AND TERMINALS
OR ELIMINATION**

As the only weak spot in S.O.P. Goals is assessing for the right goal and terminal, I have given this a lot of study and am utilizing something new I have observed that should cancel out any doubts about rightness in the auditor's mind.

Do all S.O.P. Goals steps in Model Session form. This gives you two cracks at the withholds and ARC breaks. If in doubt about how the pc is standing up to a long assessment end the session, give pc a short break and start a new session.

GOALS LIST

To do Goals, get pc to give you every goal he or she can think of. Then start using the meter to find goals and keep on finding goals until when you ask for one you get no drop on the meter. In other words, look for goals like you look for withholds.

Ask for:

Secret goals.
Withheld goals.
Anti-social goals.
Childhood goals.
Goals you've just remembered.
Silly goals.
Goals you've failed at.

Your resulting list may be as long as a hundred or more or as short as fifty. Just clear the meter on the subject. Make sure you write down every goal you get.

Now to assess the goals. Tell pc he or she doesn't have to answer aloud, and start reading the goals off to the pc. Write down how much each goal fell by divisions or fractions of divisions. Lightly cross out every goal that does not fall.

Go over list to pc again, still watching needle. Read off to pc every goal that fell before. You will find some of these have gone nul. Mark present divisions of fall for each goal. Cross out every goal that now does not fall.

Read remaining goals off to pc. Mark divisions they fell and cross out those that went nul.

Read now the goals that remain and cross out those that go nul.

Keep doing this until you have only two or three goals.

Discuss these with the pc. They may be all the same goal. Get a better definition of the goal.

Now read the remaining goals to pc and cross out the ones that go nul.

You will have at least one heavily falling goal left that does not go nul on two way comm. This of course has to be run.

This assessment is assessment of goals by elimination.

TERMINAL LIST

We have the goal. Now to get the terminal.

We get the pc to suggest terminals that represent this goal we have found.

We keep on urging the pc to give us more terminals for that goal.

We list every terminal the pc thinks up. We are not content until we have a list of about thirty possible terminals.

We now treat this list exactly as we did the goals list.

We read the list to the pc, marking divisions of fall and crossing out terminals that don't fall now.

We take the uncrossed-out terminals and read these to the pc. We mark divisions they fall and cross out those that no longer fall.

We keep doing this until we are left with one terminal.

This is our terminal. The only way it will nul is by auditing.

This is terminal assessment by elimination.

Commands are pretty easy to get.

The best command is the five-way bracket as follows:

You _____ terminal.
Terminal _____ you.
Terminal _____ another.
Another _____ terminal.
Terminal _____ terminal.

The *How* type of command is very good.

The additional data on terminals commands is to add "bad" or "badly" at the inverted levels.

On the Pre-Havingness Scale you should add WASTE below FAILED ABANDON.

You should add REGRET, SHAME and BLAME going upwards from somewhere around PROTECT. I will give you the full Pre-Hav chart in a week or two, but you need these right now.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ph.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 7 APRIL 1961
Issue II

Central Orgs
City Offices
Processing Depts
Franchise

**S.O.P. GOALS
MODIFICATION I**

On all staff and outside cases without exception the following Goals Standard Operating Procedure will be used.

S.O.P. Goals Intensives

Use Model Session throughout on assessments and all sessions.

1. Go over *rudiments* carefully.
2. Do a *Goals Assessment*.
Find out every goal the pc can recall ever having.
Make a list. Get in particular any secret goals, withheld goals, childhood goals, anti-social goals.
Go over list with a meter, as per HCO Bulletin of April 6, 1961 and later.
3. Convert goal to a *terminal*. Use HCO Bulletin of April 6, 1961 and later.
4. *Assess* this *terminal* on the *Pre-Havingness Scale* from bottom toward top. Take level that falls the most.
5. Develop an auditing command, preferably five-way bracket, that uses terminal and pre-havingness level. See HCO Bulletin of April 6, 1961 and later HCO Bulletins.
6. *Run* the *command* until tone arm becomes inactive for at least twenty minutes.
7. DELETED.
8. DELETED.
9. DELETED.
10. When the tone arm loses its action on these commands and tends to stick, no matter whether high or low arm (20 minutes is a good test), RE-ASSESS TERMINAL ON PRE-HAVINGNESS SCALE from bottom up until a new level falls.
11. Proceed as in Steps 5 to 11.
12. When the first terminal selected and the goal produce *no* needle action and seem flat, return to Goals Assessment, add any new goals pc has now, RE-ASSESS GOALS. Proceed from Steps 5 to 12.
13. When tone arm stabilizing around clear read, LOCATE HAVINGNESS PROCESS from the 36 Pre-sessions. (May be done earlier.)
14. Add the Havingness process into the processes run, using it at appropriate places (certainly at session end) while continuing Goals S.O.P.
15. When Havingness process has been used for a couple of sessions to help Goals S.O.P. find the CONFRONT PROCESS.
16. Add the Confront process into the Model Session.
17. If you run out of goals, get a NEW LIST OF GOALS from the pc and proceed as above.

LRH: ph.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 APRIL 1961

HCO Secs
Any Directors
of Security
Remimeo only for use

JOHANNESBURG SECURITY CHECK

This is the Johannesburg Security Check sheet further amplified by myself. This is the roughest Security Check in Scientology. We will call it the "Jo'burg Security Check". It does not necessarily replace other check sheets but it is probably the most thorough one we have now.

In reprinting this form use legal (foolscap) length and double-space everything except directions.

Joburg Security Check Sheet

HCO Security Form 2

Name of Person

Date

Name of Security Checker

Directions: Attempt to clear any fall observed. Mark any fall observed or any meter reaction change elicited by the question. Then write what it cleared on. Mark largely if the fall could not be cleared since this constitutes a failure to pass. Only fail somebody if there is no needle motion of any kind even with sensitivity at 16 on any question. If they are failing because it is hard to clear a question, work very thoroughly on it in an effort to clear it. In all cases complete the test.

If an important question fails to clear even after Security Checker has worked very hard to get it off, the test is flunked.

The following statement should be read or quoted to the person being Security Checked:

"We are about to begin a Security Check. We are not moralists. We are able to change people. We are not here to condemn them. While we cannot guarantee you that matters revealed in this check will be held forever secret, we can promise you faithfully that no part of it nor any answer you make here will be given to the Police or the State. No Scientologist will ever bear witness against you in Court by reason of answers to this Security Check. This Security Check is exclusively for Scientology purposes. The only ways you can fail this Security Check are to refuse to take the test, to fail to answer its questions truthfully or if you are here knowingly to injure Scientology. The only penalty attached to failure of this check is processing or our refusal to employ you or issue you a certificate, and this will only happen if we find that you are trying knowingly to injure Scientology. You can pass this test by (1) agreeing to take it, (2) answering each question truthfully and (3) not being a member of a subversive group seeking to injure Scientology."

The first questions are nul questions to determine your reaction pattern.

We will now begin—

Lie Reaction:

Are you sitting in a chair?

Are you on the moon?

Are all cats black?

Am I an ostrich?

Is this Earth?

Have you ever drunk water?

Are you holding up a tree?

Am I an elephant?

Are you a table?

Is this a Security Check?

Have you ever lived or worked under an assumed name?

Have you given me your right name?

Are you here for a different purpose than you say?

Have you ever stolen anything?

Have you ever forged someone else's signature?

Have you ever blackmailed anybody?

Have you ever been blackmailed?

Have you ever smuggled anything?

Have you ever been in prison?

Have you ever indulged in drunkenness?

Have you ever done any reckless driving?

Have you ever burglarized any place?

Have you ever embezzled money?

Have you ever assaulted anyone?

Have you ever been in jail?

Have you ever told lies in Court?

Have you ever had anything to do with Pornography?

Have you ever committed Arson?

Have you ever been a Drug Addict?

Have you ever peddled Dope?

Have you had any dealings with stolen goods?

Do you have a Police Record?

Have you ever raped anyone?

Have you ever been involved in an abortion?

Have you assisted in any abortion?

Have you ever committed adultery?

Have you ever practised Homosexuality?

Have you ever had intercourse with a member of your family?

Have you ever been sexually unfaithful?

Have you ever practised Sodomy?

Have you ever consistently made a practice of sexual perversion?
Have you ever slept with a member of a race of another colour?
Have you ever committed culpable homicide?
Have you ever bombed anything?
Have you ever murdered anyone?
Have you ever kidnapped anyone?
Have you ever done any illicit Diamond buying?
Have you ever betrayed anyone for money?
Have you ever threatened anyone with a fire-arm?
Have you been in illegal possession of fire-arms?
Have you ever been paid for giving evidence?
Have you ever destroyed something belonging to someone else?
Have you ever been a spy for an Organization?
Have you ever had anything to do with Communism or been a Communist?
Have you ever been a newspaper reporter?
Have you ever had intercourse while under the influence of drugs?
Have you ever had intercourse while under the influence of alcohol?
Have you ever used drugs or blackmail to procure sex?
Have you ever ill-treated children?
Have you ever taken money for giving anyone sexual intercourse?
Have you ever had any connection with a brothel?
Have you ever had anything to do with a baby farm?
Have you ever been a spy for the Police?
Are you afraid of the Police?
Have you ever done anything you are afraid the Police may find out?
Have you ever falsified the books in any firm you worked for?
Have you ever done anything your Mother would be ashamed to find out?
How could you help yourself generally?
What represents yourself?
How could you help your family?
What represents your family?
How do you feel about sex?
What represents (the Org (others (a group to you?
How could you help (the Org? (others? (a group?
How could you help mankind?
Have you ever controlled people?
How do you feel about being controlled?
What represents mankind to you?
How could you help animals and plants?

What represents animals and plants to you?
How could you help material things?
What represents Matter, Energy, Space and Time to you?
How could you help Spirits?
What represents Spirits to you?
How could you help God or Infinity?
What represents God or Infinity to you?
What is Communism?
Do you feel Communism has some good points?
Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?
Have you ever been a member of any group with similar ideals as the Communist Party?
Do you know any Communist personally?
Have you ever injured Dianetics or Scientology?
Have you ever committed any overts on a Scientology Organization?
Have you ever stolen anything from a Scientology Org?
Do you have any overts on LRH?
Have you ever had unkind thoughts about LRH?
Do you have any overts on Mary Sue?
Have you ever had any unkind thoughts about Mary Sue?
Have you ever injured any Scientologists?
Have you ever had any unkind thoughts about Scientologists?
Have you ever betrayed Scientology?
Do you know of any secret plans against Scientology?
Have you ever taken money to injure Scientology?
Have you ever used Dianetics or Scientology to force sex upon someone?
Do you know of any plans to injure a Scientology Organization?
Are you upset about this Security Check?

Passed

Failed

Why?

Signed by Examiner

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:lmw.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

S.O.P. GOALS
ERRORS

The primary sources of wasted time on S.O.P. Goals and the only real errors that can be made are as follows:

1. Bad Technical approach.
Remedy: Be expert on TRs and Model Session and E-Meter.
2. Improper Assessments.
Remedy: Assessment by Elimination.
3. Failure to flatten a level before re-assessing for a new level.
Remedy: Run a level until the Tone Arm has remained still for 20 minutes.
“Still” is defined as only one-eighth of a division of motion on the Tone Arm dial—e.g., an eighth of the distance from 4 to 5.
4. Failure to detect and handle a PTP.
Remedy: Do rudiments carefully watching meter needle for falls, not listening to what pc says.
5. Failure to detect and handle an ARC break.
Remedy: Do rudiments carefully and often.
6. Failure to detect and pull a withhold.
Remedy: Do rudiments carefully.

Honest, there aren't any more difficulties than the above.

I doubt any other errors could be introduced than the above that would keep a case from moving.

In all auditors' conferences and in all training, these things must be stressed.

Know the TRs.

Know Model Session.

Know the E-Meter.

Do proper assessments by the meter. Use elimination for goals, terminals.

Choose the right level by the amount of fall of the needle.

Run the right amount of processing by the Tone Arm.

Inspect rudiments often. Detect and handle all PTPs, ARC breaks and Withholds.

There are no other barriers to success in S.O.P. Goals.

But do the above wrong and you can add hundreds of hours to clearing.

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 12 APRIL 1961

CenOCon

TRAINING DRILLS

These “TRs” are those released to the 18th ACC. They are in their original form. They are the correct drills for use in all instruction.

L. RON HUBBARD

NUMBER: TR 0

NAME: Confronting Preclear. COMMANDS: None.

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

PURPOSE: To train student to confront a preclear with auditing only or with nothing.

TRAINING STRESS: Have student and coach sit facing each other, neither making any conversation or effort to be interesting. Have them sit and look at each other and say and do nothing for some hours. Student must not speak, fidget, giggle or be embarrassed or anaten. Coach may speak only if student goes anaten (dope off). Student is confronting the body, thetan and bank of preclear.

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”.

NUMBER: TR 1

NAME: Dear Alice.

COMMANDS: A phrase (with the “he saids” 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.

PURPOSE: To teach the student to send an intention from himself to a preclear in one unit of time without vias.

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.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London, April 1956, to teach the communication formula to new students.

NUMBER: TR 2

NAME: Acknowledgements.

COMMANDS: The coach reads lines from “Alice in Wonderland” omitting “He saids” and the student thoroughly acknowledges them. The coach repeats any line he feels was not truly acknowledged.

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

PURPOSE: To teach student that an acknowledgement is a method of controlling preclear communication and that an acknowledgement is a full stop.

TRAINING STRESS: Teach student to acknowledge exactly what was said so that 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 acknowledgements 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.

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.

NUMBER: TR 3

NAME: Duplicative Question.

COMMANDS: “Do fish swim?” or “Do birds fly?” Communication bridge between.

POSITION: Student and coach seated a comfortable distance apart.

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; and to teach him how to shift from one question to another with a communication bridge rather than an abrupt change.

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. To insist on communication bridge when question is changed. Even though the same question is asked, it is asked as though it had never occurred to anyone before. To teach student that a communication bridge consists of getting three agreements—one agreement to end this question, second agreement to continue session in general and maintain ARC, third agreement to begin a new question. Teach student that preclear is part of these agreements. To teach student never to vary question or shift question or command without a bridge.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956, to overcome variations and sudden changes in sessions.

NUMBER: TR 4

NAME: Preclear Originations.

COMMANDS: The student runs “Do fish swim?” or “Do birds fly?” on coach. Coach answers but now and then makes startling comments from a prepared list given by Instructor. Student must handle originations to satisfaction of coach.

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

PURPOSE: To teach a student not to be tongue-tied or startled or thrown off session by originations of preclear and to maintain ARC with preclear throughout an origination.

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 coach into better handling.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956, to teach auditors to stay in session when preclear dives out.

NUMBER: TR 5

NAME: Hand Mimicry.

COMMANDS: All Commands are by motions of one or two hands. The auditor makes a simple hand motion, holding his hand or hands in the final position. The coach bobs his head as having received it. The coach then, mirror-wise, makes the same motion with his hand or hands. The student then acknowledges. If the motion was not correctly done by coach the student acknowledges doubtfully, then repeats the motion to the coach. If the coach does it well, student thanks coach by shaking own two hands together (prize fighter fashion). Keep motions simple. Student must always be able to duplicate own motions.

POSITION: Student and coach are seated facing each other at a short distance, coach’s knees inside student’s.

PURPOSE: To educate student that *verbal* commands are not entirely necessary. To make student physically telegraph an intention. To show student necessity of having preclear obey commands.

TRAINING STRESS: Accuracy of student repeating own commands. Teaching student to give preclear wins. Teaching student that an intention is different from words.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956, from the principles of body mimicry developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Camden, N.J., in 1954.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ph.bh
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Remimeo
All Checksheets
Franchise

HCO BULLETIN OF 17 APRIL 1961

TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED

(Reissued 5 January 71, substituting word “supervisors” for “instructors”, adding the words “a command” to TR 3 and substituting the words “and coach’s remarks about self as pc” in TR 4 in place of “and remarks aimed only at the student.”)

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 the HPA/HCA, BScn/HCS 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 SOP Goals stem directly from inability to do the TRs.
5. A student who has not mastered his TRs will not master anything further.
6. SOP Goals will not function in the presence of bad TRs. The preclear is already being overwhelmed by process velocity and cannot bear up to TR flubs without ARC breaks.

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

These TRs given here should be put in use at once in all auditor training, in Academy and HGC and in the future should never be relaxed. Seven weeks on a Comm Course until he does the TRs perfectly lets the student receive at least one week’s training in the eight. A poor Comm Course in one week can wipe out the whole eight weeks.

NUMBER: TR 0 Revised 1961

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 *hold* a position three feet in front of a preclear, to BE there and not do anything else but BE there.

TRAINING STRESS: Have student and coach sit facing each other, neither making any conversation or effort to be interesting. Have them sit and look at each other and say and do nothing for some hours. Student must not speak, fidget, giggle or be embarrassed or anaten. It will be found the student tends to confront WITH a body part, rather than just confront, or to use a system of confronting rather than just BE there. The drill is misnamed if Confront means to DO something to the pc. The whole action is to accustom an auditor to BEING THERE three feet in front of a preclear without apologizing or moving or being startled or embarrassed or defending self. After a student has become able to just sit there for two hours “bull baiting” can begin. Anything added to BEING THERE is 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).

Supervisors should have coaches let student have some wins (coach does not mention these) and then, by gradient stress, get the coaches to start in on the student to invite flunks and then flunk them. This is “bull baiting”. The student flunks each time he or she reacts, no matter how minutely, to being baited.

This TR should be taught rough-rough-rough and not left until the student can do it. Training is considered satisfactory at this level only if the student can BE three feet in front of a person without flinching, concentrating or confronting with, regardless of what the confronted person says or does.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington in March 1957 to train students to confront preclears in the absence of social tricks or conversation and to overcome obsessive compulsions to be “interesting”. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard April 1961 on finding that SOP Goals required for its success a much higher level of technical skill than earlier processes.

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 saids” 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 1961

NAME: Acknowledgements.

PURPOSE: To teach student that an acknowledgement is a method of controlling preclear communication and that an acknowledgement is a full stop.

COMMANDS: The coach reads lines from “Alice in Wonderland” omitting “He saids” and the student thoroughly acknowledges them. 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 acknowledgements 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.

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 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 by L. Ron Hubbard.

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 question, 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 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 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 had a comm bridge as part of its training but this is now part of and is taught in Model Session and is no longer needed at this level. Auditors have been frail in getting their questions answered. This TR was redesigned to improve that frailty.

NUMBER: TR 4 Revised 1961

NAME: Preclear originations.

PURPOSE: To teach a student not to be tongue-tied or startled or thrown off session by originations of preclear and to maintain ARC with preclear throughout an origination.

COMMANDS: The student runs “Do fish swim?” or “Do birds fly?” on coach. Coach answers but now and then makes startling comments from a prepared list given by Instructor. Student must handle originations to satisfaction of coach.

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

TRAINING STRESS: The student is taught to hear 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 up on one TR forever or to be so tough at start student goes into a decline.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.cden
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 23 APRIL 1961

Central Orgs
Post Staff B. Board

CHANGE PROCESSES

The following telegram has been sent to Peter Williams, now instructing the Australian ACC. It is valid for all special briefing courses and HGCs as of receipt:

LT=
SIEN TOLOGY MELBOURNE=

PETER TELL CLASS AND USE ON THEM AND ESPECIALLY HGC
DEFINITION OF RELEASE ALL VERSIONS CHANGE PROCESS FLAT ON
TONE ARM STOP ON ALL LAGGARD CASES ALL HGC CASES FLATTEN
TONE ARM MOTION ON CHANGE BEFORE RUNNING SOP GOALS STOP
CHANGE PROCESS IS LOCATED ON AND CHECKED BY EMETER THINK
GET THE IDEA DICHOTOMIES FIVE OR TEN COMMAND BRACKETS
ANYTHING THAT WILL ANSWER UP AND RUN STOP WHEN ONE VERSION
OF CHANGE HAS NO MORE TA MOTION TRY ANOTHER VERSION UNTIL
ALL VERSIONS FLAT STOP THIS IS A BREAKTHROUGH AS IMPORTANT AS
SOP GOALS BEST TO EVERYONE=

RON
+++++++

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jl.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[At the beginning of the above telegram, the letters "LT" mean night letter, a form of cable, which travels overnight (per HCO PL 9 August 1966, *Use of Telex Machine*, OEC Volume 1, page 228).]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 25 APRIL 1961

Assn Sec
HCO Sec
D of P
All Staff Auditors

Mimeo Directions: Mimeo whole report as a Policy Letter.
Then mimeo the form separately for D of P. Then have it
letterpressed on flimsy paper.

D OF P FORM

CHECK TYPE ONE

(Rewritten, Modifies HCO Policy Letter March 31, 1961)

In view of improved technology and the fact that I've found there aren't enough questions to produce a tone arm shift in D of P's Check Type One, I have rewritten it as follows. Destroy the first issue of it and use this Check Type One instead.

CHECK TYPE ONE

HCO WW Form CT1

Pre-Intensive interview and Pre-Goals Assessment Check.

Before the preclear is audited in an intensive where SOP Goals may be employed the following check sheet is filled out by the D of P and passed by pc before a Goals assessment is made.

Name of PcDate

Location of HGC.....

The Pc is put on the Meter.

TA Reading.....Sensitivity Reading.....

The following statement is read to the pc: "You are about to receive Scientology Auditing. I am(name) Director of Processing of the Hubbard Guidance Centre. Your auditor's name is All I am going to do here is check your case. I am not auditing you. Your auditor will do that. We are your friends. We want you to make the fastest possible gains. Now please answer the following questions."

TANeedle Character

Have you ever received mental treatment of any kind?

TANeedle Character

How do you feel about help?.....

TANeedle Character

Do you wish to attain the state of release?

TANeedle Character

Does any of your family oppose Scientology?.....

TANeedle Character

How do you feel about control?.....

TANeedle Character

Are you prepared to answer your auditor truthfully when he or she asks you questions about your past?.....

TANeedle Character

Would you be embarrassed if we found out all about you?.....

TANeedle Character

Do you realize you will prevent yourself from being released if you withhold information from your auditor?.....

TANeedle Character

Do you realize that if you indulge in alcohol at any time during the intensive you will slow down the results?.....

TANeedle Character

Do you understand that if you get insufficient sleep each night you will have a harder time in processing?
 TA Needle Character

Is it clear to you that you should not stay with antagonistic persons or restimulative people while getting your processing?
 TA Needle Character

Character Do you know you should eat breakfast each morning before being audited?
 TA Needle Character

Do you understand you could add three hundred percent or more to the time it takes to clear you by withholding data from your auditor?.....
 TA Needle Character

Do you know we will do our best for you?
 TA Needle Character

Are you aware that you are one of the people selected to become clear?.....
 TA Needle Character

Will you cooperate with us in every way you can to achieve that goal?.....
 TA Needle Character

“That is the last of these questions. Is there anything you would care to know before we end this check out?
 TA Needle Character

Thank you. Best of luck in your auditing. You may go now.”

Adjudication

Total TA Motion (TA Dial Divs)_____ Average Character of needle_____

If average sensitivity knob was above 1.5 to get a 3rd of a dial drop (regardless of TA motion), run a Change Process.

If answers didn't make sense, run CCHs.

If needle was sticky and Tone Arm moved less than 1 division of TA dial during questioning, run Change Process.

If TA moved at least 1 division of TA dial, begin SOP Goals.

If puzzled or in doubt, run a Change Process.

Recommendation to Auditor

CCHs _____
 Change Process _____
 SOP Goals _____

If CCHs, return for check without pc. Run until pc is intelligible. If Change Process, run all but 1/8 of a TA division *out* of the TA motion and then return for ok to do SOP Goals before starting on SOP Goals.

If SOP Goals, do all Assessments and return for Check Type Two when done.

SignedD of P.

Use new check type one sheet for every D of P Check on above.

Include this sheet in pc folder.

LRH :jl.rd
 Copyright © 1961
 by L. Ron Hubbard
 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 27 APRIL 1961

CenOCon
Franchise

CHANGE PROCESSES

I have been studying change processes in relation to the tendency of the pc to alter-is commands and have found that if a pc is bad off on change (which includes about eighty per cent of the pcs you get), he cannot run another auditing command cleanly as he never really runs the command but runs something else. Therefore the only thing that can be run is a change process and it must be run until motion is removed from the Tone Arm. (This does not mean a "stuck" Tone Arm, but a motion of about one-sixteenth of a division on the Tone Arm dial.)

DISCOVERY

What has made the change process so important is a recent discovery I made that resisted change is the basis of all mass in the physical universe. Resisted change is the basis of every stuck point on the track.

There are probably dozens of versions of change processes.

The safest way to dope out what change process to run on the pc is to read it on the needle and get each different command of the whole process to fall properly, and then to run whatever has been figured out.

SAFE RULES FOR CHANGE PROCESS

Run at least two ways of flow.

Run positive and negative change.

Run a version that is real to the pc, with each command cleared on the meter (to get each command to fall before actually using it). This is meter clearing the command. It's new.

Examples:

"Think" vs. "Get the idea of" can be sorted out on the meter. The right one will fall. The wrong one won't or will fall less.

Get the flows sorted out with commands.

Process Versions:

"Get the idea of changing yourself."

"Get the idea of another changing himself."

"Get the idea of changing another."

"Get the idea of another trying to change you."

"Get the idea of another trying to change another."

"Get the idea of not changing yourself."

"Get the idea of another not changing himself."

"Get the idea of not changing another."

"Get the idea of another not changing you."

"Get the idea of another not changing another."

Another Version:

"How have you changed another?"

"How have you failed to change another?"

Another Process:

“How have you tried to change yourself?”
“How have you tried to change another?”
“How has another tried to change you?”
“How has another tried to change himself?”
“How has another tried to change another?”

Another Process:

“Think of something changing.”
“Think of something failing to change.”
“Think of changing somebody.”
“Think of failing to change somebody.”

Another Process:

“Get the idea of changing another.”
“Get the idea of failing to change another.”

Another Process:

“Recall a change. “
“Recall a failure to change.”

SUMMARY

There are many many versions of change. To get the best result, adapt a process to the pc. Before leaving a change process you have been running, because motion has come out of the Tone Arm, try to find another change process that will get the motion going again.

Change does not particularly cut down havingness, but after a while you can scout the pc's havingness process out and use it from time to time during and at the end of a session. The reason change does wreck havingness is that resistance to change prevents the pc from having, and as the ideas of change are sorted out the pc has increased havingness anyway, similar to O/W which is a havingness process.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jl.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 30 APRIL 1961R
REVISED 25 NOVEMBER 1973
REISSUED 19 SEPTEMBER 1974
(Only change is signature)


Remimeo

CHANGE BRACKETS AND COMMANDS

(Only changes are correction of typo errors whereby
“not” was omitted from commands 8, 9 and 10 of the
15 Way Bracket and inclusion of the terminal assessment.)

The basic commands of CHANGE form a series of brackets.

The basic curve of change compares to the CYCLE OF ACTION.



Therefore the basic versions of CHANGE would consist of *Change*, *No Change* and *Failed Change*.

The Standard bracket is a five way bracket. The general form of this is as follows:

You Terminal
Terminal..... You
TerminalAnother
AnotherTerminal
TerminalTerminal

Change as a five way bracket would be somebody or something as the terminal (whichever falls most on a meter) and:

Assess: Somebody _____
 Something _____

5 Way Bracket

(Use whichever gave best read above.)

1. “How have you changed something?”
2. “How has something tried to change you?”
3. “How has something changed another?”
4. “How has another changed something?”
5. “How has something changed?”

or:

1. “How have you changed somebody?”
2. “How has somebody tried to change you?”
3. “How has somebody changed another?”
4. “How has another changed somebody?”
5. “How has somebody changed self?”

15 Way Bracket

(something or somebody)

1. "How have you changed something?"
2. "How has something tried to change you?"
3. "How has something changed another?"
4. "How has another changed something?"
5. "How has something changed?"
6. "What have you not changed?"
7. "What has not changed you?"
8. "What has not changed something?"
9. "What has something not changed?"
10. "What has not changed self?"
11. "What have you failed to change?"
12. "What has failed to change you?"
13. "What has something failed to change?"
14. "What has failed to change something?"
15. "What has failed to change self?"

The above commands are run consecutively as one process. This process is the basic Release Process.

Another version:

1. "What change have you avoided?"
 2. "What change have you sought?"
 3. "What no change have you avoided?"
 4. "What no change have you sought?"
 5. "What failed change have you avoided?"
 6. "What failed change have you sought?"
-

Another version:

1. "Recall a change."
 2. "Recall a no-change."
 3. "Recall a failed change."
-

Another version:

Sort out "Think" or "Get the idea" by the meter's reaction. Use one that produces the most fall.

1. "Think (get the idea) of a change."
2. "Think of a no-change."
3. "Think of a failed change."

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1961, 1973, 1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

E-METER ESSENTIALS

by

L. Ron Hubbard

Published May 1961

E-Meter Essentials by L. Ron Hubbard was published in England in May 1961, just as the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course was starting at Saint Hill Manor in East Grinstead, Sussex, England. In May 1961, L. Ron Hubbard said of the book, "It covers everything I have discovered about the *OPERATION* of the E-Meter in the past ten years." It is Volume I of the Clearing Series.

It is a concise statement of the essential points concerning the E-Meter which must be known to an auditor, including the facts that "There is no known way to clear anyone without using a meter," and "The only way known to learn to use an E-Meter is to use one, handle one, practice with one."

Ron tells the reader what the parts of the E-Meter are and how they work; and what all the needle and tone arm actions and reactions look like and what is going on in the preclear when they occur, as well as what auditing action is indicated when one occurs. There are sections on the oddities and frailties of E-Meters.

As a bonus, there is data on the use of an E-Meter in Security Checking, locating Havingness and Confront processes, and in doing Assessments, particularly in S.O.P. Goals.

32 pages, one photograph, soft-cover with comb binding, index. Available from your nearest Scientology Organization or Mission, or direct from the publishers: Scientology Publications Organization, Jernbanegade 6, 1608 Copenhagen V, Denmark; or Church of Scientology Publications Organization U.S., 2723 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California, 90026, U.S.A.

HCO BULLETIN OF 4 MAY 1961

Franchise

PROCESS LEVELS NECESSITY FOR TRAINING

Here is some good news and some bad:

After considerable study of the use of SOP Goals by Auditors, it is apparent that the technology, while very effective in the strictly supervised auditing of HGCs is beyond the average training level of the field at this time in TRs, E-Meter and Model Session.

This means that we can do Releasing at once but we are confronted by an enormous retraining programme before broad field auditor clearing can begin. But great advances can be made on cases now with the Change Processes.

My findings indicate that the chief reason auditors fail to handle the E-Meter expertly is to be found in the TR failures, mainly confront.

SOP Goals, to be effective, demands a precision of auditing skill common only in HGCs. SOP Goals is pure dynamite to cases, but it becomes pure backfire when used by a poorly trained auditor.

SOP Goals works too fast to admit of bad technical application. Before SOP Goals becomes effective it must be applied with perfect technical precision.

However, there is no cause here for alarm because concurrent with SOP Goals, I have made another discovery which was released in last week's HCO Bulletin, *Change Processes*, which wrap up (really and truly) all cases from "answers intelligibly" to Release.

Thus we have a simple basic process which takes a preclear to Release, a basic accurate test for Release (all brackets of change nul on the needle), and another full process package from Release to Clear in SOP Goals.

This gives us the most orderly division of training levels we have ever had and rather smooths out what we do, where we go and why.

HCA /HPA LEVEL

Training to perfection in the use of TRs, Model Session and E-Meters and CCHs.

One Basic Process taught: Change Processes.

Goal of Auditing: Release.

Level of training for HPA/HCA: To accomplish without exception the state of Release in all pcs audited.

B. Scn/HCS

Training to perfection in the use of the E-Meter in SOP Goals.

One SOP taught: SOP Goals.

Goal of Auditing: Clear.

Level of training of B.ScN/HCS: To accomplish clearing in persons who have already obtained a State of Release.

D. Scn/HGA

Training in theory and practice of Dianetics and Scientology and the use of advanced meters.

Processes Taught: Theta Clearing.

Goal of Auditing: Theta Clear.

Level of training of D.ScN/HGA: To accomplish Theta Clearing in persons who have already attained the State of Clear.

The levels of Release and Clear are established facts process-wise as of now.

The level of Theta Clear and Advanced meters is still under research.

I have to hand adequate evidence now to see that auditors can and *will* audit Change Processes easily and successfully with enormously swift results on pcs.

When all Change Processes are flat on a pc, the State of Release is easily tested and observed.

When SOP Goals is flat on a pc you have a Clear.

Apparently SOP Goals should not be run on a pc by an average auditor until all Change Processes are flat, since many pcs don't do the actual commands until change is flat.

Thus I am very happy to be able to tell you of lots of wins and orderly progress ahead even if I have to warn you not to run SOP Goals until your pc is a Release and you are a perfect technician.

Any auditor should use all the Change Processes he wishes on a pc, and until Change is fully flat, and until the auditor is perfectly trained in TRs, Model Session and the E-Meter, no SOP Goals should be run.

I hope you are happy with this news. I am.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jl.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

7 May 1961—13 December 1966

Saint Hill Manor was acquired by Ron in Spring 1959. It is a grand building nestling on the side of the hill and is surrounded by some 57 acres of its own beautiful grounds, comprising park land, meadows, woods, shrubberies, swimming pool and tennis courts. In addition there is a lake covering an area of 2 1/2 acres. The whole is set in the delightful County of Sussex, renowned for its lush green grass downs and the Ashdown Forest.

Ron wanted a quiet place where he could carry on with his researches, and from which HCO WW could handle the world-wide concerns of Scientology. He needed time for this research, but didn't want to deny Scientologists his personal instruction and, as has always been his custom, he wanted to make known his discoveries as soon as they had been unearthed. He had already taught one ACC at Saint Hill—so it was possible to have students there, and the idea of a continuous course was feasible.

Thus on March 24, 1961, the doors of the Manor were opened to the first Saint Hill Special Briefing Course students, marking the beginning of Saint Hill as a Service Organization.

For the next five and a half years Ron lectured regularly to the students. In the following pages and volumes, points where these lectures occurred are indicated.

** 6105C07 SHSBC-1 E-Meter Talk and Demo

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 11 MAY 1961

Franchise

E-METER HORROR

Dick Halpern reports from the 22nd American ACC that out of 48 students, many trained on earlier ACCs, 48 did *not* know what FALLS, RISES or THETA BOPS *were* or *meant* on the E-Meter.

The moment one starts on SOP Goals it becomes painfully apparent when he or she cannot do TRs, Model Session or read an E-Meter. SOP Goals works when one knows it and these items.

I have just written a book, *E-Meter Essentials*, which details these things. You better study it.

I am opening up Unit One of Academies for retread on TRs, METER and Model Session.

Special Briefing courses will be taught.

A very special clearing course is being taught at Saint Hill.

Every effort is being made to enable you to release and clear *pcs fast*. *You* have to make the effort too to avail yourself of this data.

IF you know TRs, MODEL SESSION, METER, CHANGE PROCESSES and SOP Goals you *can* Release and Clear Anyone. We're proving it daily.

Auditors who can't run or read a meter (100% of the 22nd American, remember, that had old-timers in the majority, did not know how to read a meter) can't release or clear anyone.

Auditors who can't do TR 0 Revised 1961 aren't enough there to read a meter. (An actual fact.)

Auditors who make technical flubs on SOP Goals wind up wasting 66 2/3 of the auditing time. (We just proved that, too.)

We've got the tools. They're easily available. Let's go.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jl.cden
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HCO BULLETIN OF 11 MAY 1961

Central Orgs
Franchise Holders

URGENT

**ASSESSMENT BY ELIMINATION
S.O.P. GOALS**

Enough errors are being made by auditors in assessing to prevent clearing.

A correct assessment could require ten hours of time. It could not be done in less than three hours. I myself take now about five hours.

A correct assessment means a chance to clear. *An incorrect assessment* means an infinity of auditing without clearing.

All failures to clear are:

1. Incorrect assessment or
2. (At this time) An incomplete Pre-Hav Scale (which I am completing in a workable form and which includes all common verbs in the English language properly arranged in a primary and secondary scale).

THE RIGHT WAY

The right way to do an assessment is:

1. Know and pass and be able to do TR 0 and TRs 1 to 4 perfectly;
2. Know an E-Meter perfectly;
3. Know Model Session perfectly;
4. Know how to set up a case for a Goals Assessment;
5. Know Assessment by Elimination.

Given these, you can assess. Failing these you confront not a pc but an infinity of hours on one pc.

These can be gotten at Saint Hill in Special Briefing Courses and in HPA Retread, one or another of them.

ASSESSMENT BY ELIMINATION

Do Assessment in Model Session Form.

1. Do a full list of goals on the pc.

He can write out his goals before coming to session or the auditor can write them all, a rather lengthy business.

Number each goal, leaving a short space in the left-hand margin.

Add goals until the question “Have you had another goal?” no longer produces a reaction on the needle of the meter. Add goals until you have a nul needle on the questions of Secret goals, Childhood goals, Anti-Social goals, Embarrassing goals, “Goals you haven’t told me” and “What would have to happen to make you know Scientology works?” Get, finally, a nul needle for every category mentioned here.

Only *now* do you have a Goals List.

If you for any reason feel you do not have a complete Goals List, don’t go any further. Complete the list.

2. Select the Goal.

This is entirely a matter of E-Metering.

Assessment by Elimination is used.

There will remain, when you finish, just *one* goal that reacts on the needle of the meter. Don’t bother why only *one* remains active. But if you have *two* remain or none, go back to Step 1 above and complete your Goals List *again* and start Step 2 all over again. Be thorough.

You tell the pc he doesn’t have to answer unless he wants to. You look at your *meter needle*. You ignore the Tone Arm. You don’t have to look at the pc all the time but don’t fail to glance at him now and then.

Read the Goals List you compiled to the pc. Take one level at a time. By repeating the goal over and over (Repeater Technique, Book One) try to make any reaction of the *needle* elicited by this repeating go *nul*. This only applies if the needle changes characteristic because you are saying the goal. If the reading of the goal does not produce a Rock Slam, a Fall or a Theta Bop after several repetitions of the goal, put an X in front of the goal on the Goals List, designating it as *nul*. That ends that goal. The X eliminates it for now from the list.

If, after eight or a dozen repetitions, the goal still falls, rock slams or theta bops constantly or sporadically, mark a slant / in front of it. This means it is still on the list and is not nul. To the right of the written goal you may note “Rock Slam” or “Theta Bop” if they occurred. No need to mark fall or divisions of fall in Assessment by Elimination.

IGNORE ALL RISES OF THE NEEDLE. This is *meaningless* on a Goals Assessment.

Cover the whole Goals List in this way.

Add any changed goals or new goals the pc may give you to the Goals List.

Do end Rudiments.

Give the pc a short break.

Restart the session.

Do beginning Rudiments (and in the body of the session, clean up any occurring ARC breaks as in Rudiments).

Read, as before, the goals now marked slant / on the Goals List. Try to nul each one of these by repeating it eight or a dozen times.

When a goal goes nul, add the other bar to the slant, making an X. That eliminates it as a goal.

General Rule: On any goal, if in doubt about the needle reaction, leave the goal on the list. Don't strike a goal off with an X unless you're sure it's nul.

When the remaining goals on the Goals List have been covered, return to the top again and try to nul those that now remain, one by one, still using Repeater Technique.

Go over the list again and again until you have left only *one* goal that changes the characteristic of the needle.

3. Prove up the Goal.

Take several goals already nulled on the needle and read them, occasionally, amongst this read, also reading out the *one* goal. Be sure it continues to fall.

If it goes nul,

- (a) Check for ARC breaks.
- (b) Ask for any new goals and list them.
- (c) Cover the whole Goals List again, making sure they are all nul.

See if the pc's whole list compares nicely, here and there, to the goal you have found. Does this goal, in other words, exist also, faintly, in other goals.

See if the pc is deeply interested in the goal found. If not, re-do your assessment from the beginning.

4. Do a Terminals List.

Taking the pc's one goal, now found and proved, compile a Terminals List for it. "What beingness would fulfill this goal?" "What terminal would this be?"

Write at least thirty terminals down. Use a Hartrampff's Vocabularies and help the pc if he wants you to. Put down every terminal he thinks of or agrees to. Don't put down or push what he says wouldn't be it.

Run this sort of question to nul on the meter: "Would any other person, beingness, terminal fit with this goal?" Only when the needle goes nul do you end the Terminals List. *Don't* end it until you have exhausted every possible terminal for this goal.

It is *not* enough that a terminal is included in the goal. If the goal is "I want to be a jockey" it is highly improbable that "jockey" is the exact terminal. You get two or three dozen beingnesses that add up to jockey. A rider. A horseman. A steeplechaser. A racer. A man. A human being. A horse pilot. Etc, etc. Take anything the pc says it might be. Write them down. Now dig for more. And more. Look it up. Suggest things but only put them down if pc buys.

Remember, a pc is most stupid on the point of goal and even more stupid trying to think of its terminal. So help the pc. And get a very complete list.

5. Assess for the Terminal by Elimination.

Using Repeater Technique, repeat the terminal enough times to make it go nul or not on the needle (eight or twelve repetitions eliminates most of them from the meter).

Put an X in front of the terminal if it goes nul. Put a slant / in front of the terminal if it continues to react. Mark Rock Slam or Theta Bop after the terminal if it won't go nul and gets these reactions.

You will have several terminals left. Ask the pc for any new ones and write them down.

Cover the list items marked slant / again. Try to nul each one as before, including any new ones.

Those that cease to react, eliminate with an X as before. Finish the list reading.

Add any new terminals the pc may now have.

Eliminate more terminals with a new reading and Repeater Technique as before.

Add any new terminals.

Continue this action as above until the pc is left with just one terminal that reacts on the meter.

If in doubt, do the whole Terminals Assessment List again, putting in new Xs, /s and Xs, according to whether they vanish off the needle or stay active as you go by, repeating each one several times.

End up with only *one* terminal active on the needle, all others nul. This is *the terminal*.

6. Prove the Terminal.

Clean up rudiments.

Say the pc's *one* goal as found from the Goals List to the pc several times and note its reaction on the needle.

Say a nul goal to the pc to quiet the needle until it does quiet down.

Say the pc's *one* terminal for that goal several times. Note its reaction.

The terminal must react as much as the goal.

The terminal needle action must be the same as the goal's needle action.

Example: Goal got 5 divisions of fall on the needle dial. Then the terminal must get at least 5 divisions of fall on the needle dial.

If this is true, you are right.

If this is not true go back to I and do a whole Goals Assessment again. It will save time in auditing if you do.

Example: If the goal rock slams, the terminal must rock slam just as much as the goal to be right.

Note: Theta bops turn into falls. A theta bopping goal, in assessment, usually becomes a falling goal. In short the goal wouldn't be expected to continue to theta bop. But if it does now, the terminal must also theta bop. But both could turn into falls instead.

7. Assess for Pre-Hav Level.

Take the terminal. Start from the bottom of the original Pre-Hav Scale.

Take the first heavy fall you find as you go up and run it.

For the new Pre-Hav Scale when issued:

Take the terminal and go up the levels of the Primary Scale until you find the best fall on one climb. Move over into the Secondary Scale and go from bottom to top once. Take the best fall or reaction found.

Mark down the Pre-Hav Level for the terminal.

WARNING: Do not use Repeater Technique on the Pre-Hav Scale. Say the level only once. Go up only once.

If you go up once and, wherever the needle starts to rise, go down the scale again once (no repeater either way) all but one level usually eliminates. You may not find it safe to do this. Biggest needle reaction is good enough.

You can run a wrong Pre-Hav Level without damage and still clear. You *can't* run a wrong goal and a wrong terminal and still clear a pc.

A *perfect* Pre-Hav assessment finds the level that reacts as much as goal and terminal. But Repeater Technique on many levels can upset a case!

8. Choose a Command.

Assess for these: Think, Get the Idea, How, What, Have done, Could do. Take those that fall most and make up a 5 or 10 way bracket command.

9. Audit the pc's terminal and level.

WARNING: Audit on the Tone Arm not the needle.

WARNING: Run as a complete process as long as the Tone Arm shows motion. Don't run a still Tone Arm less than or more than twenty minutes. If it's still, change, reassess the same terminal on the Pre-Hav Scale, get new commands for the new level and continue the auditing.

10. Nul all Pre-Hav Levels that react on assessment on the first terminal.

11. Find new terminals if any for same goal and run as above.

12. Find new goals when old goal and all terminals that react for it are nul on the Pre-Hav Scale (old or new Pre-Hav). Proceed to assess as before just as though case was being started all over again.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jljh
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURE
12 May 1961

** 6105C12 SHSBC-2 Assessment

ASSESSING FOR S.O.P. GOALS IMPROVED

It is vital to get an absolutely correct assessment of the pre-clear, first on goal and then on terminal, in order to make S.O.P. Goals work. There is no such thing as a nearly correct assessment. The assessment must be perfect.

Preparation for Assessment

Preparation for S.O.P. Goals as standard practice now is to do a Joburg Security Check and clear all levels completely. Run the pc on the Pre-Havingness Scale in general without terminal if the tone arm seems stuck. This is done by assessing on the Pre-Hav Scale for a level and then run a five-way bracket, probably "think" or "get the idea" whichever falls most. Do the Joburg but omit the Pre-Hav run if the pc drops a third of a dial on a can squeeze without increasing the sensitivity knob of the meter. If the sensitivity must be increased to two or above after the Joburg is done in order to get a third of a dial drop, then a general concept type run as assessed from the Pre-Hav Scale will be indicated in order to get an accurate assessment.

Complete Goals List

Assess for goals first by making sure the *meter is nul* every time you ask for a new goal. If it isn't nul on this question, ask for withheld goals, different goals, etc, etc. Then there are more goals.

Eliminate Nulled Goals

Then assess by Elimination. Put a cross in front of those that cease to produce a needle action when they were repeated a few times to the pc. If after three repeats they are still reading, put a slant in front of the goal to show that it is still in the list. Go over the goals list the first time. If in doubt about a reaction then, leave the goal in. After the first read of the whole list and every completion of the whole list ask for new goals against the meter and write them all down as the pc gives them. Then go over the list again crossing out those that have ceased to read on the needle when repeated to pc.

Always Recheck Goals List

You will wind up with one goal. Check this by asking for additional goals of various types. Check every possible way. I don't care how much time you spend. An inaccurate assessment puts auditing hours to infinity.

Importance of Accurate Assessment

An accurate assessment means a finite number of hours to clear. Beware of artistic goals as these read strongly at first and then tend to drop out.

Two Types of Terminals to Assess

Do the terminals list just like you did a goals list. Except there are two lists of terminals, one is the causative list of the selected goal and the other is the effect end of the goal.

Example:

Goal: I want to shoot sparrows.

Causative list consists of “*Who* would want to shoot sparrows?”

Effect list: “What would you call sparrows?”

In short there is one terminal list for “I” in the goal and one for “Sparrows”. When adding to this list add on both ends.

Eliminate Nul Terminals

When a list of terminals for the goal is complete and requests for more goals do not fall on the meter then begin a repeat type read of the terminals to the pc just like you did goals. If it is still registering after three reads, leave it in. If it looks like it is fading read it many times and if it goes nul cross it out with an X . If in doubt leave it in. Each time you complete the whole terminals list ask for more terminals for the causative and also for the effect end of the goal and add to terminals list. Then reassess the list again.

Always Recheck Terminals List

You will wind up with one terminal if you go over the list often enough. All others as in goals will become nul on the needle on repeat. When you are sure you have the terminal check by asking for more terminals and go over any suspicions you may have. Sometimes the goal falls out just when you are sure you have the goal. Sometimes the terminal falls out when you are sure you have the terminal.

Perfect Assessment

If finally you have the consistent falling terminal and nothing shakes it out, you have your perfect assessment.

Needle Manifestations

Forget rises. They mean nothing because they can’t be differentiated as to what made them rise. So forget them and ignore them.

Change of characteristic of any kind (except rise) is a needle reaction for the purpose of assessment. In short, if the needle does something different than it just did (except rise), that is a read. If the needle no longer reads (except rises) then the goal or terminal is nul.

Rock slam: When the read of the goal is a rock slam or the read of the terminal is a rock slam this will probably become the read of the final goal and at last the final terminal. However do not assess only for rock slams. Rock slams are just the strongest indicator. Also note after a goal or a terminal if it theta bopped or rock slammed. Don’t bother to note extent of fall now.

Use Model Session, Clean Rudiments

Always be very sure to run an assessment in model session. Be sure to keep ARC breaks and PTPs nul on the needle by cleaning them up when you note them.

Long Duration PTPs

If the pc has a long duration present time problem, ask him for the terminal or terminals involved in this problem. Roughly take the one that falls most and run it on the Pre-Hav Scale Assessment like you would in S.O.P. Goals. But this isn’t a goals run. It is just the fastest way of getting a recurrent PTP out of the road. This means PTPs of *long* duration as different than PTPs of short duration, which are run only as in the Model Session Form process consisting of responsibility.

You Can Redo Assessments Any Time

Doing an assessment is very easy but must be very thorough. An improper assessment condemns the pc to an infinity of auditing. He will never go clear. It is no crime to do this and no pc should complain. You can do a new assessment any time it becomes apparent (say the pc is still unclear and showing no signs of it in fifty hours) that the old assessment was incorrect.

If an inaccurate assessment has been done, and the pc run no matter how long on it, then a new assessment can always be done.

Beware Sticking a Tone Arm

Do not run a stuck tone arm more than twenty minutes before reassessing on the Pre-Hav Scale. This is the only severe way you can goof a pc because he can't easily be reassessed on the Pre-Hav Scale.

Rock Slams Different

If the goal and terminal rock slammed when found you can probably expect that you will have to run Pre-Hav levels more briefly, as a rock slam means all five brackets are stuck and the Pre-Hav Scale jammed into it as well. Probably you should assess for rock slam on the Pre-Hav Scale and reassess each time the rock slam runs out on a level.

This rule apparently sends the rule of auditing only on tone arm action by the boards, but, if you kept the rock slam steady needled at set, the tone arm would be wildly waving back and forth. So it's the same rule in effect.

Comment

This is the latest gen on assessments. I have written it all down for you to make sure that you would have another look at it all.

I think staff auditors are doing very well and I am proud of their work.

Staff auditing quality is so far ahead of field auditing quality that I shudder. The reports I get in here on field auditing on Pre-Hav and S.O.P. Goals are so grim that it tempts one to put them all back in the Academy fast before they goof up any more pcs.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jl.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 19 MAY 1961

CenOCon

URGENT

ASSESSMENT DATA

On SOP Goals assessments the following mistakes are being made:

1. Auditors are assessing with a high sensitivity knob setting.
2. Auditors are taking up to an hour and a half to assess on the Pre-Hav Scale.
3. Auditors are trying to run the whole case on Rudiments only.

These rules which follow become *very* important. They prevent endless assessing for goals and terminals on SOP Goals and save session time.

RULE ONE

Assess with the sensitivity knob set for one third of a dial drop on the can squeeze, no more. Rule: *High sensitivity knob settings for more than a third of a dial drop are for any Joburg Security Check or getting off withholds only.* Only increase sensitivity beyond a third of a dial on withholds. Assess with only a third of a dial drop sensitivity setting.

If the sensitivity knob setting won't decrease enough to get only a third of a dial drop get your meter rebuilt.

If you have a larger setting than above, the SOP Goals assessment by elimination will take ten times as long.

RULE TWO

Assessment on Pre-Hav Scale is not by elimination. One assesses with *one* read up and *one* read down and takes the largest (not the lowest) read on the needle. The needle read for the proper Pre-Hav level will repeat on the trip up and the trip down. Only say the level *once*. Don't keep saying one level over and over. That's auditing.

You can get all the Pre-Hav data you want with one coverage upward from scale bottom and one coverage downward to scale bottom.

This rule applies to assessing for a general command and assessing for a terminal.

Goals and terminal searches *require* a repeat over and over of the goal or terminal on the list in order to get them to go nul (as nul as they go with the sensitivity set for a third of a dial drop as above). The Pre-Hav assessment for level does not require a repeat of a level over and over in assessing. In fact you had better not.

This *one time Pre-Hav Rule* will also apply to the new Pre-Hav Scale now being compiled. In that one you will read levels *once* upwards, once downwards on the Primary Scale. Taking the largest reaction of the needle as your level, go over to the Secondary Scale and do the same thing—once up, once down, and then take the resultant greatest needle reaction.

For purposes of assessment a RISING NEEDLE has NO meaning. Don't even remark that it is rising. You don't know *what* the pc couldn't confront that starts the rise so you ignore a rising needle ALWAYS in any modern assessment. Anything that

Stops a Rise is meaningful. The Rise has no meaning. Don't even list *Rise* on an auditor's report.

Further, RISE means nothing as a reaction in Rudiments.

RULE THREE

Don't *ever* run a rudiment only because a needle was rising. Only run a rudiment if the needle rock slams, theta bops, or falls. Only run a rudiment as long as a reaction (rock slam, theta bop, fall) remains on that rudiment. A Rise indicates *no* meaningful data.

The rule about Rudiments is this:

Don't run a case by rudiments. The reason you use and clean rudiments is to get the pc in session so you can have the pc 1) in communication with the auditor and 2) interested in own case. Therefore you run rudiments with the sensitivity set that will give the needle a third of a dial drop with a can squeeze. You can *increase* sensitivity when asking for withholds in rudiments but if you do, decrease it when finished with withholds back to a third of a dial drop.

The purpose of rudiments is to set up a case to run, not to run a case.

SUMMARY

I developed the above rules to correct various mistakes being made that were taking an assessment as high as thirty-five hours (the auditor was *erasing* goals by repeater technique with the sensitivity set to a full dial drop), and to help auditors get on with auditing, not trying to solve the whole case with rudiments.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: ph.bh
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURE
19 May 1961

** 6105C19SHSBC-3

E-Meter

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 22 MAY 1961

CenOCon
Franchise

THE ONLY VALID SECURITY CHECK

(Amends all existing data on Security Checks)

HCO Sec Form 3.

Name of Person _____ Date _____

Name of Security Checker _____ Location _____

Since a Security Check failure can compromise or injure a person's position or economics, and because *we are not moralists*, it is better to be more positive on the subject of a Security Check failure, leaving no part of it up to judgment.

The question of what constitutes a Security- Check failure has now troubled enough people to make it necessary to lay down the following policies.

A Security Check to be used for any organizational reason must be made on an HCO WW form.

There are only three ways a Security Checker may flunk any person.

1. The Security Check may be considered flunked if there is *no* needle response of any kind to any question with meter sensitivity even at extreme high. Rise as a reaction is ignored throughout a Security Check. A rise is not a useful reaction.

2. The Security Check may be considered flunked if any compromising or important question still persists in getting a consistent reaction (not a rise) even after the Security Checker has done his best to get the person being checked to clear it by answering truthfully.

3. Refusal to be checked.

Lie Reaction failure may no longer be considered a flunk. Important questions always have enough charge on them to cause a reaction even on bad criminals and the reaction will continue consistently or sporadically if the person is still withholding information.

The question of something reacting because of past life crimes is ruled out if, when a question fails to clear, the Security Checker adds "In this lifetime?" to or in the question and works on that question continuing to use that added phrase. Reactions by reason of past lives tend to drop out and clear if this is done.

The task of the Security Checker is to carefully question and *clear if possible* changes of meter needle behaviour caused by the question. Plainly note any level that failed to clear. This fails the person.

The Lie Reaction questions were originally used in Scientology only to study the needle pattern of the person being checked so that changes in it could then be judged in their true light. Some pcs, for instance, get a slight reaction every time *any* question is asked. Some get a reaction only when there is heavy charge. Both can be Security Checked by studying the common pattern of the needle demonstrated in asking the Lie Reaction questions. The purpose of the Lie Reaction questions is returned to the original intention.

A totally stuck needle can be freed by processing, or by getting off withholds. If a person is flunked by reason of I above, they require auditing before another check is taken, the auditing to be taken at the responsibility of the person being checked.

All Security Check sheets of persons Security Checked should be *forwarded to Saint Hill*, complete with all markings and the reason why the question would not at first clear, if important, or the drop marked which would not clear and whether or not the person was passed or failed.

Nothing in this Policy Letter changes the responsibility of the Director of Training in preventing Scientology from being taught to persons who would use it in violation of the Code of a Scientologist.

In reprinting this check sheet leave all directions as part of every sheet.

Directions: Attempt to clear any reaction observed. A Rise is *not* classed as a reaction. Mark any reaction observed or any meter reaction change elicited by the question. Then write what it cleared on. Mark largely if the reaction could not be cleared since this constitutes a failure to pass. Only fail somebody if there is no needle motion of any kind even with sensitivity at 16 on any question. (Rise is not a reaction.) If they are failing because it is hard to clear a question, work very thoroughly on it in an effort to clear it. In all cases complete the test. Run check with a high sensitivity setting (more than 1/3 of a dial drop).

If an important question fails to clear even after Security Checker has worked very hard to get it off, the test is flunked.

The following statement should be read or quoted to the person being Security Checked:

“We are about to begin a Security Check. We are not moralists. We are able to change people. We are not here to condemn them. While we cannot guarantee you that matters revealed in this check will be held forever secret, we can promise you faithfully that no part of it nor any answer you make here will be given to the police or state. No Scientologist will ever bear witness against you in Court by reason of answers to this Security Check. This Security Check is exclusively for Scientology purposes. The only ways you can fail this Security Check are to refuse to take the test, to fail to answer its questions truthfully or if you are here knowingly to injure Scientology. The only penalty attached to failure of this check is processing or our refusal to employ you or issue you a certificate, and this will only happen if we find that you are trying knowingly to injure Scientology. You can pass this test by (1) agreeing to take it, (2) answering each question truthfully and (3) not being a member of a subversive group seeking to injure Scientology.

“The first questions are nul questions to determine your reaction pattern.

“We will now begin—”

Establish needle pattern:

_____TA_____Sensitivity for 1/3 dial drop

_____Sensitivity setting for check.

Are you sitting in a chair?

Are you on the moon?

Are all cats black?

Am I an ostrich?

Is this Earth?

Have you ever drunk water?

Are you holding up a tree?

Am I an elephant?

Are you a table?

Is this a Security Check?

Needle Pattern

Have you ever lived or worked under an assumed name?

Have you given me your right name?

Are you here for a different purpose than you say?

Have you ever stolen anything?

Have you ever done any shoplifting?

Have you ever forged a signature, cheque or document?

Have you ever blackmailed anybody?

Have you ever been blackmailed?

Have you ever cheated?

Have you ever smuggled anything?

Have you ever entered a country illegally?

Have you ever been in prison?

Have you ever tried to act normal?

Have you ever indulged in drunkenness?

Have you ever done any reckless driving?

Have you ever hit and run with a car?

Have you ever burgled any place?

Are you guilty of anything?

Have you ever embezzled money?

Do you have a secret you are afraid I'll find out?

Have you ever assaulted anyone?

Have you ever practised Cannibalism?

Have you ever been in gaol?

Have you ever told lies in Court?

Have you ever been Court-martialed?

Have you ever deserted from a military service?

Have you ever illegally prevented conscription?

Have you ever been a mutineer?

Have you ever had anything to do with Pornography?

Have you ever committed Arson?

Have you ever been a drug addict?

Have you ever made anyone into a drug addict?

Have you ever peddled Dope?

Have you ever PDH'd anyone?
Have you had any dealings with stolen goods?
Have you ever divulged government secrets for pay or political reasons?
Do you have a Police Record?
Have you ever raped anyone or been raped?
Have you ever been involved in an abortion?
Have you ever assisted in any abortion?
Have you ever committed adultery?
Have you ever committed bigamy?
Have you ever practised Homosexuality?
Have you ever practised or assisted intercourse between women?
Have you ever had intercourse with a member of your family?
Have you ever been sexually unfaithful?
Have you ever practised sex with animals?
Have you ever publicly exhibited yourself sexually?
Have you ever hidden to watch sexual practices?
Have you ever practised Sodomy?
Have you ever consistently made a practice of sex with a member of your own sex?
Have you ever slept with a member of a race of another colour?
Have you ever committed culpable homicide?
Have you ever committed a justifiable crime?
Have you ever bombed anything?
Have you ever murdered anyone?
Have you ever hidden a body?
Have you ever attempted suicide?
Have you ever caused a suicide?
Have you ever kidnapped anyone?
Have you ever done any illicit Diamond buying?
Have you ever acted as an informer?
Have you ever betrayed anyone for money?
Have you ever betrayed a trust?
Have you ever betrayed an employer's trust?
Have you ever speculated with somebody else's funds?
Have you ever knowingly implicated an innocent person?
Have you ever withheld a communication concerning a crime or misdemeanour committed by another?
Have you ever threatened anyone with a fire-arm?
Have you ever been in illegal possession of fire-arms?

Are my questions embarrassing?
Have you ever been paid for giving evidence?
Have you ever acted as an informer?
Have you ever injured somebody's reputation by knowingly spreading lies?
Have you ever injured somebody by spreading tales you knew were true?
Have you ever destroyed something belonging to someone else?
Have you ever plotted to destroy a member of your family?
Have you ever had a member of your family in an insane asylum?
Have you ever been pronounced insane?
Have you ever been a spy for an organization?
Have you ever looted any place?
Have you ever stolen from the armed forces?
Have you ever conspired with anyone?
Have you ever had anything to do with Communism or been a Communist?
Have you practised fraud?
Have you ever been a newspaper reporter?
Are you hiding anything?
Have you ever had intercourse after placing another under alcohol or drugs?
Have you ever used hypnotism to procure sex or money?
Do you collect sexual objects? Have you ever ill-treated children?
Have you ever practised sex with children?
Have you ever practised masturbation?
Have you ever taken money for giving anyone sexual intercourse?
Have you ever sexually coerced a servant?
Do you have any bastards?
Are you withholding anything?
Have you ever had any connection with a brothel?
Have you ever coerced anyone into giving you sex?
Have you had anything to do with a baby farm?
Have you ever killed or crippled animals for pleasure?
Have you ever crippled a person?
Have you ever been a spy for the Police?
Have you ever pretended a disability?
Are you afraid of the Police?
Have you ever committed a misdemeanour?
Have you ever committed a felony?
Have you ever committed a capital offense?

Have you ever had any unkind thoughts about Mary Sue Hubbard?
Have you ever injured any Scientologists?
Have you ever had any unkind thoughts about Scientologists?
Have you ever betrayed Scientology?
Do you know of any secret plans against Scientology?
Do you plan to steal a Scientology Organization?
Have you ever taken money to injure Scientology?
Do you deserve to be helped by Scientology?
Have you ever used Dianetics or Scientology to force sex upon someone?
Have you ever falsified a claim for money to be repaid to you or to be paid you?
Do you know of any plans to injure a Scientology Organization?
Do you know of any plans to injure a Scientologist?
Are you upset about this Security Check?
What question in this check shouldn't I ask you again?
Have you withheld from answering anything because it might injure someone?
What unkind thoughts have you thought while I have been doing this check?
Have any of your answers here been designed to injure another?
Are you upset about this Security Check?

Passed _____ Failed _____

Why? _____

Signed by Examiner

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jl.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 23 MAY 1961

Central Orgs

Urgent for Use on All Cases

PREHAV SCALE REVISED

(This is the rough version. The Primary Scale is Accurate and Complete. The Secondary Scale is not necessarily complete or edited.)

This is the first major revision of the Pre-Havingness Scale I originated in January of 1961. This Scale now contains a Primary Scale and a Secondary Scale. The Secondary Scale contains nearly all simple verbs in the English Language, properly placed for Level and repeated on other Levels.

USE

The Scale is used for General Running of Levels (without specified terminal) in brackets of 5 or 10, using "Someone" or "Something" as the terminal, sometimes using plus and minus (Change, No Change).

The Scale is also used for terminals found for S.O.P. Goals by Goals and Terminal Assessment.

The two uses of the Scale are done exactly the same way with the single exception that for a general run one says, "Do you have ____ (Pre-Hav Level)" or "Are you ____ (Pre-Hav Level)" or "Do you ____ (Pre-Hav Level)", and in the use for goals terminals one says, "Would the (or 'a') ____ (goals terminal) (Pre-Hav Level)?"

General Run Assessment Example: Start at Bottom of Primary Scale 65 (Faith). Go up Pre-Hav Primary Scale asking about each level *once only* and carefully noting E-Meter Needle Reaction (ignore Rises of the needle) that responds or doesn't respond to the question. Convert the level to a sensible question without varying the actual level. The questions: "Do you have Faith?" "Are you Cause?" "Do things have No Effect upon you?" "Are you the Effect of things?" "Do you think people run a Can't Have on you?" "Do you Create?" "Do you Think?" etc, etc. When you have reached the top of the Scale, go back down again (from Level 1 to 65), still noting reaction. The one that *reacted most* when you went up and when you went down the Primary Scale is the Level. (Do not take the lowest level, take the level that reacted most, as the worse off people are, the higher terminals tend to be found on the Scale as a loose rule. Terminals come *down* scale as the pc goes up on successive assessments after runs.)

You now take the Primary Level found by E-Meter needle reaction and GO TO THE SECONDARY SCALE FOR THAT LEVEL. Assess this Secondary Scale for the level exactly as you did the Primary Scale. Go from the highest number (lowest point) up to the top (lowest number), asking once about each level and noting needle reaction (not rise). Take the Level that reacted most on the needle. Form it into a five way bracket (or 10 way) consulting the needle for the best expression of each "leg" of the bracket. Then run it. The motion of the TA should increase, then decrease, then tend to halt. If it remains unchanged (1/8 to 1/4 of a Tone Arm Division of motion only in 20 minutes) Reassess.

When reassessing on the Pre-Hav for a new level, assess exactly and as carefully as you did the first time—first assess on the Primary. Then assess on the Secondary Scale for that level.

Example for assessing a goals terminal (or a PT Problem or ARC break terminal). The assessment is done the same way as in a general run assessment except all questions have to do with the terminal. Example: If the goals terminal were “woman”. Start at the bottom (highest number) of the Primary Pre-Hav Scale and assess one level at a time. “Would a woman have *Faith*?” “Would a woman *Cause* things?” “Would there be *No Effect* on a woman?” etc, etc, noting the needle reaction (not rise). Then come down (lowest to highest number) the Pre-Hav Primary Scale one level at a time, again noting the needle reaction (always ignore rises). The right level will react going up and going down in much the same way. Take this level and go to the Pre-Hav Secondary Scale. Assess it from bottom (highest number) to top (lowest number) and then back down again. Choose the level that reacted both going up and down.

Any levels found may be checked cautiously (repeating only once) by comparing it to other levels in terms of needle reaction. You want the level with *most* reaction always.

If you take more than fifteen minutes to do a level assessment, you are doing something odd or unnecessary such as saying the levels several times or expecting the pc to answer you aloud (the pc should remain silent during an assessment) or you are unfamiliar with the Scale.

In asking assessment questions on the Scale always speak with the same degree of loudness and inflection, and always make the level the hardest and most stressed word in the question. If you vary loudness from question to question or change emotional tone, the needle may react to your change, not the Pre-Hav Level, giving you an inaccurate reading based on your goofs or changes, not on different Scale levels.

You can do an Assessment twice. You should come out with the same Primary and Secondary Levels. If you don’t, run, don’t walk, to the nearest Academy.

The Secondary Level is the one used in Commands. You will note that the Primary Level words are repeated in the Secondary Scale. Thus if the level comes out to be that Primary word, you’ll still have it as a Secondary word and can use it in the command.

Audit only *one* level at a time. Use only the word that caused the needle to react to make up your command. Do not combine two levels.

If you get Tone Arm motion running a level either generally or as a goals terminal, PTP or ARC break level, flatten it before choosing and running a new level. One knows when level is flat. The Tone Arm doesn’t move any more. You can cause a pc to feel “spiny” by starting a new level before the old one is flat.

Do not *overrun* a level. The test of “flat” is the TA moving only 1/4 to 1/8 of a division up or down in 20 minutes of auditing (not cumulative movement such as “The TA moves 1/16th twice so that’s 1/8th of a division”—this is wrong. If it moves from 2.25 to 2.50 to 2.25 two or three times in twenty minutes, this is called “flat” and has moved only 1/4 of a TA division. This is right.)

The Secondary Level, if not the word in the Primary Level, may react on the needle far more than the Primary Level.

The Primary Level may not react at all in rare cases. If this happens, assess the whole Secondary Scale, all groups, independent of the Primary Scale, starting with the Secondary group for Faith and going right on through the groups. This is only likely to happen with rough beginning cases or with persons nearly clear who are being shaped up and stabilized.

When a pc assesses as a Rock Slam, it may be necessary after a level turns on the Rock Slam to say a nul word to the pc like “Floor, Floor, Floor....” until the Rock Slam turns off. Rock Slam carries over many levels unless it is shaken out of the needle in this way. Mark the Level that turned it on “Rock Slam”. This is

the strongest react there is. If several levels turn on a Rock Slam, choose by reading the Rock Slam levels once each again (using a nulling word several times between each one) and choose the widest Rock Slam or the one that didn't fall out (which will probably be the widest).

In auditing a Rock Slam, the rule "Assess by the Needle, Audit by the Tone Arm" seems to have an exception. However, if the needle that is Rock Slamming could be held at SET on the needle dial by moving the TA you would see that a Rock Slam *is* a Tone Arm reaction. Thus one can't call a process flat while a Rock Slamming needle still exists on a level. The Rock Slam has to be run out before the level is flat.

The Complete and Edited Version of the Secondary Scale and the Primary Scale will appear first in the Clearing Series Book *S.O.P. Goals* to be published in about two months. This rough version will however serve your purposes for the moment.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:iet.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

(*Note:* This bulletin is being sent to you with the completed Primary Scale attached. The Secondary Scale will be sent to you in parts as it is run off the mimeograph machine. More copies may be mimeographed locally if required.)

PRE-HAVINGNESS SCALE
PRIMARY SCALE

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 66. TR 10 | 33. FAILED LEAVE |
| 65. FAITH | 32. LEAVE |
| 64. CAUSE | 31. WAIT |
| 63. NO EFFECT | 30. SURVIVE |
| 62. EFFECT | 29. FAILED TO ARRIVE |
| 61. OBSESSIVE CAN'T HAVE | 28. ARRIVE |
| 60. CREATE | 27. FAILED IMPORTANCE |
| 59. THINK | 26. IMPORTANCE |
| 58. INVERTED INTEREST
(PECULIAR INTEREST) | 25. PROPITIATE |
| 57. DISPERSE | 24. ATTENTION |
| 56. INVERTED COMMUNICATION
(INTEND TO NOT COMMUNICATE) | 23. SEPARATE |
| 55. INVERTED CONTROL | 22. FAILED WITHHOLD |
| 54. INVERTED HELP
(BETRAY) | 21. WITHHOLD |
| 53. COLLECT | 20. MIS-EMOTIONAL |
| 52. SUBSTITUTE | 19. DESTROY |
| 51. WITHDRAW | 18. MOTION |
| 50. DUPLICATE | 17. FAILED OVERT
(FAILED ATTACK) |
| 49. ENTER | 16. OVERTS
(ATTACK) |
| 48. INHIBIT | 15. DISLIKE |
| 47. DISAGREE | 14. LIKE |
| 46. ENFORCE | 13. COMPETE |
| 45. AGREE | 12. FAILED HELP |
| 44. DESIRE | 11. HELP |
| 43. WANT TO KNOW | 10. FAILED CONTROL |
| 42. FAILED TO ENDURE | 9. CONTROL |
| 41. ENDURE | 8. EMOTIONAL |
| 40. NO MOTION | 7. FAILED COMMUNICATION |
| 39. FAILED TO ABANDON | 6. COMMUNICATION |
| 38. ABANDON | 5. FAILED INTEREST |
| 37. FAILED WASTE | 4. INTEREST |
| 36. WASTE | 3. CONNECT |
| 35. FAILED TO PROTECT | 2. FAILED HAVINGNESS |
| 34. PROTECT | 1. HAVINGNESS |

SECONDARY SCALE

1 — HAVINGNESS

This is the Secondary Scale of Havingness. It is not usually used for assessment as subjective havingness does not run with benefit. If a case is, however, "live" on a havingness level, run them on it, using their objective havingness process at frequent brief intervals (10 to 12 commands of objective havingness).

OBTAIN EARN TAKE REGAIN RECLAIM PURCHASE PROCURE INHERIT AFFORD
ACCEPT PROFIT DEPOSIT AMASS GET POSSESS ACQUIRE HAVE RETAIN GAIN SHARE
SALVAGE SUSTAIN TENDER SUPPLY REplete STOW FILL SUFFICE FINANCE
REIMBURSE ENDOW REDEEM BESTOW CONTRIBUTE REFIT OFFER PROVIDE EQUIP
CULTIVATE PAY REPAY REMUNERATE TRAFFIC TRADE REMIT IMPORT RAFFLE WEAR
DISTRIBUTE RAID PRE-EMPT SPOIL COMMANDEER FORAGE DRAW REQUISITION SEIZE
DESPOIL SACK SNATCH EXPLOIT WREST BOARD IMPRESS CAPTURE EXTORT
IMPOUND GRASP PLUNDER REPLACE RECEIVE REPLENISH RESTORE PERMEATE
PERVADE LOOT CONSERVE KEEP CLAIM CHERISH TREASURE CATCH ENTRAP
HAVINGNESS CACHE SECURE

2 — FAILED HAVINGNESS

COVET PIECE EXACT CONSERVE PAWN PETITION WANT DISCARD PREPAY LOSE
AMPUTATE DISBURDEN RAID CASTRATE CROP DESPOIL GUT EVISCERATE
DISEMBOWEL TAX SACK SCALP STARVE WREST SINK DEPRIVE OSTRACIZE BANISH
EXILE MAROON IMPOVERISH IMPOUND DEMOTE SPILL SWINDLE ADULTERATE
BEHEAD SQUEEZE SPOIL SURRENDER DROP PLUNDER ISOLATE DIE ABOLISH
OBLITERATE ERADICATE EXPUNGE LIQUIDATE ERADICATE EXTIRPATE DISINTEGRATE
LAPSE FINISH FAIL EXPIRE WITHER EFFACE ANNUL ELIMINATE ELAPSE ESTRANGE
TERMINATE EXPEND DISPOSE ENGULF OCCLUDE DELETE ERASE EXPURGATE
EXTINGUISH DESTROY ANNIHILATE RUIN ERODE CONSUME DISPERSE STRAY STREW
LOOT SEPARATE ZONE DIVIDE DIFFER OUTLAW EXCOMMUNICATE DETACH DIVEST
UNLOAD DISROBE EXCLUDE STRADDLE SUNDER SCRAPE BICKER QUARREL
REMONSTRATE CONTRADICT DISSENT PROTEST CONCEDE DECLINE REcede SLOP
REFRAIN EXCEED TRY FORGO WEAN REFUSE DWINDLE DISABLE DISSUADE DEPRIVE
ENTRAP ESCHEW CAGE ENFEEBLE MISS DENY CURTAIL DEMUR FUMBLE DEDUCT
DEBIT BEMOAN BEWAIL LOSE MISPLACE MISLAY DISALLOW DESPAIR ENVY SURFEIT
DWINDLE MOURN REGRET EKE FAILED HAVINGNESS

3 — CONNECT

CONNECT MISIDENTIFY LINK IDENTIFY ASSOCIATE CIRCUMSTANTIATE WEAR APPLY
CONCILIATE SUPPORT RECONCILE ENTWINE YOKE CLING SPEAR TIE BIND BOARD
NAIL DISPERSE DRAW CONSORT LINK JOIN ATTACH PERMEATE ACCOMPANY
PERVADE CONJUGATE MEET ENCOUNTER ADJOIN PERTAIN REJOIN APPEND
INTERSECT COMBINE EMBRACE SPLICE KNIT REUNITE FRATERNIZE TOUCH MARRY
WED BETROTH CONFUSE CRUCIFY GRAFT HANDCUFF FETTER MANACLE CONFUSE
ESCORT CHAIN TRUSS ENTANGLE SEIZE TRICE GRAB PASTE INVOLVE FIND UNITE
HAMMER HANG HIT INDENT INCRIMINATE IMPLICATE WIPE LASH LICK INTERCEPT
SHACKLE TIE SHEATHE FASTEN SUSPEND BIND CLUTCH TACK WEAVE WELD LIKE
ASSOCIATE

4 — INTEREST

TOUT PROFFER PROMULGATE CANVASS CIRCULARIZE QUIZ PEDDLE QUERY INCLINE
SAMPLE URGE ILLUMINE BID INFORM INITIATE EVOKE ILLUMINATE ILLUSTRATE
ANTICIPATE POPULARIZE IGNITE INFUSE AROUSE ROUSE TEASE TEMPT FLIRT WOO
ELECTRIFY EXCITE ENKINDLE ALLURE SCINTILLATE TRANCE IMPRESS CAPTIVATE
FASCINATE ATTRACT TANTALIZE PERFORM ENGROSS STUNT PARTICIPATE WAGER
ATTEND DETERMINE INSPIRE COMPETE MARVEL GOGGLE PROBE FIND PURSUE
SEARCH TRAIL AWAKE WAKE

WAKEN DISPLAY UNFOLD UNROLL UNFURL UNVEIL UNDRRESS UNEARTH UNCOVER
EXPLORE TRACK SCOUT TRACE INTEREST PERK RECREATE REVIVE VOLUNTEER
ENLIVEN DELIGHT DIVERT RECALL LECTURE DESCRIBE ADDRESS ANNOUNCE SPEAK
CHAT PREACH PEN RECITE TRAIN TEACH WRITE DISPORT DEMONSTRATE NARRATE
DECORATE TATTOO TALK SING SERENADE WARBLE HUM WHISTLE EXHIBIT SHOW
QUESTION INVESTIGATE QUIZ INTERROGATE REACT DISPOSE EXPEND VIVISECT
PICNIC SOJOURN LIKE CRAVE PERMEATE PERVADE RADIATE RANGE BURST HUNT
HAUNT GROPE DEBATE COAX THRALL RUMMAGE RISK EDUCATE SPECIALIZE
BESIEGE TURN TUG SHOW INSTIL INSPECT LOVE TRANSCEND RECOMPENSE POSE
PREFER PRESENT PROMOTE PROPAGATE CATCH ENTRAP EMBELLISH SURPRISE
AMAZE GARNISH TRIM CACHE DESIRE EXHUME PRY CONNIVE BETRAY INSPIRIT
ASPIRE ADORN BOAST BRAG PICK PREOCCUPY TOP INLAY APPRECIATE PRESENT
DESPISE

5 — FAILED INTEREST

REJECT NAP YAWN SLEEP SLUMBER BORE DROWSE DOZE NOD PALL FAILED
INTEREST DIVERT DAZE STUN STUPEFY STULTIFY DESERT STRAGGLE PROLONG
OCCLUDE LAPSE FINISH FAIL WILT EXPIRE WITHER EFFACE ANNUL ELIMINATE
ADJOURN ELAPSE ESTRANGE TERMINATE DESIST QUIESCE ABIDE OSSIFY FREEZE
RELAX RUSTICATE BECALM LOAF STRAGGLE STREW DISPERSE STRAY INDISPOSE
CONCEDE DECLINE RECEDE SHIRK GARBLE SLOP IMMERSE HUMOUR RESORT
JUMBLE BOGGLE REFRAIN BOTCH TRY FORGO SHRUG LEAP TOY TURN FORGET CLOY
EMBITTER DESPAIR DISPLEASE DISLIKE MOPE DRUDGE ENCUMBER COMMISERATE
REGRET BEGRUDGE MEDICATE MIRE BOTHER CURTAIL DISHEARTEN DENY
DISCOURAGE ESCHEW CRITICIZE DISSUADE SUBMERGE IGNORE

6 — COMMUNICATION

MANIFEST EMBLAZON WARRANT PROMISE PROPOUND WITNESS PROPOSE X-RAY
DISPENSE PERSUADE TRAFFIC PURPOSE TRADE REMIT AGREE FORWARD YARN
RENDER REMUNERATE SANCTION IMPORT OSCULATE WEAR RAFFLE THROW RATIFY
SIGNIFY SIGN PROJECT DISTRIBUTE NOTIFY CONFRONT INDICATE PERUSE EXHORT
CORRESPOND REPAY ACQUAINT UNDERSTAND SPECIFY PHRASE ACKNOWLEDGE
ASSENT APPLY APPEAL WELCOME REMARK REPLY REQUEST ADDRESS CONVEY
PARTAKE DOT CIRCUMSTANTIATE DESIGNATE DEMONSTRATE PROCLAIM ALLUDE
ASK VOICE UTTER DISPUTE STATE DISPATCH WRITE RESPOND RETAIL TRUMPET
DESCRIBE SUGGEST HAIL DISCUSS ASSERT REPORT DECLAIM NARRATE CONSENT
DELINEATE HEAR CONSULT LECTURE CONTRACT TRAIN PURVEY DECLARE PROFESS
CABLE PARAPHRASE TEACH PEN SOUND CALL SPEAK ANNOUNCE EXPOUND
DISCOVER PREACH EVINCE ELUCIDATE RECITE PRELUDE SCRIBE FACE CHAT DETECT
INTRODUCE INTERVIEW DECREE EXPRESS DISCOURSE PUBLISH PRONOUNCE
PREAMBLE ATTEST AFFIRM ENUNCIATE MAIL PAY DISPORT VIEW ESPY SPOT
SURVEY GAZE GLANCE BEHOLD GLIMPSE SEE SCRUTINIZE INSPECT LOOK SCAN
OGLE OBSERVE SNIFF WHIFF SMELL TASTE TAP FEEL RUB STROKE CUDDLE CARESS
HUG SING SERENADE WARBLE HUM VOCALIZE WHISTLE EXCLAIM EXHIBIT REVEAL
SHOUT SHOW REACH TELL TALK DISCLOSE PLEA CALM EXPLAIN COMFORT SOOTHE
SOLACE RECOMMEND REASSURE CONTRIBUTE CONSOLE ENLIGHTEN ENCOURAGE
ADVISE ASSURE INSTRUCT COMMAND ORDER HANDLE HEAVE MANIPULATE
OPERATE TOW MIX DRILL HOIST LOAD PUT PUSH HAUL FETCH START STEER SHUT
MANAGE SUPERVISE SUPERINTEND ADMINISTER MEDIATE NEGOTIATE TREAT SEND
CONSIGN AIM AWARD UTILIZE ALLOT ALLOCATE APPOINT ASSIGN COMPLY
DISBURSE SHAPE DISABUSE ORIENTATE ARRANGE STIPULATE PRESCRIBE HUSH
NAVIGATE PILOT USHER EMEND EDIT REGULATE ADJUST CORRECT SUMMON
SUBDUE CHALLENGE RECALL HITCH TAG UNTANGLE ORGANIZE REIGN ENUMERATE
SPACE HEFT HABITUATE OFFICIATE IDENTIFY TACKLE REWARD PRESIDE REQUIRE
VOTE ASSORT MASTER DEPUTE DELEGATE VEST ACTUATE ALTER ENGAGE DEPLOY
JOCKEY JUGGLE TEST HOLD HALT STOP DISCIPLINE DIRECT RULE EMPOWER
APPROVE DISSUADE CATCH PERCEIVE DISTINGUISH PLAY DISPLAY IMPLY INFORM
INTERSECT INVIGORATE ADVANCE TUG TURN TUSSLE DIVULGE PRESENT REJECT
CITE INSCRIBE PROMOTE ARBITRATE AVOW ELECT RENT SHAPE HIRE
COMMUNICATION RECALL QUESTION

INTERROGATE INTIMATE QUIZ ISSUE ORIGINATE EMIT EMANATE PULSATE SMART
TINGLE THROB SWELTER STINK SPARKLE GLISTEN PATTERN SWISH CLACK CLANG
CLINK PEAL JINGLE REVERBERATE RIPPLE RING DRIP SLUMP SLIP SLOUCH REACT
RECIPROCATE RESTORE REPLACE REPLENISH REHEARSE MIME PRACTISE PORTRAY
IMITATE ENACT SKETCH DEPICT REPRODUCE RECORD TRANSCRIBE PRINT REPRINT
COPY REDUPLICATE DUPLICATE EMULATE CHARACTERIZE TRANSMIT RECOUNT
REFER RELAY QUOTE REITERATE ITERATE RECAPITULATE TESTIFY SUBSTANTIATE
RELATE REPEAT RETRACE REVIEW RECOGNIZE REMEMBER REMIND RECEIVE
UNDERSTUDY COMPREHEND MULTIPLY EXECUTE EAT GNAW DEVOUR EXPLODE
FLAME VIVISECT EMBOWEL DRINK NIBBLE SWIG SWALLOW QUAFF SUP SLAY
SLAUGHTER CRUSH SWILL GUZZLE TIPPLE CRUNCH ERODE CRUMPLE GOBBLE
GRUMBLE EFFUSE STIMULATE DUB GLOW PROMULGATE PIN SECURE SITE BELAY
LOCATE PARK CAMP BATTEN DWELL ABIDE RESIDE SOJOURN BASK RECLINE
SPRAWL SIT SQUAT POISE PICNIC NESTLE POSE STICK INFORM PERCH QUERY
CIRCULARIZE MISS POPULARIZE PROFFER BID URGE ILLUSTRATE CANVASS DEMEAN
CONNECT COMBINE ENTWINE KNIT LINK JOIN ATTACH PERVADE PERMEATE APPEND
CONSORT ENCOUNTER FRATERNIZE ACCOMPANY UNITE REUNITE REJOIN MEET
TOUCH CLING EMBRACE YOKE SPLICE SHOWER RADIATE RANGE SPREAD SPATTER
DISROBE ZONE CLEAVE FILTER SUNDER CHASE SEPARATE HUNT HAUNT COLLIDE
IMMERSE EDUCATE PETITION MISTAKE CLARIFY SORT ARTICULATE LEVEL
INTERCHANGE DEMAND DISALLOW CONVINCE FAMILIARIZE ENTREAT DICTATE
BETRAY CONNIVE DELIVER SALUTE REGARD PRAISE

7 — FAILED COMMUNICATION

FAILED COMMUNICATION PERSUADE EXHORT PROCLAIM SPEAK STATE SUGGEST
ASK ASSENT BLIND DEAFEN EXILE MAROON DECEIVE GAG STALK SQUELCH
IMPRISON ISOLATE CHOKE KIDNAP INTERDICT CHEAT CONFOUND INCARCERATE
INFILTRATE SINK DESERT OSTRACIZE QUARREL FIGHT WRANGLE BANISH RASP
FINISH DEODORIZE TERMINATE DISPOSE EXPEND ESTRANGE ENGULF DESPATCH
CONSUME DELETE ERASE ELAPSE ADJOURN EXTINGUISH EXPURGATE ELIMINATE
ABOLISH ANNUL OBLITERATE EFFACE ERADICATE EXTIRPATE EXPUNGE IRRADICATE
LIQUIDATE DEVASTATE DEMOLISH EXECUTE PURGE ANNIHILATE DESTROY
DISINTEGRATE LAPSE WILT WITHER EXPIRE FAIL QUIESCE OSSIFY FREEZE REPOSE
RELAX RUSTICATE BECALM IMPAWN LOAF DESIST DISPERSE STRAY STREW
STRAGGLE STAMPEDE DIFFUSE INTERSPERSE BURST ROUT BESTREW UNCLASP
UNLOAD DIVEST DETACH EXCOMMUNICATE OUTLAW DIFFER DIVIDE SEPARATE
EXCLUDE CLEAVE SUNDER SHATTER RECEDE GARBLE IMMERSE HUMOUR RESORT
RISK WISH SLOP STUMBLE BOGGLE HESITATE EDUCATE FORGO AMPUTATE LOSE
RETRACT WEAN BESIEGE FOUL BOTHER MIRE MEDICATE FUMBLE BEGRUDGE CHIDE
COMMISERATE REGRET JUMBLE CARP CHEW CONDEMN COMPLAIN BLAME
REPROACH FULMINATE REPREHEND AVENGE CENSURE UPBRAID SWERVE SUCCUMB
RETCH WAVER WRITHE SQUIRM VOMIT WINCE NAUSEATE FALTER TIRE HATE PANT
PUFF CAPITULATE CRY FIGHT DESPAIR ZONE DESPOND DEMAND DICTATE DISALLOW
CLAIM REJECT SCORN SHRUG TURN TUSSLE IGNORE PLOT CONSPIRE GESTICULATE
CONNIVE CONVINCE DOMINATE COMPEL COERCE ENFORCE DEPRIVE MORTIFY
ESCHEW SHAME EMBARRASS CAGE DISOBEY CRITICIZE CURSE DISCOURAGE DENY
DISHEARTEN DISTRACT DISAPPROVE CURTAIL MISCONCEIVE OVERLOOK PEER
DECLINE CONCEDE PROTEST DISSENT CONTEND CONTRADICT BICKER
REMONSTRATE QUARREL HUNT HAUNT GROPE DEBATE COAX LISP HARP

8 — EMOTIONAL

EMOTIONAL DISPUTE RESPOND EXHORT WELCOME UNDERSTAND APPEAL PLEA
IRRITATE TERRIFY TERRORIZE IRK TORMENT DENOUNCE DEPRESS DISGRACE
DISHONOUR DISAFFECT DERANGE DISMAY DEMORALIZE IMPRECATE FRIGHTEN
GRIEVE ALARM SCARE PERK SOOTHE EXHILARATE ENLIVEN CHEER DELIGHT
BRUTALIZE BULLY DEJECT DEGRADE DEMENT AGGRAVATE BENUMB BEDEVIL
APPALL STUPEFY STUN VEX UNNERVE WORRY RASP PAIN QUARREL OFFEND NETTLE
BEATIFY ANIMATE ENGROSS TANTALIZE ATTRACT FASCINATE CAPTIVATE IMPRESS
TRANCE SCINTILLATE ENKINDLE

EXCITE AROUSE ROUSE MARVEL ELECTRIFY INSPIRE TRANSPORT SHRUG HIDE NEED
APPROVAL FROM OWN PROTECT CONTROL BLAME PUNISH BE KILL MAKE
APATHETIC MAKE AMENDS GRIEVE PROPITIATE SYMPATHIZE FEAR NOT
SYMPATHIZE RESENT COVERTLY ANGER PAIN BORE MAKE INDIFFERENT CONTENT
MILDLY INTEREST INTEREST STRONGLY ENTHUSE MAKE EAGER MAKE SERENE
CONVICT DESPISE HUMILIATE BETRAY SIGH REPENT RUE YELP AGONIZE SORROW
WEEP SADDEN MOAN MOPE MOURN ENVY DESPAIR EMBITTER WAVER FALTER
AVOID CAPITULATE COMMISERATE REGRET DEMUR DISHEARTEN EMBARRASS
BEMOAN BEWAIL SULK OUTCRY SCORN INFURIATE RAGE RANKLE GROWL POUT
GRUMBLE NAG YAP DISGUST DISLIKE DISPLEASE DETEST HATE INCULPATE ASCRIBE
UPBRAID CHIDE COMPLAIN CHEW CONDEMN OBJURGATE CARP IMPLY FULMINATE
REPREHEND REPROACH AVENGE RESENT CENSURE DEPLORE RECRIMINATE DARE
DISAPPROVE ABUSE REBUKE CRITICIZE CRY FOUL ENFEEBLE MORTIFY DARE SHAME
ASHAME INSANE ENTREAT BE SERENE AMUSE EXULT ENJOY SMILE NUZZLE JUBILATE
FROLIC FONDLE REJOICE GRIN GLADDEN LIKE REVEL TRUST LOVE RELISH ESTEEM

9 — C O N T R O L

EXPAND DILATE ELONGATE AMPLIFY ENLARGE MAGNIFY EMPHASIZE BEGIN ABATE
ALLOW MODERATE SITUATE SET TAME ACCOUNT DETAIL ACQUIT DEMAGNETIZE
UNRUFFLE PREDISPOSE HIRE RENT ELECT APPROVE EMPOWER RULE DIRECT
DISCIPLINE STOP HALT HOLD TEST JUGGLE JOCKEY DEPLOY ENGAGE ALTER
ACTUATE VEST DELEGATE DEPUTE MASTER ASSORT VOTE REQUIRE PRESIDE
REMAND TACKLE IDENTIFY OFFICIATE HABITUATE HEFT SPACE ENUMERATE REIGN
ORGANIZE UNTANGLE TAG HITCH RECALL CHALLENGE SUBDUE SUMMON CORRECT
ADJUST REGULATE EDIT EMEND USHER PILOT NAVIGATE HUSH PRESCRIBE
STIPULATE ARRANGE ORIENTATE DISABUSE SHAPE DISBURSE COMPLY ASSIGN
APPOINT ALLOCATE ALLOT UTILIZE AWARD AIM CONSIGN SEND TREAT NEGOTIATE
MEDIATE ADMINISTER SUPERINTEND SUPERVISE MANAGE SHUT STEER START
FETCH HAUL PUSH PUT LOAD HOIST DRILL MIX TOW OPERATE MANIPULATE HEAVE
HANDLE ORDER COMMAND CIVILIZE DRIVE DIVERT DEVELOP CULTIVATE EXPEDITE
ENABLE SPONSOR REHABILITATE FACILITATE REFORM RECTIFY LEAN EXTEND
PREPARE PERMIT SERVE INSTRUCT CONTROL OBSERVE WIN CONTINUE RECUPERATE
RECOVER REPRIEVE REINSTATE PROSPER LUXURIATE SUCCEED FLOURISH
SURMOUNT GROW THRIVE LIVE SURVIVE MAINTAIN RECONSTRUCT RENOVATE
RENEW GRUB LABOUR TOIL NURTURE FIX NOURISH MATURE PERPETUATE TIME
DARN VALET LAY MEND INHALE RESPIRE OPPRESS REPRESS OVERWHELM
OVERPOWER TYRANNIZE COMMIT DRAG CHARGE DEPOSE QUELL INTERDICT
TROUNCE ISOLATE STEADY STEER GRASP COERCE FORCE FOX VANQUISH IMPLANT
ADMONISH ENSLAVE SUBJUGATE SWITCH IMPOUND CAPTURE PRESS IMPRESS
CONQUER DOUSE EXILE SURVIVE REPLENISH REPLACE EXECUTE FINISH DEODORIZE
TERMINATE DISPOSE EXPEND BATTEN CAMP QUIESCE PARK LOCATE BELAY SITE
SECURE PIN PERVADE PERMEATE APPEND REUNITE REJOIN ENTWINE YOKE SPLICE
CONNECT COMBINE KNIT LINK JOIN ATTACH BETROTH WED MARRY RADIATE
DIFFUSE INTERSPERSE SPREAD SHOWER BESTREW RANGE CLEAVE STRADDLE
DECOCT FILTER EXCLUDE SORT SEPARATE ZONE DIVIDE DETACH DIVEST UNLOAD
UNCLASP DISROBE INJECT INSERT INVITE MATRICULATE INSTALL INVEST
INOCULATE ENTRUST HUNT CONTRADICT DEBATE DECLINE REMONSTRATE PROTEST
COAX CONCEDE EXTRICATE LIMIT SHACKLE TIE ISOLATE LOCALIZE IMMERSE
THRALL FASTEN PROHIBIT PREVENT EDUCATE STILL FORBID PETITION RESTRICT
WEDGE ARREST SUSPEND BOUND DISPOSE PLAY DISSUADE PREDETERMINE DENY
CAGE ENTRAP ENJOIN CATCH CHECK CURTAIL CAUTION READJUST LEGISLATE
PROVE FAMILIARIZE DESIRE ENTREAT DISALLOW DICTATE DEMAND PREVAIL
DELIVER ALIGHT CONNIVE CLAIM REJECT RESPECT PREDOMINATE LIFT SHOVE LEAP
TURN TUG SHIFT CURB PROTRACT RETARD IGNORE ADVANCE TRANSPORT TEACH
INTERVENE TRAIN SECURE SHAKE EDUCATE

10 — F A I L E D C O N T R O L

PROLONG PROTRUDE EXCEED POTTER DRIBBLE BOTCH BOGGLE STUMBLE SLOP WISH
JUMBLE RISK RESORT RUMMAGE HUMOUR IMMERSE GARBLE

COLLIDE FAILED CONTROL LOSE WRANGLE WALLOP WRECK FIGHT QUARREL
WRENCH WREST DESERT WHIP MUTINY SINK PILLORY SLAP SMACK UNSETTLE STICK
SLAM DROWN DOPE DRUG BUMP COLLIDE BURN GAS BULLY ELECTROCUTE
KEELHAUL POACH BRAND MAIM DISABLE MANGLE SCOURGE SCORCH
INCAPACITATE SCALD IMPOSE FLOOD PLAGUE INUNDATE SMUDGE HASH SHAKE
INCARCERATE HANG SIN SMUGGLE BOOTLEG CRIPPLE STRAGGLE SACK THROW
SCRATCH CLAW COMMIT TRANSGRESS DISSIPATE DERANGE DRENCH CAPITULATE
DUCK CRUCIFY DISLOCATE DENT FETTER TRUSS HANDCUFF CHAIN MANACLE SEIZE
GOOF ENTANGLE TRIP SICKEN BESIEGE TORTURE TRIFLE DECAPITATE LOOT STRIKE
DAMAGE TRICE JERK RACK PARALYZE FLOG EXECUTE SLACK GOLDBRICK SHIRK
IMPRISON PENALIZE RAVAGE PESTER REND PLUNDER PROSECUTE REVOLT REBEL
JOLT DROP JOSTLE STUN INTOXICATE CONQUER VANQUISH BIND TIE INEBRIATE
SURRENDER SMASH SPANK SPLIT VIOLATE BROACH SPLASH STAIN SPRAIN SPOIL
GAG STORM FLAIL SWAMP LOSE NICK BASH BATTER ASSAIL THRASH SWITCH
BELABOUR BESLAVER SLAVER DROOL BESET BESLOBBER BESMEAR BESPATTER
ADMONISH SPREADEAGLE BITE SHELL BOMB BOMBARD BREAK SPILL IMPLANT
IMPALE CORRUPT DEBAUCH DEFACE FRACTURE CAPSIZE PRICK PUNCTURE PUNISH
DISTURB CANE MUTILATE PIERCE BUTCHER MOB RUIN MAR MASH MASSACRE
BRUISE SMASH REACT SLOUCH SLIP PULSATE THROB TINGLE SMART SLAVE
SWELTER STINK REPTILE CRUMBLE FAIL RUIN GOBBLE ERODE CRUNCH TIPPLE
GUZZLE EXPIRE SWILL WITHER WILT LAPSE DISINTEGRATE DESTROY CRUSH BURST
STREW ROUT SPATTER BESTREW DISPERSE STRAY STRAGGLE SPREAD STAMPEDE
LOOT HACK IMPERIL DIVEST DIVERGE EXCOMMUNICATE OUTLAW FILTER INFEST
EVADE TRESPASS LACERATE RE-ENTER ADMIT PENETRATE LISP DEAFEN GROPE
BICKER DISSENT QUARREL CONTEND HARP HAUNT RECEDE SHIRK THWART GARBLE
THREATEN HUMOUR RESORT RISK JUMBLE REFRAIN BOTCH TRY REFRAIN HESITATE
RESIST FORBEAR AMPUTATE LOSE BESIEGE DISTRACT DISHEARTEN DISCOURAGE
MEDICATE FUMBLE MINCE BOTHER REGRET COMMISERATE WET FEAR DISAPPROVE
SURRENDER FULMINATE CHIDE COMPLAIN CONDEMN CHEW CARP BLAME
REPROACH RESENT CENSURE UPBRAID ATTEMPT PUTREFY PANT PUFF SAY CRY
DRAIN TIRE DOMINATE COMPEL COERCE ENFORCE WIGGLE STAGGER RETCH
WOBBLE WAVER WRITHE VOMIT WINCE NAUSEATE ROT FALTER DESPOND ENTREAT
DESIRE DESPAIR CRITICIZE EXHUME PRY SQUIRM NAG FIDGET FIGHT PLOT REVOLT
IMPLORE CONSPIRE BETRAY CONNIVE SLOBBER WITHSTAND STRUGGLE SHIVER
TOLERATE SHRUG SHOVE LEAP TURN SHIFT CLUTCH YIELD REJECT DEMAND
CONVINCE EXERT DICTATE DISALLOW DENY SHAME ERR ENFEEBLE CAGE
EMBARRASS DARE ENTRAP ENJOIN DEPRIVE SQUABBLE TANGLE LIMP STAMMER
STUTTER DISABLE DIVERT BREAK SCATTER MORTIFY

11 — H E L P

INSTRUCT SHARE INNERVATE SERVE TRAVAIL ASSIST HEAL HARMONIZE SALVAGE
SATISFY SALVE HELP HABILITATE SUSTAIN ASSURE BEFRIEND BESPEAK ABSOLVE
ALLEVIATE ADVISE ALLAY MITIGATE PARDON PALLIATE PERFUME PERMIT PERK
EASE EDIFY PLEASE ENCOURAGE PREPARE ENDEAR ENERGIZE ENHANCE ENLIGHTEN
TENDER REIMBURSE ENDOW FINANCE BESTOW SUPPLY REplete STOW SURFEIT FILL
SUFFICE FULFIL CONSOLE EXTEND CONTRIBUTE CO-OPERATE AVAIL LEAD LEND
SIMPLIFY IRRADIATE RAISE REASSURE RECOMMEND RECONCILE REDEEM RECTIFY
RECREATE REFORM REFIT REDRESS REFRESH RE-ENFORCE FACILITATE
REGENERATE REHABILITATE REJUVENATE REINFORCE RELIEVE RELY REPAIR
FORGIVE RESPITE RESUSCITATE RESCUE FURTHER RETOUCH REVIVE REVISE OFFER
RETRIEVE REVIVIFY OBLIGE UNDERTAKE SMOOTH UPHOLD SOLACE VALIDATE
VERIFY SOOTHE SPELL SPONSOR WILE VOLUNTEER VINDICATE VOUCH STAUNCH
STRENGTHEN STROKE SUBSCRIBE SUCKLE SUCCOUR SURCEASE SUPPORT ENABLE
EXHILARATE PROVIDE ENLIVEN EQUIP CHEER EXCEL EXCULPATE COMFORT EXCUSE
CONCILIATE EXPEDITE EXPLAIN DEFRAID DELIGHT CULTIVATE DEVELOP DIVERT
DISBURDEN DRESS DRIVE WINE CALM CIVILIZE BURNISH CURE INVIGORATE ENGAGE
HEAVE HANDLE MANIPULATE ACTUATE EMPOWER OPERATE ALTER ORDER
COMMAND RULE DIRECT DISCIPLINE STOP RADIATE HALT HOLD TEST JUGGLE
JOCKEY DEPLOY TOW MIX DRILL PUSH PUT LOAD HOIST DILATE EXPAND HAUL
FETCH START STEER STRUT MANAGE SUPERVISE SUPERINTEND ADMINISTER
NEGOTIATE MEDIATE TREAT SEND ELECT APPROVE CONSIGN RENT HIRE

VEST ELONGATE AMPLIFY DELEGATE DEPUTE EMPHASIZE AIM AWARD MAGNIFY
ENLARGE UTILIZE ALLOT ALLOCATE APPOINT ASSIGN COMPLY DISBURSE BEGIN
ABATE ALLOW MASTER SHAPE ASSORT DISABUSE ORIENTATE ARRANGE MODERATE
PRESCRIBE STIPULATE HUSH PILOT NAVIGATE USHER VOTE SITUATE SET EMEND
EDIT REGULATE ADJUST CORRECT SUMMON REQUIRE SUBDUE CHALLENGE RECALL
TAKE HITCH PRESIDE ACCOUNT TAG ORGANIZE UNTANGLE HABITUATE PREDISPOSE
OFFICIATE IDENTIFY REWARD TACKLE DETAIL REIGN ENUMERATE SPACE ACQUIT
DEMAGNETIZE HEFT UNRUFFLE HELP REQUEST PURVEY ELUCIDATE PARTAKE
CONSENT CONSULT CONVEY DEMONSTRATE WELCOME UNDERSTAND TRADE AGREE
REMIT REMUNERATE FORWARD RENDER DISTRIBUTE CORRESPOND REPAY TRAIN
TEACH PLEA TIE BIND BUTCHER DOUSE STEADY EXTRACT BOIL STAVE PENETRATE
SMEAR FIX FORCE GRASP ISOLATE GRAB PASTE FORAGE QUENCH SEIZE BOTHER
STICK INVESTIGATE DOCK NAIL MEND TIME DARN VALET LAY GRUB LABOUR TOIL
NURTURE REPAIR NOURISH MATURE PERSIST PERPETUATE MAINTAIN
RECONSTRUCT RENOVATE RENEW CONTINUE RECUPERATE RECOVER REPRIEVE
REINSTATE PROSPER LUXURIATE SUCCEED FLOURISH WIN SURMOUNT GROW
THRIVE LIVE REMIND REMEMBER IMITATE REVIEW REPEAT RELATE TESTIFY
RECAPITULATE REITERATE QUOTE RECOUNT PRACTISE REHEARSE REPLENISH
REPLACE RESTORE ENACT DEPICT SKETCH REPRODUCE UNDERSTUDY COMPREHEND
REFER SUBSTANTIATE RETRACE RECOGNIZE RECIPROCATE PRINT REPRINT COPY
REDUPLICATE DUPLICATE TRANSMIT RELAY TRANSCRIBE RECORD EXECUTE FINISH
DEODORIZE TERMINATE DISPOSE EXPEND BEATIFY PROCREATE PROFFER INFORM
PARK LOCATE SITE SECURE PIN BATTEN CAMP BELAY PARTICIPATE YOKE BETROTH
PERMEATE PERVADE REUNITE REJOIN SPLICE CONNECT COMBINE KNIT LINK JOIN
ATTACH MARRY WED EMBRACE TOUCH MEET ACCOMPANY FRATERNIZE CONSORT
BESTREW DIFFUSE INTERSPERSE ROUGE EXCLUDE SORT SEPARATE ZONE DIVIDE
DETACH DIVEST UNLOAD UNCLASP DISROBE LICK LANCE INOCULATE INVEST
PENETRATE ADMIT INSTALL INVITE RE-ENTER INHABIT INHUME INTRUST INSERT
INJECT COAX CONCEDE INCREASE HUMOUR RISK TRY EDUCATE PIECE CONSERVE
PAWN DISCARD FORBEAR AMPUTATE LOSE WARD WARN SPARE COMMEND CLEANSE
CATCH OBIVIATE POLISH PACE MOISTEN PRETTIFY CLARIFY CAUTERIZE PURIFY
PREFER SOLVE ENTRAP INTERVENE DENY MODIFY MODULATE SWEETEN SWEEP
BEAUTIFY AMEND PERFECT MODERNIZE INVIGORATE INTERVENE LOVE SHADE
TRANSPORT DEVOTE DEDICATE ADORN ARBITRATE COMPLIMENT DISCOUNT GRANT
UNCHAIN RELEASE UNFETTER UNTIE UNLOCK LIBERATE SHIFT EXEMPT EMANCIPATE
LUG SHOVE LEAP TURN LIFT IMMIGRATE ADVANCE HURRY ACCOMPLISH ACHIEVE
ATTAIN ANOINT ADAPT INSPIRIT ACCUSTOM REWARD FOSTER PROMOTE PROVE
FAMILIARIZE DELIVER DONATE DESIRE PACIFY AMELIORATE SHELTER COMFORT
FEED LAVE SAVE TEND COVER LEGITIMIZE CACHE WIPE WASH FERTILIZE LUBRICATE
SEW INTERVENE IMPROVE TRANSFORM CHECK CAUTION PROSPER SPRAY VARNISH
EXTRICATE STANDARDIZE LIKE QUIESCE

12 — FAILED HELP

CUMBER SYMPATHIZE REMAND TACKLE FAILED HELP PROLONG PERSIST NICK LOSE
SWELTER STINK SMASH BRUISE CRUSH MAROON MAR RUIN MOB MUTILATE DISTURB
PUNISH PUNCTURE CONQUER PRICE PROSTRATE FRACTURE DEFLATE CONVICT
DEFRAUD DAZE DEFACE DEBASE EXCRUCIATE CORRUPT DEBAUCH DECEIVE EXTORT
DEJECT DEGRADE DELUDE IMPOVERISH SPILL DIVORCE DEMOTE AMBUSH KILL
BREAK BESPATTER BESMIRCH BESET BEDEVIL SWINDLE SULLY SUBJUGATE ENSLAVE
STRAIN SPOIL SPRAIN VITIATE STAIN SPLASH VIOLATE VANQUISH VICTIMIZE VEX
UNDERMINE UNDERCUT SMEAR SURRENDER INEBRIATE INTOXICATE DROP NETTLE
REVENGE PESTER PLAGUE PERSECUTE INFECT MAUL GOLDBRICK SLACK SHIRK
PAUPERIZE PARALYSE TERRIFY TERRORIZE DUPE TROUBLE IRK DAMAGE TRIFLE
TORMENT TRIP SICKEN INCRIMINATE DENOUNCE DEPRESS DEPOSE CAPITULATE
DISGRACE DRENCH DISHONOUR DESPOIL DISAFFECT DERANGE DERAIL DISMAY
TRANSGRESS SCRATCH TAX STRAGGLE CRIPPLE DEMORALIZE EXPLOIT CONFOUND
SMUDGE FLOOD TRICK IMPOSE BOTHER STARVE SCALD INCAPACITATE FRIGHTEN
GRIEVE ALARM SCARE SCORCH MANGLE DISABLE MAIM MOLEST BRUTALIZE BULLY
UNSETTLE TYRANNIZE SINK WEARY ULCERATE UNNERVE WOUND WORRY MUTINY
DESERT DEPRIVE

PAIN QUARREL FIGHT WRECK OPPRESS LOSE EAT DEVOUR ESTRANGE CRUMPLE
GOBBLE GNAW EXPLODE FLAME ERODE ENGULF RUIN ANNIHILATE SLAUGHTER SLAY
PURGE EXECUTE CRUSH DEMOLISH DESTROY DEVASTATE LIQUIDATE IRRADICATE
TOPPLE DOOM DESPATCH EXTIRPATE EXPUNGE ERADICATE OBLITERATE EFFACE
DISINTEGRATE FAIL VIVISECT GRUMBLE EMBOWEL CRUNCH LOAF DESIST IMPAWN
BECALM TEMPT ENTWINE YOKE CLING STAMPEDE STRAGGLE STRAY DISPERSE
SPATTER ROUT STREW BURST DIVERGE DIVEST DETACH EXCOMMUNICATE OUTLAW
DIFFER DIVIDE ZONE SEPARATE EXCLUDE SUNDER CLEAVE HUNT DEAFEN GROPE
HAUNT HARP CONTRADICT BICKER DECLINE DISSENT REMONSTRATE QUARREL
PROTEST CONTEND COLLIDE GARBLE IMMERSE RESORT RISK JUMBLE BOGGLE
REFRAIN BOTCH EXCEED TRY HESITATE EDUCATE FORGO EXACT WANT DISCARD
FORBEAR LOSE AMPUTATE WEAN ABSTAIN ENTREAT RESENT CENSURE UPBRAID
CHIDE COMPLAIN CONDEMN CARP REGRET COMMISERATE BOTHER FOUL MIRE
MEDICATE SHRUG TURN IMMIGRATE FUMBLE BEGRUDGE DISHEARTEN DENY
DISCOURAGE CURSE CRITICIZE DISAPPOINT ENFEEBLE SUFFER RENOUNCE ABANDON
FORSAKE REPUDIATE FORSWEAR REJECT IGNORE WEEP BETRAY CONSPIRE REVOLT
PLOT GRIEVE GROAN POUT PRY DISPLEASE CRY DESPAIR DESPOND SUCCUMB
SUBSIDE SUBMIT TIRE AVOID HATE PERISH CAPITULATE BLAME REPROACH AVENGE
DESIRE CAGE ENTRAP ENERVATE DEPRIVE DISABLE

13 — C O M P E T E

RACE RUN SPAR PURSUE HUNT TRACK BREAST SUBVERT CONTEST JOUST BOX
CHASE BELEAGUER BATTLE BET COMBAT WRESTLE SCUFFLE ANGLE STEM COMPETE
BUFFET FIGHT ENGAGE LAY STRUGGLE STRIVE FISH CRUSADE ENCOUNTER STAKE
WAGER SKIRMISH MILITATE CONFLICT PLAY TUSSLE WAGE ANTAGONIZE GRAPPLE
ATTACK CAMPAIGN SUPPLANT DISPLACE DISCREDIT UNDERMINE OUST SWEEP
PRETEND REDUCE BETRAY ENVY HATE RESENT DEFY SURMOUNT EXCEL DEFEAT
WIN LOSE CONFOUND EXPLOIT CRIPPLE DEMORALIZE CHEAT DISMAY DESPOIL
CAPITULATE DUCK CHARGE ENSNARE TRAP FENCE DUEL SEIZE BESIEGE TROUBLE
TROUNCE COUNTERFEIT DUPE SIEGE RAID PARALYSE PENALIZE REVENGE COERCE
REVOLT FORCE REBEL RETALIATE TIE SURRENDER UNDERCUT UNDERMINE
VANQUISH PENETRATE SQUELCH STAVE STALK SUBJUGATE BEAT ATTACK BESET
CAPTURE DECEIVE CONQUER CRUSH PRACTISE REHEARSE WAGE PARTICIPATE
PERFORM WAGER RADIATE HECKLE DIFFER SCORE LICK SCUFFLE INFRINGE INVEST
CONTEND DEBATE HUNT LIMIT INTERCEPT TIE SEIZE COLLIDE THREATEN THRASH
GARBLE RESORT RISK PREVENT YIELD OVERPOWER VIE COVET FRUSTRATE RESIST
FOIL LITIGATE OUTWIT OUTWORK OVERWHELM SURPASS OUTSTRIP WIN TRIUMPH
LITIGATE CHASE SCRIMMAGE DISAGREE CONTRAVENE CONTEST COMBAT RACE
WRESTLE TUSSLE TAUNT COMPETE DIVERT LEAD RE-ENFORCE REINFORCE UPHOLD
STRENGTHEN EXCEL DISPUTE FACE PURPOSE THROW CONFRONT SUE SUCCEED
SURMOUNT TIME LIVE SURVIVE THRASH LOSE WRANGLE QUARREL FIGHT WRING
DEPRIVE WREST OVERPOWER OVERWHELM WORRY WHIP UNSETTLE INFILTRATE
DISABLE INCAPACITATE BOTHER IMPOSE TRICK INVADE GAMBLE CONTEND COPE PIT
RIVAL DUEL GAMBLE

14 — L I K E

SAVOUR SNUGGLE PET RELISH ESTEEM LIKE BEFRIEND PLEASE ENCOURAGE ENDEAR
DELIGHT SANCTION UNDERSTAND WELCOME ACKNOWLEDGE RESPOND HUG CARESS
STROKE CUDDLE FEEL RUB EMULATE COPY COMPREHEND RESTORE DUPLICATE
REPRODUCE REPLENISH INCLINE SHOWER BESTOW RADIATE BURST CLEAVE TOY
WANT APPROACH LEAP REVERE RESPECT COMMEND COMPLIMENT CHERISH
TREASURE SELECT APPRECIATE IDOLIZE REGARD PRAISE APPLAUD VALUE LOVE—
HATE LIKE—DISLIKE FAMILIARIZE DESIRE LOVE BE SERENE AMUSE EXULT ENJOY
SMILE NUZZLE JUBILATE REVEL FROLIC FONDLE REJOICE GRIN GLADDEN LIKE
TRUST FAVOUR PREFER FANCY LOVE DOTE ADMIRE ENJOY APPRECIATE APPROVE

15 — D I S L I K E

DISLIKE OFFEND DISMAY DISAFFECT IRK PERSECUTE GRIPE BITCH MIMIC RIDICULE
IMITATE MIME ANNUL ABOLISH ELIMINATE EXPURGATE ANNIHILATE

SLAUGHTER SLAY PURGE EXECUTE CRUSH DEMOLISH DESTROY DEVASTATE
LIQUIDATE IRRADICATE TOPPLE DOOM EXTIRPATE EXPUNGE ERADICATE
OBLITERATE EFFACE DISINTEGRATE FINISH ESTRANGE STREW ROUT RADIATE
SPATTER INSULT HORRIFY HIT ABUSE EXCLUDE SEPARATE ZONE DIVIDE DIFFER
OUTLAW EXCOMMUNICATE LOATHE PROTEST QUARREL REMONSTRATE DISSENT
CONTEND DECLINE BICKER CONTRADICT HARP RECEDE DISMISS SHUN SHIRK SPURN
RESENT VILIFY PREJUDICE RESIST LITIGATE RESENT SADDEN ABOMINATE EXECRATE
CONDEMN BLAME DESPISE HATE DISCARD GARBLE LEAP TOY TUG DISPARAGE
REJECT PROHIBIT HESITATE HATE—LOVE DISLIKE—LIKE SULK OUTRAGE ABHOR
ABOMINATE ANGER SCORN INFURIATE COLLIDE BETRAY CONNIVE RAGE RANKLE
POUT GRUMBLE FIGHT DISPLEASE DETEST AGONIZE ENVY DISGUST DISLIKE HATE

16 — O V E R T S

INTRUDE TERRIFY TERRORIZE BURGLE GASH RACK RAID COMMANDEER QUARTER
RAM RAPE RAP FORAGE RANSACK PARALYSE DEVASTATE FLOG PASTE SLUG RASE
GOAD PAUPERIZE EXECUTE GRAB RASP KIDNAP IMPERSONATE COUNTERFEIT FORGE
DUPE REQUISITION THRUST SIEGE CHOKE THUMP THROTTLE TROUNCE INTERDICT
TORTURE TORMENT QUENCH QUELL TRIFLE QUASH DECAPITATE DAMAGE TRICE
JERK IRK TICKLE TROUBLE TRIP SICKEN BESIEGE JAB SPY INTERROGATE SEIZE GOOF
ENTANGLE TRUSS CHAIN MANACLE INTIMATE DEMOLISH DENT FETTER HANDCUFF
ENSNARE SNIPE FENCE DUEL INCRIMINATE TRAP DRENCH DISGRACE DISMEMBER
CASTRATE DISSECT DUCK CAPITULATE CHARGE DEPOSE DEPRESS CRUCIFY
DISLOCATE DEPRAVE CUT DENOUNCE CROP DISHONOUR DRAG DESPOIL GUT DRAW
DISAFFECT DERANGE DERAIL DISMAY EVISCERATE CLAW DISEMBOWEL DISSIPATE
CHEAT TRANSGRESS COMMIT SCRATCH THROW CHOP TAX DAZZLE SACK RUSTLE
STRAGGLE SNATCH STEAL PREVARICATE EMBEZZLE LIE CRIPPLE DEMORALIZE
EXPLOIT CONFOUND CRIMINATE AXE SMUGGLE GAMBLE SIN BOOTLEG INVADE
GOUGE KICK INCARCERATE SMUDGE SKIN INUNDATE FLOOD TRICK IMPOSE SCALP
BOTHER STARVE WRY SAVAGE SCALD IMPRECATE INCAPACITATE GRIEVE FRIGHTEN
ALARM SCARE INCINERATE SCORCH INCISE SCOURGE KNOCK MANGLE DISABLE
MAIM BRAND POACH MOLEST KEELHAUL GAS ELECTROCUTE BRUTALIZE BULLY
BURN COLLIDE BUMP DRUG DOPE SMOTHER DROWN EMASCULATE IMMOBILIZE
NEUTER SPAY POISON SMITE INFILTRATE SLAM SLICE STICK QUIZ SLAP
INVESTIGATE UNSETTLE SMACK SIZZLE SLIT TYRRANIZE DOCK PILLORY REPRESS
NAIL SINK WHELM WEARY WHACK PROD ULCERATE WHIP UNNERVE ANNEX WOUND
WORRY OVERWHELM OVERPOWER WARP MUTINY WAYLAY DESERT WREST DEPRIVE
PAIN WRENCH WRINKLE ROUGH WRING OSTRACIZE QUARREL FIGHT WRECK WALLOP
WRANGLE OPPRESS BANISH OFFEND LOSE NICK NIP RASP MASH THIEVE CRUSH
MASSACRE MOB EXILE BRUISE BRUTIFY SMASH MAROON DOUSE CANE PIERCE
MUTILATE PINCH BUTT BUTCHER SQUEAL RUIN DISTURB MAR DEBAUCH CORRUPT
EXCRUCIATE DEBASE BOARD DEFACE EXPOSE DAZE DEFRAUD CONVICT DEFLATE
FRACTURE PRESS PRICK CAPSIZE PROSTRATE PROSCRIBE IMPRESS PULVERIZE
PUNCH SHOOT CONQUER PUNCTURE PUNISH CLUB DECEIVE IMPLANT DEGRADE
DEJECT EXTRACT CAPTURE IMPALE EXTORT SHELL IMPOVERISH DECORTICATE
DEMENT DELUDE IMPOUND BOMB GAG BOMBARD BREAK KILL AMBUSH DEMOTE
MURDER DIVORCE HEW SPILL AGGRAVATE SWITCH BELABOUR BENUMB BESLAVER
BESET BESLOBBER BESMEAR BESMIRCH BESPATTER ADMONISH STULTIFY
SPREADEAGLE BITE BOIL STORM STRANGLE STRAFE YANK STRAIN STUN FLAIL
SWAMP STUPEFY ENSLAVE SUBJUGATE SULLY SUFFOCATE SWEAT APPAL SWINDLE
ADULTERATE BASH BATTER ASSAIL BEFOUL BEAT BEHEAD BEDEVIL ATTACK THRASH
STIFLE STRIKE STALK STARTLE STAVE SQUELCH SQUEEZE STAB DEAFEN SMASH
SMEAR UNDERCUT UNDERMINE SMOKE SPANK SOCK SOIL VICTIMIZE VANQUISH
SPLIT VEX VIOLATE SPLASH BOOBYTRAP STAIN SPEAR VITIATE SPRAIN SPOIL
PENETRATE GOSSIP SQUASH SPIT SURRENDER BLIND INEBRIATE BIND INTOXICATE
FOMENT RETALIATE RIVE FIX JOLT NETTLE DROP JOSTLE RAZE GRASP RAVISH
RAVAGE INFECT PERSECUTE PLAGUE GRILL PESTER RECK REVENGE REND PLUNDER
POKE GRIPE BITCH POUND PROSECUTE TIE FLAGELLATE FLAY COERCE REVOLT
FLOOR FORCE REBEL IMPRISON RIP RIFLE IRRITATE SHIRK GOLDBRICK SLACK MAUL
CRIMP ASSASSINATE PECK ISOLATE PENALIZE PRY QUESTION BESTRIDE SHATTER
LOATHE TRESPASS LYNCH LASH LACERATE LAME TRAP SENTENCE LICK SEAR
LANCE INJURE SCUFFLE INFRINGE SCRATCH TRAMPLE

INFLICT TUT SCORE INFILTRATE INFEST SCRAPE INDISPOSE IMMURE HATCH
IMMOLATE HURT HARRY HOUND HANG HORRIFY HECKLE HACK HASH HIT HARASS
HAMMER HAZE SHOCK SHRED LOOT INSULT ATTACK ENGAGE TACKLE HEAVE
HANDLE MANIPULATE ACTUATE EMPOWER OPERATE ALTER REMAND ORDER
COMMAND RULE DIRECT DISCIPLINE STOP HALT HOLD TEST REPAY THROW TRAFFIC
PERSUADE EXHORT TEACH PEN SUGGEST ALLUDE LECTURE DISCUSS DISPUTE
DISCLOSE REVEAL SHOUT TAP SMELL OGLE INSTIGATE CONTRIVE STINK TESTIFY
MIMIC GOBBLE GNAW EAT DEVOUR ESTRANGE CRUMPLE EXPLODE FLAME ERODE
ENGULF RUIN SLAUGHTER SLAY PURGE EXECUTE CRUSH DEMOLISH DESTROY
DEVASTATE LIQUIDATE IRRADICATE TOPPLE DOOM DESPATCH EXTIRPATE EXPUNGE
ERADICATE OBLITERATE EFFACE DISINTEGRATE FAIL VIVISECT GRUMBLE EMBOWEL
CRUNCH STIR PROVOKE INVOLVE PLANT MAKE SPAWN IMPREGNATE DAB STICK
LOAF FREEZE PURSUE TRACK PROBE TRAIL ROUSE AROUSE ELECTRIFY TEASE
TEMPT CLING YOKE ENTWINE BETROTH CONSORT MEET TOUCH EMBRACE WED
MARRY JOIN LINK COMBINE PERVADE PERMEATE STREW BURST ROUT RADIATE
ROUGE STAMPEDE SPREAD SHOWER SPATTER STRAGGLE STRAY INTERSPERSE
DISPERSE BITCH DISROBE DIVEST DIVERGE DETACH EXCOMMUNICATE OUTLAW
DIFFER DIVIDE ZONE SEPARATE EXCLUDE SUNDER CLEAVE EXTRADITE INOCULATE
INVEST PENETRATE INSTALL INHUME INSERT INJECT HAUNT DEAFEN HUNT HARP
CONTRADICT BICKER DISSENT CONTEND QUARREL YANK DISMISS INTERCEPT SHIRK
SHACKLE SEGREGATE THWART TIE ISOLATE SEIZE COLLIDE GARBLE THREATEN
THRASH IMMERSE RISK JUMBLE SLOP STUMBLE BOTCH GAG EXCEED FETTER
AMPUTATE LOSE DISCARD EXACT COVET REPRESS ARREST SURROUND SUSPEND
BESIEGE HURRY ADVANCE TRAMP STOVE LEAP TOY TURN TUG SHIFT TOSS HURL
ENCHAIN INFORM IMPACT INSINUATE STARVE STEAL PILFER PURGE CALUMNIATE
CURSE PHILANDER SCOLD FLAUNT INTRUDE SATIRIZE SCATTER IMPLY SHAKE
INVEIGH ROB CONDEMN DISCREDIT DISOBEY DISMISS DISQUALIFY EMBEZZLE
MISAPPROPRIATE BEREAVE SWIPE STEAL THIEVE DISABLE BLIND SLANDER DEPRIVE
POLLUTE PERJURE DAMN INVALIDATE PROFANE CATCH ENERVATE ENTRAP
MORTIFY SHAME DARE ABORT ROB EMBARRASS CAGE ENFEEBLE CRIPPLE DISOBEY
CHASTISE ERR ENDANGER MISTREAT ABUSE MISBEHAVE SUBJECT CRITICIZE CURSE
DISCOURAGE DEFORM DENY DISHEARTEN PEPPER DISAPPROVE DISTRACT RACK
CARVE FLAY MASSACRE MEDICATE BEGRUDGE BOTHER FOUL STAMP SPRAY
COMMISERATE WIPE SKEWER LEVEL TEAR SMUGGLE MUTINY REBEL REVOLT CARP
CHEW OBJURGATE CHIDE COMPLAIN UPBRAID CENSURE INCULPATE IMPLY RESENT
ASCRIBE AVENGE REPROACH BLAME REPREHEND OVERTHROW OVERWHELM KNIFE
DISTRESS DISLIKE DISPLEASE PERFORATE MINCE DISCHARGE WASTE DEVASTATE
DISALLOW DICTATE DEMAND CONVINCEN DOMINATE COMPEL COERCE ENFORCE
HATE EXHUME GLOAT FIGHT AGGRIEVE MADDEN SADDEN PROVE PRY RECANT
IMPUTE IMPUGN TRADUCE REVOLT PLOT CONSPIRE CONNIVE COLLUDE INFURIATE
BETRAY OUTRAGE ANNOY TRUMP CERTIFY OVERPOWER UNDERBID DEVEST
DEROGATE DESECRATE DETRACT DISRATE PROTRACT RETARD DISPARAGE
DISCREDIT

17 — FAILED OVERT

EDUCATE HESITATE TRY FAILED OVERT INVIGORATE EXPEDITE COMFORT CHEER
EQUIP ENABLE SUPPORT SUCCOUR STRENGTHEN OBLIGE RESPITE RELIEVE
FACILITATE RECONCILE REASSURE CO-OPERATE CONTRIBUTE SUPPLY ENERGIZE
ENDEAR ENCOURAGE PLEASE EASE HELP ASSIST INNERVATE CAPITULATE
SURRENDER PARRY SHIELD WARD TURN CONCEDE RECEDE THWART TIE LOCALIZE
LATCH THREATEN HUMOUR RESORT BOGGLE PREVENT BESIEGE BOTCH DESPAIR
RESIST FORBID FORBEAR REPRESS FOIL WARD WARN RETRACT SPARE REFRAIN
STRIVE WITHSTAND REGRET TURN SHRUG

18 — MOTION

TUNNEL TRENCH DAB FLAP POP DESCEND DIP PROD EFFUSE BROWSE CRUISE PITCH
PLUNGE PLY POUR PRANCE POWER PROCEED PROGRESS PROWL PULL CAPER
DISLODGE DISPLACE CAREEN CARRY CAST DODGE CLUMP COAST COIL DABBLE
CREEP CLIMB SOAR SPIN SPEED SPRINT SPRING SPURT STAGNATE STEP STEM
STRIDE STROLL STRUM SURGE SWAY SWIM SWIRL ARISE SWING BESTIR BLOW
BOOST BRANDISH MARCH BUDGE BUSTLE PASS

MOVE MOUNT EBB ELEVATE WRESTLE WHIZ WHIRL WHISK WEND WHEEL WEIGH
SLINK SLING SLOG SLIDE SLUSH SKIM HURL HUSTLE HASTEN FLANK TEEM FLARE
FLING FLIP FLICK RETURN FLIT FLOAT FLOP FLOW FLUTTER FOLLOW FLY REPASS
REVOLVE RISE ROAM ROMP ROLL ROTATE ROW ROVE JOG JOIST JOURNEY JUMP
ZOOM WABBLE WADE WADDLE WANDER WALTZ WAGGLE WALK WAG WAFT WAVE
WIELD TREMBLE TREK TOTTER TOSS TODDLE TILT THRUM LEAN TICK TOUR LEVER
LILT LIMBER LIMP LOWER LUNGE LURCH FALL GALLOP RACE GLIDE RAMBLE
GLIMMER PACE PADDLE PARADE PEDAL FARE PLOD GUSH REDOUBLE SHUFFLE LAP
SIDLE IMPEL SKID TROLL IMPRINT DANCE DASH DART QUAKE QUIVER QUAYER
TRILL TWIRL TWIDDLE TREND TROT TRICKLE LAUNCH TREAD TRAVERSE TRAVEL
TUMBLE SHIFT TUSSLE TUG TURN SHIP TOY SHAMBLE LEAP SHEER LUG SHOVE
SHRUG TRUCK LIFT TRUDGE ADVANCE TRAMP TRANSPORT SAUNTER SCALE
IMMIGRATE HURRY ASCEND AMBLE APPROACH SAIL MOTION JUGGLE JOCKEY
DEPLOY TOW MIX DRILL PUSH PUT LOAD HOIST DILATE TACKLE EXPAND HAUL
HEAVE FETCH START STEER HANDLE SHUT DISPORT OSCULATE HUG CARESS
STROKE CUDDLE TAP FEEL RUB TRANSACT COMMENCE PATTERN SWISH CLACK
CLANG CLINK PEAL JINGLE REVERBERATE RIPPLE RING DRIP SLUMP SLOUCH REACT
SLIP PULSATE THROB SLAVE HIT GRAB PUNCH RASP GOAD SLUG FLOG RAP RAM
GASH BANG THUMP THRUST JERK JAB CROP CUT DUCK DRAG DRAW CLAW CHOP
SNATCH AXE GORGE KICK INCISE SCOURGE KNOCK COLLIDE BUMP SMITE SLAM
SLICE SLASH UNSETTLE SMACK SLAP SLIT DOCK NAIL SINK PROD WHACK WHIP
WARP WREST SCREW WRENCH WRINKLE WRY WRING WALLOP NIP NICK CRUSH
MASH BUTT PINCH PIERCE CANE DOUSE CLUB PUNCTURE PUNCH PULVERIZE SPUR
PRICK EXTRACT SPILL BITE BESMEAR BESPATTER SWITCH BEAT BATTER BASH FLAIL
STRAIN YANK STRIKE STALK STAVE STAB SQUEEZE SQUASH PENETRATE SPRAIN
PRY SPEAR SPLASH SPLIT SMEAR JOSTLE DROP JOLT FORCE COERCE POUND POKE
REND RIP SLACK SUFFUSE STIMULATE STIR TOPPLE BUILD MAKE PRODUCE ERECT
NIBBLE INNOVATE MANUFACTURE ESTABLISH CONSTRUCT INITIATE INCLINE
UNCOVER UNEARTH UNDESS UNVEIL UNFURL UNROLL ENGAGE DISPLAY TRAIL
SCOUT TRACE TRAIL SEARCH PURSUE TRACK EXPLORE PARTICIPATE PERFORM
KNIT STREW BURST ROUT RADIATE RANGE BESTREW STAMPEDE SPREAD SHOWER
SPATTER STRAGGLE STRAY HARRY DISROBE UNCLASP UNLOAD DIVEST DETACH
CLEAVE EVADE EXTRICATE GO EMERGE YANK REBOUND RECEDE RECOIL SHAKE
INJECT INSERT RE-ENTER INSTALL ADMIT PENETRATE INVEST HUNT EVADE EXTRACT
IMMERSE STUMBLE BOUND BOLT HAUL HASTEN HURL HOIST HUSTLE PUSH HEAVE
TOW SCATTER SEND SHUT RAISE VIBRATE PRECIPITATE MEANDER BEND SURFACE
SWERVE EXHUME EVICT RUSH SCRAM SKIP VACATE SCATTER RUN RETREAT
EMIGRATE UPHEAVE PASTE TRUNDLE SLOP

19—D E S T R O Y

ABOLISH OBLITERATE ERADICATE EXPUNGE LIQUIDATE IRRADICATE EXTIRPATE
DISINTEGRATE LAPSE FINISH FAIL EXPIRE WILT WITHER EFFACE ANNUL ELIMINATE
ADJOURN ELAPSE ESTRANGE TERMINATE EXPEND DISPOSE ENGULF DELETE ERASE
EXPURGATE EXTINGUISH DESTROY ANNIHILATE RUIN CONSUME ERODE TOPPLE
VIVISECT EXECUTE DEMOLISH DEVASTATE PURGE DOOM DEPRECIATE DEODORIZE
DESPATCH EAT GNAW DEVOUR EXPLODE FLAME EMBOWEL DRINK NIBBLE SWIG
SWALLOW QUAFF SUP SLAY SLAUGHTER CRUSH SWILL GUZZLE TIPPLE CRUNCH
CRUMPLE GOBBLE CRUMBLE DESTROY WEAR SMASH ASSASSINATE RAZE RAVAGE
FLAY RIVE WRECK SINK POISON DROWN SMOTHER EMASCULATE NEUTER SPAY
CASTRATE DEAFEN BLIND SMASH UNDERMINE SPLIT SPEAR VITIATE SPOIL SQUASH
SPIT STAB EXPOSE STIFLE STRANGLE SWAMP SUFFOCATE BASH BATTER BEHEAD
BOIL BOMB SHELL BOMBARD BREAK KILL SLAY MURDER IMPALE DEFACE PULVERIZE
SHOOT CLUB DOUSE MUTILATE BUTCHER MOB RUIN MASH CRUSH MASSACRE MAUL
BURN GAS ELECTROCUTE KEELHAUL MAIM DISABLE MANGLE SKIN SCORCH
INCINERATE INCAPACITATE SCALD SAVAGE STARVE SCALP FLOOD INUNDATE AXE
CRIPPLE SACK CHOP CLAW DISEMBOWEL EVISCERATE GUT DERAILED DRAW DRAG
DISMEMBER DISSECT CRUCIFY DEMOLISH QUENCH QUASH DECAPITATE DAMAGE
CHOKE THROTTLE QUARTER RAM PARALYSE DEVASTATE RASE EXECUTE RADIATE
ROUT BURST DISPERSE STREW SHRED HANG HACK HASH IMMOLATE IMPALE
CLEAVE SUNDER SHATTER LYNCH SEAR TRAMPLE INFLICT PENETRATE INVEST
INOCULATE BICKER QUARREL DEAFEN EXTRACT COLLIDE GARBLE JUMBLE SLOP
BOGGLE

BOTCH LOSE AMPUTATE DISCARD REPRESS LEAP SPAY WEED LEVEL SHRED AVENGE
UPROOT WASTE DEVASTATE REVOLT COLLUDE BETRAY REJECT SHRIVEL RETARD
HANG SHATTER LYNCH INCINERATE IMMOLATE CREMATE DISABLE DEPRIVE
ENERVATE ABORT CURSE SACRIFICE ENFEEBLE DESICCATE CURTAIL MASSACRE
DISSOLVE MASTICATE DEDUCT MEDICATE STERILIZE

20 — MIS - E M O T I O N A L

MIS-EMOTIONAL RESPOND DISPUTE EXHORT WELCOME UNDERSTAND APPEAL PLEA
IRRITATE TERRIFY TERRORIZE IRK TORMENT DENOUNCE DEPRESS DISGRACE
DISHONOUR DISAFFECT DERANGE DISMAY DEMORALIZE IMPRECATE PERK SOOTHE
EMBITTER ENLIVEN CHEER DELIGHT FRIGHTEN GRIEVE ALARM SCARE BRUTALIZE
BULLY DEJECT DEGRADE DEMENT AGGRAVATE BENUMB BEDEVIL APPAL STUPEFY
STUN VEX UNNERVE WORRY PAIN QUARREL OFFEND NETTLE STIR PROVOKE
ANTICIPATE QUAIL LOATHE HAUNT LISP HARP BICKER PROTEST WISH BOGGLE
TRANSPORT SHRUG STUMBLE SYMPATHIZE RELISH ESTEEM HUMILIATE HIDE NEED
APPROVAL FROM OWN PROTECT CONTROL BLAME PUNISH BE KILL MAKE
APATHETIC MAKE AMENDS GRIEVE PROPITIATE SYMPATHIZE FEAR NOT-
SYMPATHIZE RESENT COVERTLY ANGER PAIN RESENT OVERTLY BORE MAKE
INDIFFERENT CONTENT MILDLY INTEREST INTEREST STRONGLY ENTHUSE
EXHILARATE MAKE EAGER MAKE SERENE DESPISE WAIL SORROW SIGH BETRAY
GRIEVE GROAN REPENT RUE YELP AGONIZE MOAN MOPE MOURN ENVY CRY
DESPAIR EMBITTER WAVER FALTER AVOID CAPITULATE COMMISERATE REGRET
DEMUR DISHEARTEN EMBARRASS BEMOAN BEWAIL WEEP AGONIZE DISGUST
ENTREAT CENSURE UPBRAID FOUL DISAPPROVE ENFEEBLE HUMILIATE MORTIFY
DARE SHAME ASHAME SULK OUTCRY SCORN INFURIATE RAGE RANKLE GROWL
POUT GRUMBLE NAG YELP YAP DISGUST DISLIKE DISPLEASE DETEST HATE
INCULPATE ASCRIBE CHIDE COMPLAIN CHEW CONDEMN OBJURGATE CARP IMPLY
FULMINATE REPREHEND REPROACH AVENGE RESENT DEPLORE RECRIMINATE
DISAPPROVE ABUSE REBUKE CRITICIZE CONVICT INSANE OUTRAGE WHOOP SLOBBER
ABHOR ABOMINATE ANGER ANNOY SCORN INFURIATE SENTIMENTALIZE SHUDDER
SIGH QUIBBLE IMPLORE GESTICULATE RAGE RAMP GLOAT PANIC GNASH FAINT
FIDGET FIGHT REPENT FRET DREAD RUE YELL AGGRIEVE MADDEN PALPITATE
DISLIKE DISPLEASE DISTRESS DESPAIR DESPOND DETEST AMERCE MORTIFY SHAME
RESENT CURSE DISCOURAGE DISTRACT BOTHER COMMISERATE REGRET BLAME
HATE

21 — W I T H H O L D

ACCUSE ABUSE ACCOST PURLOIN IMPEACH AGITATE IMPERIL IMPAIR IMPALE
AFFLICT IMPLICATE TRANSFIX SCAR INCRIMINATE INDENT INDICT SEGREGATE SEAL
SHACKLE TUCK SHIRK SECLUDE INTERCEPT SHUN HIDE HIBERNATE HINDER LIMIT
INSULATE EXEMPT CLAM EXCEPT CONCEAL CONTAIN CONSTRICT CONSTRAIN CURB
ENCHAIN CLUTCH ENGORGE PRECLUDE PINION MUZZLE MUFFLE BOUND BOLT BIND
ABSTAIN BESIEGE BAN ARREST SWADDLE SURROUND SUSPEND APPREHEND STILL
SPECIALIZE SPARE WEDGE SNARE WEAN WARD WARN RETRACT WITHHOLD STOW
REFORM SOOTHE STAUNCH EXCUSE CIVILIZE CALM HOLD HALT STOP SHUT HITCH
DISCIPLINE TAME RECALL CHALLENGE SUBDUE REQUIRE SUMMON HANDLE
CORRECT ADJUST REGULATE EDIT EMEND SET SITUATE VOTE STEER USHER
NAVIGATE PILOT HUSH STIPULATE PRESCRIBE DIRECT MODERATE ARRANGE
ORIENTATE ASSORT DISABUSE SHAPE RULE COMMAND MASTER ORDER ABATE
PARRY SQUEEZE TIE BIND NAIL DESERT DEPRIVE OSTRACIZE BANISH FIX GRASP
TRAP CRIMP COMMANDEER REQUISITION KIDNAP INTERDICT TRICE QUELL SEIZE
MANACLE CHAIN TRUSS ENSNARE HANDCUFF FETTER CRUCIFY DEPOSE
CAPITULATE COMMIT STEAL SNATCH INCARCERATE STARVE EXILE MAROON
EXPOSE EXCRUCIATE TAX DEFACE EXTORT CAPTURE EXTRACT SPILL MURDER
FORGET DESIST IMPRESS IMPRISON IMMURE SORT ZONE UNCLASP UNLOAD DIVIDE
CLEAVE EXCLUDE INDISPOSE YANK RECOIL INOCULATE INHUME CONTRADICT
DECLINE RECEDE HUMOUR GAG EDUCATE CONSERVE PAWN CAGE CEASE COMMIT
CONSECRATE COVER DISABLE DEPRIVE CATCH ENJOIN ENTRAP ESCHEW CAGE
ENFEEBLE DENY SUPPRESS CURTAIL MIRE FOUL PLOT CAUTION CHECK CACHE
COVER DISARM DISALLOW CONSPIRE GO CONNIVE COLLUDE CLAIM RETARD
FORGET FILTER RESTRAIN RESTRICT SECRETE FRUSTRATE RESIST RESERVE FORGO
FORBID REPRESS FOIL FETTER

FASTEN PROHIBIT PREVENT REFRAIN GAG RECOMMIT LOCALIZE LATCH THREATEN
THRASH THRALL TIE ISOLATE SHEATHE SEIZE IMMURE FORBEAR THWART

22 — F A I L E D W I T H H O L D

SHRIVE LOOSE GASP GRANT RELEASE FLAUNT YIELD LIBERATE PHILANDER
OUTBREAK UNCHAIN UNLOOSE UNLOCK UPHEAVE UNTIE UNGIRD UNFETTER
ACQUIESCE ACCEDE BLAB BLURT PEACH EMANCIPATE CLOY DISGORGE DIVULGE
FAILED WITHHOLD WHIMPER SHARE SATISFY RECOMMEND ADVISE PARDON PERMIT
TENDER REIMBURSE ENDOW COAX PANIC FINANCE BESTOW SUPPLY REPLETE
OBLIGE SURFEIT FILL SUFFICE FULFIL EXTEND CONTRIBUTE CO-OPERATE AVAIL
LEND REDRESS RE-ENFORCE REINFORCE OFFER REVIVIFY UNDERTAKE VOLUNTEER
SUCKLE SUPPORT DEFRAID PROVIDE EQUIP DRIVE MANIFEST REMAND ALLOW START
BEGIN FETCH HEAVE HAUL DISBURSE COMPLY ASSIGN APPOINT ALLOCATE ALLOT
UTILIZE ENLARGE MAGNIFY EXPAND AWARD AIM ALTER EMPHASIZE DEPUTE
DELEGATE TACKLE OPERATE EMPOWER DILATE AMPLIFY ELONGATE VEST ACTUATE
HIRE RENT CONSIGN APPROVE ELECT HOIST MANIPULATE LOAD PUT SEND REMAND
PROFESS APPEAL RESPOND REPORT REMARK REPLY ASK VOICE UTTER SPEAK CALL
SOUND BREAK DISCLOSE REACH TELL TALK EXCLAIM EXHIBIT REVEAL SHOUT SHOW
SMELL SLUMP SLOUCH REACT STINK SLIP SMART PULSATE THROB TINGLE DRIP
RECOUNT QUOTE REITERATE RECAPITULATE TESTIFY RELATE REPEAT REVIEW
REMEMBER REMIND IMITATE BREAK BOMBARD SHELL AGGRAVATE BITE BESPATTER
BESMIRCH BESMEAR BESLOBBER BESET BESLAVER BELABOUR ATTACK BEDEVIL
BEFOUL ASSAIL BATTER BASH FLOOD SWAMP FLAIL STORM STRIKE STAB SQUELCH
SQUASH GOSSIP SPOIL PRY STAIN SPLASH VIOLATE SPLIT VEX SOCK SOIL SMEAR
SMASH SURRENDER SMITE INFILTRATE SLAM SLICE SLASH SMACK SLAP SINK
WHACK WOUND WORRY OVERWHELM MUTINY PAIN WRENCH QUARREL WRECK
WALLOP OPPRESS OFFEND NIP NICK JOSTLE DROP NETTLE JOLT RETALIATE REBEL
FORCE REVOLT POUND POKE PLUNDER REND REVENGE RECK PESTER PLAGUE
PERSECUTE RAVAGE RAVISH RAZE IMPRISON RIFLE RIP PECK GRAB GOAD SLUG
PASTE DEVASTATE RANSACK RAP RAPE RAID GASH BURGLE THUMP THRUST
TROUNCE TROUBLE IRK DAMAGE TORMENT TORTURE SPY JAB TRIP INTIMATE
INCRIMINATE DUEL SNIPE DENT DENOUNCE CUT CHARGE DRENCH DISSIPATE
TRANSGRESS COMMIT CLAW DAZZLE SACK EXPLOIT CRIMINATE SMUGGLE INVADE
KICK SIN SMUDGE INUNDATE IMPOSE BOTHER SAVAGE SCALD SCORCH KNOCK
MANGLE POACH MOLEST BUMP MAUL MASSACRE SQUEAL MOB BUTT BUTCHER
PIERCE CANE DISTURB CLUB SHOOT PUNCH IMPRESS PRESS IMPALE IMPOUND
LIQUIDATE DEVASTATE DESTROY DEMOLISH CRUSH EXECUTE PURGE SLAY
SLAUGHTER ANNIHILATE RUIN ENGULF EXPIRE WILT ERODE FLAME EXPLODE
CRUMPLE EXPEND ESTRANGE CONSUME DEVOUR SWILL EAT GUZZLE SWIG GNAW
GOBBLE TIPPLE NIBBLE DRINK TOPPLE IRRADICATE IMPREGNATE DIVULGE SQUEAL
UNCOVER UNEARTH UNDRRESS UNVEIL UNFURL DISPLAY UNROLL UNFOLD EXTRACT
ENTWINE CONSORT TOUCH WED MARRY EMBRACE PERVADE PERMEATE
ENCOUNTER CLING DISPERSE DIFFUSE STRAY STRUGGLE STREW SPATTER SHOWER
BURST SPREAD ROUT STAMPEDE HAMMER HAZE SHOCK LOOT INSULT BITCH
HORRIFY HECKLE HIT HARASS IMMOLATE HURT HARRY HOUND INCRIMINATE
IMPLICATE AFFLICT ACCOST ABUSE DISROBE UNCLASP CLEAVE UNLOAD DIVEST
DIVERGE SUNDER DETACH EXCOMMUNICATE OUTLAW DIFFER DIVIDE ZONE
SEPARATE TRESPASS SHAKE LYNCH INJURE SCRATCH INFLICT ADMIT PENETRATE
INJECT INSERT INVEST HARP HUNT LISP DEAFEN CONCEDE CONTRADICT PROTEST
QUARREL REMONSTRATE DISSENT CONTEND BICKER TIE COLLIDE GARBLE IMMERSE
JUMBLE SLOP STUMBLE BOTCH EXACT PAWN WANT DISCARD SHOVE LEAP TOY
TURN TUG SHIFT ENVY AGONIZE MOAN YELL YAP YELP RUE REPENT GRUMBLE
FIGHT POUT GROAN GLOAT REVOLT IMPUGN RECANT TRADUCE BETRAY SHUDDER
INFURIATE ANGER SLOBBER WEEP WAIL OUTRAGE OUTCRY SHIVER BROOK CONFESS
PRY DESIRE ENTREAT DESPAIR VOMIT NAUSEATE SUCCUMB RETCH REVEAL
DISCLOSE SPILL STOOL SING TALK TATTLE DEDUCT ELUDE ENFEEBLE ENTRAP
INFORM SQUEAL DISTRESS BULLY RAM ACCUSE INFRINGE

23 — S E P A R A T E

SUNDER STRADDLE REFRACT DECOCT EXCLUDE FILTER DISROBE UNCLASP UNLOAD
DIVEST DIVERGE DETACH EXCOMMUNICATE OUTLAW DIFFER DIVIDE

ZONE SEPARATE SORT CLEAVE DILATE INDIVIDUATE SHARE RIVE ISOLATE IMPRISON
SECEDE BANISH DIVORCE OSTRACIZE WRENCH DEPRIVE DESERT SLIT SEVER SLASH
SPILL SPLIT PRY BEHEAD IMPOUND MAROON INCISE AXE SNATCH STRAGGLE CHOP
DISEMBOWEL EVISCERATE DRAW DESPOIL DISMEMBER CASTRATE DISSECT CUT
CROP KIDNAP BANISH STRAY INTERSPERSE STREW SPATTER DIFFUSE DISPERSE
RADIATE RANGE SHRED LOOT HEW HASH PURLOIN EXTRACT DEBATE PROTEST
QUARREL REMONSTRATE DISSENT CONTEND BICKER CONTRADICT RECEDE YANK
EMERGE DISMISS HIBERNATE SHUN SCENDE SEGREGATE ISOLATE LATCH THRASH
AMPUTATE DISCARD RESERVE WEDGE WEAN PARTICULARIZE DISTINGUISH
TABULATE ITEMIZE DIVERSIFY BISECT DEDUCT DISCRIMINATE DISCHARGE DEPORT
EXILE FIRE EXPEL BANISH SECEDE SELECT EXORCIZE EXCEPT CLEAVE

24 — A T T E N T I O N

FIX FIXATE DAZZLE DAZE IMPLANT STARTLE WORRY PESTER HELP ASSIST SERVE
INVOLVE EVOKE WAKE WAKEN AWAKEN ENGROSS TEMPT ATTRACT TANTALIZE
MARVEL ALLURE TRANCE IMPRESS CAPTIVATE FASCINATE ELECTRIFY HORRIFY
HARASS HOUND TRANSFIX DIVIDE SEPARATE SORT ZONE THRALL BOGGLE EDUCATE
SPECIALIZE SHIFT PREOCCUPY USE PURSUE PRACTISE FREQUENT EXERCISE
EMPLOY WELCOME THANK SYMPATHIZE REMEMBER RECOGNIZE INGRATIATE HOB-
NOB FAVOUR ENDEAR EMBOSOM BEFRIEND ACKNOWLEDGE WORSHIP VENERATE
VALUE TREASURE REVERE PRIZE LOVE LIKE IDOLIZE HONOUR HARBOUR HALLOW
GLORIFY ESTEEM DOTE CHERISH APPRECIATE ADORE ADMIRE AWAIT WATCH
GUARD BEWARE TREK OVERHAUL MARAUD FORAGE DISSECT CANVASS TRAVERSE
SCOUR PIERCE EXPLORE VENTURE STALK FOLLOW CHASE SOUND PROBE FUMBLE
FATHOM DELVE TEST EXPERIMENT WINNOW SIFT ANALYSE SPECULATE REGARD
OBSERVE MARK CONTEMPLATE BEHOLD STARE PEER PEEP OGLE GLOAT GAZE SPY
SCAN QUIZ PRY EYE SEEK SEARCH RUMMAGE RANSACK QUEST NOSE LOOK HUNT
FERRET SCHEME PLOT PLAN GET THE IDEA ATTENTION FIXED THINK FORESEE
RECALL RECONSIDER VALIDATE PREMEDIATE DELIBERATE CONCENTRATE BETHINK
ABSORB VIEW SENSE PERCEIVE IMAGINE FEEL CONCEIVE CATCH APPREHEND
THEORIZE CON RECKON REASON PHILOSOPHIZE COGITATE REVOLVE RUMINATE
PONDER MUSE MEDITATE CUDGEL CHEW REGARD PERUSE BROOD SPECULATE TEST
COMPARE WEIGH MIND HEED ENTERTAIN CONSIDER ATTEND STUDY SCRUTINIZE
AWAKE EXAMINE CONSULT ATTENTION SHIFTED ATTENTION

25 — P R O P I T I A T E

GRATIFY PACIFY PANDER PAMPER PRAY FAWN FLATTER APPEASE STOOP
SUPPLICATE SYNCOPATE PLEAD BESEECH BOW PROPITIATE EXPATiate EXPiate
DEFER CRINGE DOTE INDEMNIFY AMELIORATE LULL THANK PAY WINE DIVERT
CULTIVATE CONCILIATE WILE SOOTHE ALLAY SMOOTH OBLIGE APPEAL WELCOME
PROMISE PERSUADE REMUNERATE SANCTION REPAY CONSENT PROFESS ASK
RESPOND SATISFY PLEA SLAVE EMULATE ADMIT PROSTRATE ABASE CLING ENTWINE
CONSORT FRATERNIZE JOIN COMBINE REJOIN REUNITE SHOWER BESTREW
IMMOLATE CLEAVE DISROBE UNCLASP UNLOAD DIVEST INVITE CONCEDE COAX
CONTRADICT HUMOUR WISH TRY CONSERVE LOSE PETITION PREPAY DEIFY SHRUG
SHAMBLE SYMPATHIZE TRUCKLE EXTOL DEDICATE EXALT CROUCH ENTREAT
APPEAL GRIN SACRIFICE WORSHIP CAJOLE INDULGE SIMPER TRY COMMISERATE
WHEEDLE APPLAUD LIONIZE SHINE SIGNALIZE AWE GLORIFY PRAISE IDOLIZE
INFLATE WEEP SLOBBER IMPLORE REPENT DREAD WORSHIP ANOINT CAPITULATE

26 — I M P O R T A N C E

TRUCKLE TRUMP TROW DEVOTE DEVOLVE DESERVE CROW DEIFY CONSECRATE
EXTOL DEDICATE CONGRATULATE PROMOTE ENNOBLE CAPITALIZE ESTIMATE
CERTIFY CHERISH EXALT CITE COMPLIMENT COMMEND PRESENT FELICITATE
REPUTE FOSTER RESPECT REVERE REWARD JUDGE OUTNUMBER WAX WORSHIP
SLATE VALUE SOLEMNIZE VOW STRESS STRUT SUPERPOSE SURPASS ANOINT
SWAGGER SWANK APPLAUD ARBITRATE ASPIRE ASSAY AVOW ADJUDGE ADJUDICATE
ADORN BLAZON BOAST BRAG MILITATE PICK PLEDGE POSTURE PRECEDE
PREDOMINATE PREEN PREOCCUPY LIONIZE

INSTIL SHINE SIGNALIZE TRIUMPH TOP AWE RANK GLORIFY RATE GRADE PRAISE
REGARD IDEALIZE IDOLIZE IMMORTALIZE ACCREDIT APPRECIATE TOWER
INAUGURATE SALUTE INFLATE SELECT TREASURE INLAY INSCRIBE INSPIRE EDIFY
ENCOURAGE ENDEAR ENHANCE EXTEND CONTRIBUTE RAISE REINFORCE RE-
ENFORCE RELY FURTHER UPHOLD VALIDATE SPONSOR STRENGTHEN EXCEL
DELIGHT LIVE CULTIVATE DEVELOP CIVILIZE PAY EMBLAZON DECORATE TATTOO
EXHIBIT PERSIST PERSEVERE PERPETUATE MAINTAIN RECONSTRUCT RENOVATE
RENEW CONTINUE PROSPER SUCCEED WIN SURMOUNT GROW SURVIVE IMPRESS
BRAND EXPLOIT GOAD DUB ATTRIBUTE CRAVE SHOWER BESTREW RADIATE
STAMPEDE HORRIFY ZONE EXCOMMUNICATE OUTLAW FILTER DECOCT SORT DIFFER
CLEAVE SCORE INTRUST BICKER CONTEND COAX DISSENT REMONSTRATE QUARREL
PROTEST DEBATE HARP SEAL ISOLATE THRALL HUMOUR RISK EDUCATE SECRETE
COVET CONSERVE WARN SPECIALIZE SURROUND BESIEGE ASCEND HURRY ADVANCE
TURN FLAUNT ESTEEM BLUSTER INITIATE INSPIRE RECOMPENSE PREFER SWEAR
RAVE CATCH SCORE ENTRAP DARE ELABORATE EMBELLISH SWELL GARNISH TRIM
TRANSFIGURE CACHE BLESS WORSHIP FLATTER PROVE EXHUME PRY ENVY AGONIZE
NAG DREAD YELL GROAN GLOAT RAMP PLOT CONSPIRE QUIBBLE CONNIVE COLLUDE
SHUDDER ABOMINATE BETRAY ABHOR WEEP WHOOP PALE STRIVE PREVAIL INSURE
PROCLAIM PLEDGE PROMISE CONCENTRATE DISPLAY DRAMATIZE DISTINGUISH
EXAGGERATE BEDAZZLE IMPORTANCE

27—F A I L E D I M P O R T A N C E

IMBRUE DESPISE DESECRATE DEROGATE DISDAIN DISPARAGE DISRATE DISCREDIT
DISCOUNT CROUCH DEIGN CRIMP DETRACT DWINDLE DEVEST BLUSTER
SUPERANNUATE SUBMERGE STANDARDIZE UNDERBID UNDERESTIMATE UNDERRATE
UNBEND UNDERVALUE OVERPOWER OUTSTRIP OUTWIT OUTWORK WAIVE RELEGATE
WANE REDUCE GLOZE IGNORE SHRINK SHRIVEL CRITICIZE DISCOURAGE HEAL SALVE
ABSOLVE ALLEVIATE ALLAY MITIGATE PARDON PALLIATE CONSOLE RECONCILE
FORGIVE SMOOTH SOOTHE EXCULPATE COMFORT DEFRAID DISBURDEN ABASE
DEGRADE DEBASE DEFLATE SHAME CONQUER CRUSH EXILE DISABLE INCAPACITATE
DEPRESS DEPOSE QUELL TRIFLE QUASH DAMAGE ASSASSINATE OVERWHELM SINK
REPRESS SMASH SMEAR UNDERMINE UNDERCUT VANQUISH SQUASH SQUELCH
STULTIFY ENSLAVE SUBJUGATE DEMOTE LOAF REPOSE RELAX RUSTICATE SPATTER
BURST STREW DIFFUSE ROUT STRAY STRAGGLE DISPERSE INSULT IMPEACH
EXCLUDE SUNDER DETACH DIVEST UNLOAD UNCLASP DISROBE DIVIDE SEPARATE
CLEAVE INHUME CONCEDE DECLINE SHIRK LOCALIZE HUMOUR RISK FORGO LOSE
DISCARD RETRACT RETREAT RETIRE INURE OUTCRY SCORN MOPE MOURN ENVY
EXHUME DESPAIR DESPOND BELITTLE CAPITULATE PERISH PUTREFY ROT SUBMIT
SUCCUMB IGNORE STOOP MOCK BOW FOUL DECREASE ENFEEBLE RANK RESCIND
REPUDIATE RESIGN FORSAKE RENOUNCE SHIFT LEAP TURN SHRUG REJECT FORGET
CLOY TAUNT DISAPPROVE CURTAIL WHITTLE REGRET DEGRADE DEMOTE HUMILIATE
JEER DECRY DEFAME GIBE RAG REBUFF CATCH SCOFF MORTIFY EMBARRASS
MINIMIZE SLUR RIDICULE RIB DEPRIVE JIBE INVALIDATE DEPRECATE SPURN SNUB
SNEER DISPROVE DISCLAIM OMIT DISABLE RELINQUISH PROSTITUTE FAILED
IMPORTANCE

28 — A R R I V E

ATTAIN ALIGHT ACHIEVE ACCOMPLISH ENCAAMP CONCLUDE CULMINATE DETRAIN
ARRIVE END COME DELIVER BARRACK CONFRONT FACE REVEAL EXHIBIT SUCCEED
WIN SURVIVE MATURE COMPREHEND SUBSTANTIATE TESTIFY RECOGNIZE RELAY
TRANSMIT REPLACE RESTORE REPLENISH DUPLICATE REMEMBER COPY PRINT
QUOTE RECEIVE INFILTRATE RAM RAID SMUGGLE INVADE INUNDATE BOARD BESET
STORM PENETRATE MATERIALIZE FIND ABIDE DWELL SOJOURN CAMP PARK PERCH
SITE ATTEND WED MARRY JOIN REJOIN REUNITE CONNECT LINK MEET INTERSECT
ENCOUNTER COMBINE MATRICULATE INSTALL ADMIT PENETRATE INJECT INSERT
INVEST INOCULATE INTRUST EMERGE IMMIGRATE LEAP CATCH

29 — F A I L E D T O A R R I V E

PROTRACT RETARD FAILED TO ARRIVE RECAPITULATE REITERATE PRACTISE
REHEARSE RETRACE TRANSCRIBE REPEAT RECORD REMIND REDUPLICATE

REPRODUCE REVIEW MULTIPLY RECOUNT DERAIL STRAGGLE MAROON IMPOUND
AMBUSH DROWN IMMOBILIZE WAYLAY WRECK RUSTICATE RELAX REPOSE LOAF
BECALM BASK IMPAWN RECLINE SPRAWL SIT SQUAT STICK DESIST POISE BURST
STREW DIFFUSE RADIATE RANGE STAMPEDE ROUT DISPERSE STRAY STRAGGLE
HANG STRADDLE EXCLUDE ZONE SUNDER DETACH DIVEST UNLOAD
EXCOMMUNICATE OUTLAW FILTER CLEAVE DISMISS GARBLE RESORT STUMBLE
BOTCH BOGGLE PREVENT BESIEGE MIRE SUCCUMB PERISH SWERVE STAGGER
WAVER FALTER DESIRE MOPE FIDGET FRET STRIVE STRUGGLE RETREAT SAUNTER
TURN DEPRIVE DISSUADE DISABLE EVADE

30 — S U R V I V E

PROSPER RECOVER RECUPERATE WIN SUCCEED SURMOUNT TIME GRUB LIVE VALET
DARN REPRIEVE RENEW LUXURIATE THRIVE FLOURISH RECUR CONTINUE TOIL
LABOUR SURVIVE PERSEVERE MAINTAIN PERPETUATE PERSIST PROLONG LAY
INHALE RESPIRE NURTURE NOURISH RECONSTRUCT RENOVATE REINSTATE GROW
MATURE FIX INVIGORATE CIVILIZE DEVELOP CULTIVATE EXCEL ENLIVEN PROVIDE
EXHILARATE ENABLE SUPPORT SUCCOUR REINFORCE RE-ENFORCE STRENGTHEN
VOLUNTEER UPHOLD UNDERTAKE REVIVIFY REVIVE FURTHER RESCUE RESUSCITATE
REJUVENATE REGENERATE RAISE CO-OPERATE CONTRIBUTE EXTEND FULFIL
ENERGIZE SUSTAIN HELP TRAVAIL SERVE INNERVATE LENGTHEN DUPLICATE
MULTIPLY IMITATE REPRODUCE RESTORE REPLACE REPLENISH REMEMBER REMIND
EMULATE COPY RECORD PORTRAY PRINT REPRINT DEPICT QUOTE REPEAT
REDUPLICATE VANQUISH EXPLOIT PROSECUTE PROPAGATE POPULATE BREED
PROCREATE INBREED BEGET IMPREGNATE SECURE RELAX REPOSE LOAF SOJOURN
DWELL ABIDE RESIDE SITE RUSTICATE FREEZE OSSIFY INHABIT CONSERVE PIECE
REIGN PREVAIL EVOLVE ENDEAVOUR QUALIFY TRANSPORT ADVANCE PROTRACT
IMMORTALIZE TRIUMPH WAX EXIST PREVAIL ENDURE EKE LAST WITHSTAND
SUBSIST CLEAVE

31 — W A I T

PROCRASTINATE EXPECT DELAY DETAIN DETER LURK DALLY DANGLE DAWDLE
QUEUE LOUNGE WAIT LANGUISH LIGHT IMPEND TEMPORIZE LOITER LOLL AWAIT
MUSE PAUSE POSTPONE BIDE WAIT MEDIATE NEGOTIATE REMAND HOLD HALT STOP
SHUT ENGAGE TREAT DRILL PERSIST PERPETUATE MAINTAIN PERSEVERE CONTINUE
RECUPERATE TIME PROLONG WAYLAY HANG STICK IMMOBILIZE AMBUSH STALL LAG
LURK BESIEGE SEIZE ANTICIPATE ABIDE RESIDE LOCATE SITE STICK RUSTICATE
PERCH POSE SQUAT SIT SPRAWL RECLINE BASK BECALM NESTLE IMPAWN PIN
BATTEN BELAY FREEZE CAMP SECURE OSSIFY POISE RELAX REPOSE LOAF PARK
SOJOURN DWELL CLING ENTWINE BETROTH HANG CLEAVE INHUME DEBATE HAUNT
HIDE BOGGLE HESITATE CONSERVE SUSPEND TOY PARK AMBLE SAUNTER FIDGET
DESIRE FRET RELAPSE MOPE RETARD SUBMIT STALL DISSUADE DEFER ENTRAP
CAGE PROTRACT

32 — L E A V E

EXPEL EXPORT DEPORT DESERT DISAPPEAR DISCHARGE EXUVIATE WITHDRAW
UPROOT EXHALE EXTRUDE EXUDE BANISH EJACULATE EJECT ELOPE ESCAPE
EMBARK ENTRAIN APOSTATIZE EVACUATE EXHAUST DECAMP QUIT PERSPIRE
ABSCOND ABSENT SECEDE LEAVE HIE HIKE ABDICATE ABDUCT LEAVE START BEGIN
ALLOW RELAY TRANSMIT WILL RETREAT SINK DESERT BANISH DISSIPATE EXILE
DEVISE QUIT PURSUE DESIST DECAMP RADIATE RANGE STAMPEDE ROUT DISPERSE
STRAY STRAGGLE OUTLAW EXCOMMUNICATE UNLOAD UNCLASP DISROBE DIVEST
DETACH SUNDER DIVERGE DIVIDE SEPARATE EXTRICATE GO DISMISS EMERGE YANK
REBOUND RECEDE RECOIL CONCEDE REBOUND LOSE AMPUTATE MIGRATE CURTAIL
DISSUADE DEPART FLY RETREAT FLEE MARCH SAIL RETIRE RESIGN PERISH AVOID
TIRE UNFIT ROT NAUSEATE VOMIT RETCH SWOON PUTREFY DRAIN CAPITULATE
SUCCUMB END VACATE SCATTER RUN EXORCISE FLUSH SKIP RUSH SCRAM BETAKE
EVICT FORSAKE EMIGRATE FORSWEAR CEASE REJECT OUTBREAK SHIFT TURN LEAP
SHOVE TRANSPORT IMMIGRATE BOLT TRAVEL JOURNEY SEPARATE EVAPORATE
DEPRIVE

FREQUENT ENWRAP ENCOMPASS ENVELOP ENCLOSE ENCIRCLE OVERTAKE SETTLE
 HOVER REMAIN VOLUNTEER HELP ASSIST REMAND HITCH STOP TAME RECALL
 MEDIATE NEGOTIATE CHALLENGE MIX ENGAGE TREAT FETCH SUBDUE DEMAND
 REQUIRE SUMMON HEAVE HAUL HOLD HALT DISCIPLINE INTRUDE RECALL RECOVER
 REPRIEVE REINSTATE PROLONG RECONSTRUCT RENOVATE RECUR RENEW PERSIST
 PERPETUATE MAINTAIN PERSEVERE CONTINUE RECUPERATE PILLORY RESTORE
 REPLENISH DUPLICATE REPRODUCE REDUPLICATE REMIND REMEMBER RECORD
 COPY PORTRAY PRINT REPRINT DEPICT QUOTE REPEAT TRANSCRIBE RECEIVE
 CHARACTERIZE ITERATE RETRACE REHEARSE PRACTISE REITERATE RECAPITULATE
 REVIEW REPLACE PENETRATE TIE DROWN BIND IMMOBILIZE WARD WAYLAY FIX
 PESTER PLAGUE RAVAGE IMPRISON RAM QUARTER RACK TRICE BESIEGE SIEGE
 TRUSS CHAIN MANACLE SEIZE TRAP FETTER ENSNARE CRUCIFY COMMIT INVADE
 INCARCERATE DISABLE MAROON BECALM IMPRESS PRESS BOARD IMPALE IMPOUND
 SECURE CAMP FREEZE BELAY BATTEN PIN IMPAWN NESTLE BASK RECLINE SPRAWL
 SIT SQUAT POSE PERCH RUSTICATE STICK SITE LOCATE RESIDE ABIDE DWELL
 SOJOURN PARK LOAF REPOSE RELAX QUIESCE OSSIFY EMBRACE CLING ENTWINE
 MARRY WED REUNITE REJOIN HANG HECKLE IMMURE HARRY IMPERIL INFILTRATE
 INFEST TRESPASS INFRINGE RE-ENTER INHABIT HAUNT HARP LIMIT INTERCEPT
 SECLUDE SHACKLE SEIZE LATCH THRALL HUMOUR FASTEN PREVENT HESITATE
 FETTER RESIST RESTRICT SNARE ARREST SURROUND APPREHEND LAST DESPAIR
 MOPE UNDERGO ENDURE WITHSTAND EXIST PREVAIL RETARD BOUND BIND BOLT
 CUMBER ENTRAP MIRE CACHE ABIDE HAUNT STICK INFEST DELAY HOLD CAGE
 FIDGET TURN TUG CATCH FAILED LEAVE

COVER DISPEL EMBANK EVERT DISCRIMINATE CODDLE PRESERVE PROTECT
 ENTRENCH ESCORT KEEP DEFEND LAVE LEGALIZE LEGITIMIZE LEGISLATE LICENSE
 GUARD GIRD FEND FORTIFY REPULSE REPEL FRANCHISE THATCH AVERT BLESS
 PARRY PATROL PICKET SAVE DISARM SAFE TEND DEFLECT HELP SUSTAIN ASSURE
 ALLEVIATE ALLAY MITIGATE PALLIATE EASE STOW RAISE REASSURE REFORM
 REDRESS RE-ENFORCE REINFORCE RESCUE FURTHER UPHOLD SPONSOR VINDICATE
 STRENGTHEN SUCCOUR SUPPORT PROVIDE EQUIP CULTIVATE DRESS ADMINISTER
 SUPERINTEND SUPERVISE MANAGE PRESIDE HANDLE ASSIGN APPOINT ALLOCATE
 ALLOT TOW ACCOUNT TAG UTILIZE HOLD TEST ORGANIZE UNTANGLE CORRECT
 ADJUST REGULATE DISCIPLINE HALT EDIT STOP DETAIL ENUMERATE ENLARGE
 MAGNIFY EXPAND AWARD AIM EMPHASIZE DRILL TAME EMEND ALTER DELEGATE
 DEPUTE SHUT RECALL NEGOTIATE MEDIATE TACKLE CHALLENGE SET OPERATE
 DEPLOY EMPOWER START SITUATE REIGN DILATE AMPLIFY ELONGATE VEST VOTE
 SPACE MIX DEMAGNETIZE ACTUATE ACQUIT UNRUFFLE RENT HIRE ENGAGE
 CONSIGN STEER TREAT HITCH HEFT JOCKEY JUGGLE USHER NAVIGATE PILOT
 OFFICIATE IDENTIFY FETCH BEGIN SUBDUE REMAND PREDISPOSE HUSH APPROVE
 STIPULATE PRESCRIBE DIRECT REQUIRE ELECT MODERATE ARRANGE HABITUATE
 ALLOW ORIENTATE ASSORT DISABUSE SUMMON HOIST SHAPE MANIPULATE RULE
 COMMAND MASTER ORDER LOAD PUT PUSH HEAVE HAUL SEND COMPLY ABATE
 DISBURSE RENDER CIRCUMSTANTIATE SPEAK PLEA REPRIEVE REINSTATE REPAIR
 RECONSTRUCT RENOVATE RENEW PERSIST PERPETUATE MAINTAIN PERSEVERE
 CONTINUE RECUPERATE NOURISH FIX NURTURE LABOUR TOIL DARN LAY GRUB
 VALET REMIND REPRODUCE MULTIPLY TESTIFY COMPREHEND RECOGNIZE REPLACE
 RESTORE REPLENISH REMEMBER PICKET PATROL DODGE STAVE DUCK SECURE
 FREEZE BELAY BATTEN PIN IMPAWN LOAF OSSIFY CAMP REPOSE RELAX NESTLE
 CONNECT CLING ENTWINE MARRY WED BETROTH JOIN COMBINE EMBRACE
 PERSUADE PERMEATE LINK HECKLE HURT ZONE SEPARATE EXCLUDE FILTER
 OUTLAW EXCOMMUNICATE UNLOAD UNCLASP CLEAVE DISROBE DIFFER DIVEST
 DETACH SUNDER DIVERGE DIVIDE LASH INOCULATE CONTEND HUNT INSULATE
 HIBERNATE HIDE SECLUDE TUCK SHACKLE SEAL SEGREGATE THWART ISOLATE
 SHEATHE LOCALIZE LATCH THREATEN IMMERSE HUMOUR RESORT RISK FASTEN
 PROHIBIT PREVENT EDUCATE RESIST FORBID FORBEAR FOIL WARD WARN SPARE
 SWADDLE SURROUND SHELTER ENCLOSE ENCOMPASS HARBOUR COLLUDE CONNIVE
 ENTREAT ENFORCE DOMINATE DISALLOW DICTATE

COMPEL TIRE SWERVE SWOON GUARANTEE WALL SAFEGUARD MUFFLE BOLT LEAP
TURN TUG CLUTCH EXEMPT RETARD CLAIM CHERISH FOSTER VALUE INSURE
BETRAY INTERVENE CACHE JUSTIFY CONDEMN CAUTION MEDICATE DISTRACT
CURSE ENTRAP CAGE CATCH CONSERVE PREPARE CAMOUFLAGE

35 — F A I L E D P R O T E C T

SURRENDER STAKE OVERWHELM UNARM OVERTHROW GAMBLE COMPLY ALLOW
DISBURSE PAIN AGGRAVATE CAPTURE DEGRADE DEJECT TERMINATE FINISH
IRRADICATE LIQUIDATE TOPPLE DOOM DISPOSE DEVASTATE DESTROY DESPATCH
CRUSH DEMOLISH DELETE EXTIRPATE EXPUNGE EXECUTE PURGE ERASE ERADICATE
OBLITERATE SLAY SLAUGHTER ANNIHILATE ABOLISH ANNUL ELIMINATE EFFACE
DISINTEGRATE RUIN ENGULF EXPIRE EXPURGATE EXTINGUISH DEPRECIATE FAIL
LAPSE ELAPSE WILT WITHER FLAME ERODE EXPEND EXPLODE DEODORIZE CRUMBLE
CRUMPLE ESTRANGE ADJOURN SWALLOW EMBOWEL DEVOUR CONSUME EAT SHAKE
IMPLORE SWILL SWIG GUZZLE GOBBLE GNAW TIPPLE QUAFF SUP DRINK CRUNCH
NIBBLE TERMINATE IMPREGNATE SEIZE TROUBLE TROUNCE KIDNAP REQUISITION
TORTURE TORMENT QUASH DAMAGE TERRORIZE TERRIFY GASH COMMANDEER RAM
RAPE RANSACK PARALYSE DEVASTATE PAUPERIZE RIP RIFLE RAZE PERSECUTE
PLAGUE PESTER REND PLUNDER PROSECUTE JOLT DROP OPPRESS WRECK ROUGH
WRINKLE OVERPOWER OVERWHELM WORRY WOUND SINK REPRESS TYRANNIZE
UNSETTLE SLASH SURRENDER SMASH SMEAR UNDERMINE SOIL VEX VICTIMIZE
VANQUISH VIOLATE STAIN VITIATE SPOIL PENETRATE SQUASH SQUELCH STARTLE
STORM STRAFE STRAIN ENSLAVE SUBJUGATE SULLY BATTER BASH BEFOUL BEDEVIL
BESET BESMEAR BESMIRCH BESPATTER SHELL BOMBARD BREAK EXTORT BOARD
DEBASE EXCRUCIATE CORRUPT DEBAUCH EXPOSE DEFACE FRACTURE PRICK
CAPSIZE PROSTRATE CONQUER DISTURB MUTILATE MOB MAR MASH CRUSH
MASSACRE BRUISE BRUTIFY SNARL BUMP BULLY BRUTALIZE MOLEST TRESPASS
POACH MAIM DISABLE MANGLE SCORCH ALARM FRIGHTEN SCARE INCAPACITATE
SCALD SAVAGE BOTHER IMPOVERISH IMPOSE INVADE VIVISECT EXPLOIT
DEMORALIZE CRIPPLE STEAL SNATCH RUSTLE SACK DISMAY DERANGE DESPOIL
DRENCH DISHONOUR DISGRACE DENT DENOUNCE INCRIMINATE IMBRUE OSSIFY PIN
IMPAWN BECALM STRAY STRAGGLE DISPERSE SHOWER SPATTER ROUT STAMPEDE
BURST BESTREW STREW HAZE SHOCK SHRED LOOT INSULT HANG HORRIFY HACK
HIT HARASS HARRY HOUND INCRIMINATE SCAR IMPLICATE AFFLICT IMPAIR IMPERIL
AGITATE ACCUSE ABUSE DIVIDE CLEAVE DIFFER DIVEST DETACH SUNDER SCORE
INFILTRATE INFEST SHATTER LYNCH LICK INJURE INFRINGE INFLECT INVEST INJECT
PENETRATE DECLINE DEAFEN REMONSTRATE PROTEST HUNT RECEDE SEIZE
COLLIDE THREATEN THRASH IMMERSE RISK JUMBLE BOTCH REFRAIN FORBEAR
ENFEEBLE CURTAIL AVENGE SLOBBER SORROW ANNOY SHUDDER BETRAY CONNIVE
ENVELOP PERISH EMBITTER ABANDON FLINCH CRINGE DISTRESS DESPOND DESPAIR
SUCCUMB ROT PUTREFY DREAD PRY EXHUME AGONIZE PALPITATE FAINT AGGRIEVE
PANIC EMBROIL TRAMP ADVANCE LEAP TREASURE EVICT RESCIND RENOUNCE
REPUDIATE RELINQUISH FORSAKE FORSWEAR ABANDON RETREAT SUFFER PALE
WAIL END OUTRAGE FRET DISABLE SACRIFICE WORRY UPSET PERTURB CATCH
ENTRAP CAGE DEPRIVE DISROBE FAILED PROTECT

36 — W A S T E

SCRAP WASTE SPEND SQUANDER ATTEMPT BURY REplete SURFEIT MEDIATE
DETAIL ENUMERATE EXPAND MAGNIFY ENLARGE EMPHASIZE DRILL TAME EMEND
ALTER DELEGATE DEPUTE SHUT RECALL NEGOTIATE REVIEW PRACTISE REHEARSE
RETRACE ENGULF FORGET BREAK STULTIFY STRIKE SQUELCH SQUASH SPOIL
VITIATE SPILL SURRENDER IMMOBILIZE EMASCULATE ABORT CONTRACEPT NEUTER
SPAY POISON SINK WRECK DROP REND RAVAGE RAZE IMPRISON EXECUTE
DEVASTATE DAMAGE TRIFLE DUEL CASTRATE GUT SACK CRIPPLE FLOOD INUNDATE
IMPOUND INCAPACITATE SCORCH INCINERATE MANGLE DISABLE MAIM BURN EXILE
MASSACRE CRUSH MASH MAROON MAR BUTCHER MUTILATE DEFACE DEBASE
IGNITE RUSTICATE LOAF REPOSE QUIESCE SIT SPRAWL RELAX RECLINE BASK
IMPAWN DESIST BECALM ABIDE BETROTH WED MARRY BESTREW STREW SPATTER
SHOWER STRAY STRAGGLE DISPERSE SPREAD HACK IMMOLATE

ZONE DIVEST SEPARATE EXCLUDE EXCOMMUNICATE OUTLAW SUNDER SHATTER
LOATHE LAME INJURE DECLINE SHUN SECLUDE SHIRK SEGREGATE GARBLE RISK
SLOP BOTCH PROHIBIT EDUCATE CONSERVE PAWN DISCARD FORGE FORBID
REPRESS BAN PERISH PUTREFY VOID ROT NAUSEATE VOMIT RETCH SUCCUMB
REJECT SPOIL DEMUR MIRE FOUL DENY ENTRAP ESCHEW DEPRIVE CATCH
PROSTITUTE DISABLE CAGE LOSE DAWDLE LOUNGE SEVER ABANDON SKIP
UNDERVALUE UNDERESTIMATE UNDERRATE TRAMP TOY CLUTCH FORGET
DISGORGE PROTRACT DISCARD LOAF IDLE FRITTER EXPAND MISAPPLY MISUSE
DESTROY DEVASTATE OVERLOOK IGNORE WISH

37 — F A I L E D W A S T E

GLUT GORGE LAVISH FAILED WASTE SHARE SALVAGE BESPEAK CONTRIBUTE AVAIL
LEND REDEEM REFORM REFIT REHABILITATE REJUVENATE REPAIR RESCUE
RESUSCITATE OFFER RETRIEVE STAUNCH SUCKLE HOLD UTILIZE ACCOUNT TAG
RATION ALLOCATE ALLOT AWARD ASSIGN APPOINT AIM TOW HANDLE ORGANIZE
SUPERINTEND ADMINISTER SUPERVISE MANAGE PRESIDE TEST UNTANGLE CORRECT
ADJUST REGULATE DISCIPLINE EDIT HALT STOP RENOVATE RECONSTRUCT
REINSTATE RENEW REPRIEVE CONTINUE PERSEVERE MAINTAIN PERPETUATE
PERSIST FIX REPAIR DARN VALET PROLONG RECOVER REVIEW RECAPITULATE
REITERATE TRANSCRIBE REPEAT RECORD REDUPLICATE RECOUNT RELAY
TRANSMIT DUPLICATE COPY PRINT QUOTE RECEIVE RELATE EMULATE IMITATE
PORTRAY REPRINT DEPICT REMIND REPRODUCE MULTIPLY REPLACE RESTORE
REPLENISH REMEMBER WREST PLUNDER GRASP RIFLE GRAB FORAGE RANSACK
QUARTER RAID BURGLE COMMANDEER REQUISITION SEIZE TRAP DESPOIL RUSTLE
SNATCH EXPLOIT SMUGGLE SCALP POACH IMPRESS PRESS EXTORT EXTRACT
SCRAPE INFRINGE TUCK GARBLE HUMOUR FASTEN PREVENT EDUCATE COVET WANT
RESERVE SPARE WEAN LAST ADAPT EXIST ENCUMBER ENGORGE ABSTAIN DETEST
EXCEED BLOAT

38 — A B A N D O N

FLUSH EXORCIZE VACATE SCATTER DISCONTINUE RUN SKIP EMIGRATE RETREAT
CEASE RELAPSE SCRAM SEVER SHED RUSH BETAKE EVICT RENOUNCE RESCIND
REPUDIATE RETIRE RELINQUISH FORSAKE FORSWEAR RESIGN ABANDON REFORM
EDIT DIVERT COMPLY EMEND ALTER DISBURSE ABATE DEPUTE DELEGATE SHUT
RECALL NEGOTIATE MEDIATE STOP HALT BREAK SLACK STRAGGLE QUIT DODGE
FALTER DROP BANISH OSTRACIZE DESERT SURRENDER MAROON EXILE LOAF
DISSIPATE DERAIL RUSTICATE DESIST IMPAWN BELAY PARK SPRAWL RELAX BASK
RECLINE QUIESCE REPOSE DISPERSE STAMPEDE STRAY SUNDER ROUT DIVERGE
UNLOAD UNCLASP OUTLAW FILTER EXCOMMUNICATE DETACH EXCLUDE SEPARATE
DIVEST EVADE EXTRICATE GO REBOUND RECOIL CONCEDE DECLINE QUAIL RECEDE
SHUN SECLUDE SHIRK THRALL JUMBLE BOTCH AMPUTATE LOSE RESERVE FORGO
RETRACT BOLT IMMIGRATE SHRUG SHOVE LEAP TURN SHIFT FORGET PERISH
REJECT AVOID TIRE UNFIT ROT SUCCUMB SWOON PUTREFY CAPITULATE ABDICATE
RESIGN RETIRE DECAMP ESCAPE APOSTATIZE EVACUATE QUIT RUN RETREAT FLY
FLEE DESERT SURRENDER MIGRATE DEMUR CURTAIL DISCARD ESCHEW END
SUSPEND DISALLOW DUMP DISSUADE DEPRIVE ENJOIN SHEER

39 — F A I L E D T O A B A N D O N

FAILED TO ABANDON DEVELOP SUPPORT SUCCOUR STRENGTHEN VINDICATE
SPONSOR SPELL SOLACE UNDERTAKE REVIVIFY RETRIEVE REVIVE FURTHER RESCUE
REPAIR RELY RELIEVE REINFORCE REHABILITATE RE-ENFORCE REFIT RAISE LEAD
CO-OPERATE CONTRIBUTE EXTEND CONSOLE STOW SUPPLY ENCOURAGE BEFRIEND
SUSTAIN HELP SALVAGE ASSIST SERVE HOLD HALT STOP TACKLE MEDIATE
NEGOTIATE CHALLENGE INTRUDE RECALL RENOVATE RECONSTRUCT REINSTATE
RENEW REPRIEVE CONTINUE PERSEVERE MAINTAIN PERPETUATE PERSIST FIX DARN
VALET PROLONG RECOVER LIVE SURVIVE MATURE RECUPERATE PILLORY
REPLENISH REMEMBER PRACTISE RETRACE REHEARSE REFER RELAY TRANSMIT
REPLACE RESTORE REVIEW RECOUNT DUPLICATE COPY PRINT QUOTE

RELATE PORTRAY REPRINT DEPICT REMIND REPRODUCE MULTIPLY RECAPITULATE
REITERATE REPEAT RECORD TRANSCRIBE REDUPLICATE INFILTRATE STEAL
ENSNARE FETTER TRAP SEIZE MANACLE CHAIN TRUSS KIDNAP REQUISITION
COMMANDEER BESIEGE TORMENT TRICE GOAD GRAB GRASP RAVAGE PERSECUTE
PLAGUE PESTER PLUNDER FIX WRENCH WREST WAYLAY WORRY STICK BIND TIE
VEX SWEAT ASSAIL ATTACK BELABOUR BESET BOMBARD MOB MAUL SAVAGE
IMPOUND DESPOIL DRAG CHARGE ABIDE DWELL SOJOURN OSSIFY BASK NESTLE SIT
POSE PERCH IMPAWN PIN FREEZE SECURE STICK LOCATE RESIDE DESERT DECAMP
ENTWINE CLING REUNITE REJOIN BETROTH WED MARRY HANG HECKLE HEW HOUND
HARRY INDENT STRADDLE INFILTRATE INFEST INDISPOSE TRESPASS INFRINGE
INHIBIT CONTEND COAX DISSENT HARP GROPE REMONSTRATE PROTEST BICKER
CONTRADICT HAUNT TUCK SHACKLE TIE SEIZE SIEGE RECOMMIT LATCH HUMOUR
BOGGLE FASTEN PREVENT FETTER SECRETE RESIST SNARE ARREST DEBATE
SURROUND STRIVE FIDGET FAMILIARIZE PROVE EXHUME DESPAIR DESPOND WAIT
DELAY LANGUISH ENFORCE CACHE SUBMIT MIRE CAGE ENTRAP REMAIN PARK
CLAIM TUG CLUTCH BOLT BIND BESIEGE ACCUSTOM ENCUMBER EKE ENDURE
PREVAIL DEVOLVE INSURE STRUGGLE WITHSTAND BOUND

40 — N O M O T I O N

SET HOLD SHUT STOP HALT FOSSILIZE PIN QUIESCE ABIDE OSSIFY FREEZE RELAX
RUSTICATE BECALM LOAF DESIST PICNIC SOJOURN IMPAWN STICK REPOSE NESTLE
POSE POISE SQUAT SIT SPRAWL RECLINE BASK PERCH RESIDE DWELL BATTEN CAMP
PARK LOCATE BELAY SITE SECURE FIX PILLORY BECALM MAROON IMPALE CRUCIFY
CRIPPLE IMPOUND SPREADEAGLE STUN TIE BRAND IMMOBILIZE STICK NAIL STALL
FLOOR IMPRISON PARALYSE TRICE BESIEGE SIEGE TRUSS TRAP SEIZE MANACLE
CHAIN FETTER PLACE PLANT INCARCERATE ANTICIPATE KNIT ENTWINE HANG
IMMURE IMPALE ZONE INHUME SHACKLE GARBLE BOGGLE HESITATE PAWN ARREST
SWADDLE SUSPEND STILL SETTLE DISABLE ABIDE HITCH DISSUADE CATCH ENTRAP
ENERVATE CHECK MIRE SUBMIT SUBSIDE BOLT CUMBER WITHSTAND NO MOTION

41 — E N D U R E

DRUDGE EXIST PREVAIL ENDURE EKE ENCUMBER ACCUSTOM ADAPT LAST INSURE
INURE TOLERATE WITHSTAND UNDERGO STRUGGLE STRIVE SUBSIST SUFFER BEAR
BROOK TRAVAIL SUSTAIN UPHOLD REVIVE RESUSCITATE REFIT REPAIR REJWENATE
REGENERATE FACE CONFRONT DRILL SITUATE REIGN CONTINUE PERSEVERE
MAINTAIN PERPETUATE PERSIST PROLONG SURVIVE MATURE GROW RECUR TOIL
LABOUR COPY PRINT QUOTE RELATE PORTRAY REPRINT DEPICT REMIND
REPRODUCE MULTIPLY REPLACE RESTORE REPLENISH REMEMBER PRACTISE
RETRACE REHEARSE REFER RELAY TRANSMIT ENACT SKETCH SUBSTANTIATE
CHARACTERIZE ITERATE TESTIFY RECOGNIZE IMITATE EMULATE RECAPITULATE
REITERATE REPEAT RECORD TRANSCRIBE REDUPLICATE REVIEW RECOUNT
DUPLICATE DETERMINE OSSIFY PARK CAMP SOJOURN DWELL PICNIC ABIDE RESIDE
LOCATE SITE STICK SECURE FREEZE BELAY BATTEN PIN BECALM IMPAWN REUNITE
REJOIN KNIT SPLICE ATTACH CONSORT CONNECT LINK PERVADE PERMEATE JOIN
COMBINE WED MARRY CLING ENTWINE YOKE ACCOMPANY CLEAVE STRADDLE
SHAKE INHABIT BICKER CONTEND IMMERSE HUMOUR RESORT RISK WISH STOP
BOTCH EDUCATE RESIST FORBEAR STAGNATE ABSTAIN TRANSPORT TRAMP TRUDGE
ADVANCE SHRUG IMMORTALIZE PROTRACT CONFRONT FIDGET FRET FAMILIARIZE
DESPOND ENTRAP CURTAIL COERCE COMPEL EXERT

42 — F A I L E D E N D U R E

RETCH AVOID SUCCUMB NAUSEATE PANT PERISH PUFF DRAIN CAPITULATE HATE
SAG CRY VOMIT SWOON ROT FALTER TIRE PUTREFY UNFIT WINCE SQUIRM WRITHE
WAVER WRIGGLE WOBBLE SUBMIT STAGGER SUBSIDE BLANCH SWERVE PALE SHIVER
WHIMPER WEAR RESPOND APPEAL DISCIPLINE PUNISH RULE RECALL CORRECT STOP
HUSH EMEND EDIT ALTER REMAND SHUT HOLD SUBDUE UNTANGLE HALT BREAK
SHOUT PLEA FEEL THROB PULSATE SMART SLIP STINK SLOUCH SLAVE REACT
SLUMP SWELTER

TINGLE DRIP SLACK SHIFT EXTINGUISH TERMINATE FINISH IRRADICATE LIQUIDATE
TOPPLE DOOM DISPOSE DEVASTATE DESTROY DESPATCH CRUSH DEMOLISH DELETE
EXTIRPATE EXPUNGE EXECUTE PURGE ERASE ERADICATE OBLITERATE SLAY
SLAUGHTER ANNIHILATE ABOLISH ANNUL ELIMINATE EFFACE DISINTEGRATE RUIN
ENGULF EXPIRE EXPURGATE DEPRECIATE FAIL LAPSE ELAPSE VIVISECT WILT
WITHER FLAME ERODE EXPEND EXPLODE DEODORIZE CRUMBLE CRUMPLE
ESTRANGE ADJOURN SWALLOW EMBOWEL DEVOUR CONSUME EAT SWILL SWIG
GUZZLE GOBBLE GNAW TOPPLE QUAFF SUP DRINK DODGE YIELD SICKEN REVOLT
REBEL WRECK DESERT MUTINY SURRENDER CAPITULATE BREAK DISABLE
INCAPACITATE DISMAY DEPOSE FOLD SQUEAL FALTER FLAG QUIT ROUT STAMPEDE
STRAY STREW STRAGGLE BURST DISPERSE BITCH HORRIFY HARASS HURT IMPAIR
AGITATE DIVIDE DIVERGE UNLOAD UNCLASP SUNDER OUTLAW ZONE CLEAVE
EXCOMMUNICATE SPATTER CRUNCH DISROBE DETACH EXCLUDE SEPARATE DIVEST
DIFFER INDISPOSE EXTRICATE GO EMERGE REBOUND EVADE SHATTER LOATHE
INJURE SCRATCH HAUNT HUNT DEBATE DECLINE DEAFEN BICKER CONCEDE
PROTEST QUARREL REMONSTRATE HARP DISSENT CONTRADICT QUAIL RECEDE
EVADE EXTRACT HIBERNATE HIDE SHUN SECLUDE SHIRK RISK SEGREGATE
THREATEN WISH SLOP BOGGLE PROHIBIT PREVENT PIECE LOSE AMPUTATE DISCARD
PETITION WARD RETRACT YELL AGONIZE PALPITATE MOAN MOURN DISGUST
DISLIKE GROAN POUT GRUMBLE FAINT DREAD NAG YELP YAP MADDEN CRY
ENTREAT DESPAIR DETEST EMBITTER BOLT SHRUG SHOVE SHEER LEAP SHAMBLE
TURN PANT FORGET YIELD GASP SQUEAL SHRINK DUCK SHRIVEL QUIVER TREMBLE
FALTER FADE WANE SUPERANNUATE REJECT ABANDON CEASE FORSWEAR RESIGN
RETIRE RETREAT VACATE FORSAKE SCATTER DISCONTINUE SKIP RELAPSE SCRAM
SHED BETAKE ABHOR MOPE END CULMINATE OUTCRY WAIL WEEP OUTRAGE WHOOP
SLOBBER ABOMINATE ANGER ANNOY INFURIATE BETRAY PANIC GRIEVE DISTRESS
SHUDDER SHATTER COLLAPSE FLINCH CRINGE PERSPIRE SURRENDER DECOMPOSE
SIGH FADE FAG REGRET MEDICATE DISTRACT DISHEARTEN DISCOURAGE ENFEEBLE
SAP EMBARRASS MORTIFY ENTRAP ENERVATE SCREAM SHRIEK HOWL SOB WHINE
RUN DEPRIVE SNIVEL SQUAWK BAWL DISMAY BREAK RECOIL FAILED ENDURE

43 — W A N T T O K N O W

PROVE FAMILIARIZE EXHUME PRY WANT TO KNOW INTERVIEW CONSULT TEST
CIVILIZE EXPLAIN VOUCH VALIDATE VERIFY RELIEVE RECOMMEND REASSURE
ENLIGHTEN ADVISE ASSURE INSTRUCT TIME PROVOKE RECONNOITRE SCOUT PICKET
PATROL INFILTRATE QUERY QUIZ EXTORT EXTRACT SQUEEZE PRY QUIZ
INVESTIGATE WRING GRILL QUESTION RIFLE SPY INTERROGATE EXPLORE SEARCH
PROBE PURSUE TRACK TRAIL TRACE SCOUT DETACH SEPARATE SORT DISROBE
REFRACT FILTER SPECIALIZE APPROACH SCOOP DREDGE DARE SNOOP DISCOVER
BETRAY

44 — D E S I R E

DESIRE ENTREAT REQUEST PARTAKE DELIGHT OBLIGE FULFIL SUFFICE SURFEIT
REPLETE ENDEAR PLEASE BESPEAK ELECT PREDISPOSE APPROVE STIPULATE
PRESCRIBE DIRECT REQUIRE TINGLE THROB PULSATE WILL INCLINE CAPTIVATE
EXCITE ROUSE AROUSE ATTRACT WOO TANTALIZE FASCINATE FLIRT TEMPT INSPIRE
FRATERNIZE CONSORT PERVADE EMBRACE PERMEATE JOIN COMBINE WED MARRY
CLING ENTWINE LINK CONNECT BETROTH CONJUGATE TOUCH CRAVE CLEAVE
DISROBE COAX RISK EXACT PETITION WANT APPROACH IMMIGRATE LEAP PANT
HANKER YEARN LUST ITCH ENJOY LOVE LIKE SELECT SIGH MADDEN ENVY

45 — A G R E E

ENDORSE SUPERSCRIBE CLAIM PREDISPOSE UNRUFFLE VOTE ALLOW DEPUTE
DELEGATE VEST APPROVE ELECT HIRE RENT AGREE RATIFY SANCTION WARRANT
PROMISE AFFIRM ATTEST ASSENT UNDERSTAND ACKNOWLEDGE CONTRACT
CONSENT CONCILIATE SUPPORT SUBSCRIBE SPONSOR VERIFY VALIDATE FURTHER
RECONCILE CONTRIBUTE CO-OPERATE ENCOURAGE PLEASE PERMIT HARMONIZE
SHARE COMPLY PREDISPOSE NEGOTIATE MEDIATE MODERATE ARRANGE HABITUATE
ALLOW APPROVE ORIENTATE

ORDER ASSORT ADJUST REGULATE OBSERVE REACT COPY DUPLICATE REPRODUCE
REMEMBER SUBSTANTIATE TESTIFY EMULATE COMPREHEND SLAVE INCLINE
BETROTH FRATERNIZE CONSORT EMBRACE PERMEATE JOIN COMBINE WED MARRY
CLING ENTWINE LINK CONNECT MEET SPLICE ACCOMPANY PERTAIN KNIT REJOIN
REUNITE SPREAD DIFFUSE HATCH CLEAVE CONCEDE SEAL THRALL HUMOUR
EDUCATE PREPAY ESTEEM RESPECT COMMEND COMPLIMENT CERTIFY APPRECIATE
ACCREDIT PRAISE PLEDGE APPLAUD VOW AGREE—DISAGREE TOLERATE COLLUDE
PROVE FAMILIARIZE DESIRE ENTREAT CONCUR LICENSE FRANCHISE APPROVE OKAY
CONSENT PROMISE SWEAR AGREE ACQUIESCE SHIFT SYMPATHIZE ACCEDE

46 — E N F O R C E

DISALLOW CONVINCEN EXERT DOMINATE COMPEL ENFORCE COERCE DECLAIM
DECREE DECLARE ASSERT EXPOUND UPHOLD REINFORCE RE-ENFORCE STRENGTHEN
INTRUDE PERSEVERE STOP CHALLENGE HALT SHUT HOLD SUBDUE TACKLE
STIPULATE TAME DISCIPLINE PRESCRIBE REMAND CORRECT SUMMON HOIST ADJUST
SHAPE MANIPULATE RULE COMMAND MASTER ORDER DIRECT REGULATE LOAD PUT
PUSH HEAVE HAUL REQUIRE SEND EMPOWER DRILL START EMPHASIZE ENLARGE
MAGNIFY EXPAND SET TOIL MAINTAIN PERPETUATE PERSIST PROLONG LABOUR LAY
TRANSFIX GRUB BREATHE RESPIRE INHALE NOURISH NURTURE WIN REMIND
SUCCEED SURMOUNT RECOVER FIX RECONSTRUCT REPEAT REPLACE REITERATE
RECAPITULATE REVIEW RECOUNT REDUPLICATE RECORD MULTIPLY PRACTISE
REHEARSE RETRACE SUBSTANTIATE TESTIFY REMEMBER SCREEN WILL STIMULATE
LIQUIDATE TOPPLE DOOM DISPOSE DEVASTATE DESTROY DESPATCH FINISH
DEMOLISH CRUSH EXECUTE PURGE ERASE ERADICATE OBLITERATE SLAY
SLAUGHTER ANNIHILATE ABOLISH ANNUL ELIMINATE EFFACE DISINTEGRATE RUIN
ENGULF VIVISECT FLAME EXPLODE CRUMPLE CRUMBLE SWALLOW EMBOWEL
CONSUME DEVOUR EAT GOBBLE CRUNCH TIE INVOLVE BESTRIDE ORDAIN URGE
SQUEEZE PENALIZE CONTRACEPT FETTER TROUNCE RECK PROSECUTE COERCE
FORCE OPPRESS OVERPOWER OVERWHELM TYRANNIZE BIND VANQUISH SUBJUGATE
BELABOUR ADMONISH IMPOSE TAX COMMIT CHARGE IMPLANT COAX SENTENCE
CONVICT IMPRESS PRESS PUNISH CONQUER IMPAWN STICK SECURE FREEZE
QUIESCE RUSTICATE DESIST BELAY PIN BATTEN BECALM COMBINE WED MARRY
CLING ENTWINE LINK SPLICE KNIT ATTACH YOKE BETROTH JOIN EMBRACE RANGE
RADIATE INTERSPERSE ROUT SHOWER SPATTER SPREAD STAMPEDE STREW BURST
HAMMER SHOCK HANG HIT HARASS HURT HARRY HOUND INDENT INDICT
INCRIMINATE AFFLICT DIVEST DIVERGE DECOCT SUNDER OUTLAW ZONE FILTER
REFRACT CLEAVE DIVIDE EXCOMMUNICATE DISROBE DETACH EXCLUDE SEPARATE
DIFFER INDISPOSE INFILTRATE INFEST SHAKE SENTENCE LASH LICK SCUFFLE
INFRINGE INFLICT TRAMPLE INOCULATE INJECT INSERT INVEST INSTALL PENETRATE
CONTEND CONTRADICT DECLINE DEAFEN BICKER PROTEST QUARREL REMONSTRATE
HARP YANK DISMISS SHACKLE RECOMMIT LATCH COLLIDE THREATEN THRASH
IMMERSE FASTEN EXCEED EDUCATE EXACT CONSERVE WARM WEDGE FIGHT NAG
PROVE DICTATE DEMAND HURRY SCALE ADVANCE LIFT SHOVE LEAP TUG POWER
CONSTRAIN PROTRACT RETARD INSTILL PREDOMINATE STRESS PREVAIL ENCUMBER
INSURE CORRECT CONDEMN MEDICATE CRITICIZE DENY SUBJECT CAGE ENTRAP
CATCH OBTRUDE DRIVE

47 — D I S A G R E E

CHALLENGE CORRECT HALT STOP HUSH EDIT ALTER DISABUSE ESTRANGE TINGLE
THROB PULSATE SMART SLUMP SWELTER DRIP SLOUCH SLIP STINK REACT
PROVOKE SNIPE MUTINY REVOLT DENOUNCE DISAFFECT ATTACK ASSAIL VIOLATE
OSTRACIZE QUARREL WRANGLE OFFEND NETTLE FOMENT EMEND DISPUTE REBEL
PROSECUTE PECK IRK INTERDICT ARGUE STRAGGLE STRAY INTERSPERSE SHREAD
INSULT BITCH HECKLE HIT ABUSE DIVIDE DIFFER SEPARATE EXCLUDE DISAGREE
CLEAVE ZONE OUTLAW SUNDER DIVERGE DIVEST SCORE LOATHE TUT SEAR
SCUFFLE HARP REMONSTRATE QUARREL PROTEST BICKER DECLINE DEBATE
DISSENT CONTRADICT CONTEND QUAIL RECEDE DISMISS HINDER SHIRK THWART
COLLIDE THREATEN GARBLE BOGGLE BOTCH PROHIBIT PREVENT EXCEED HESITATE
DISCARD RESIST REPRESS DISAGREE—AGREE SULK OUTCRY OUTRAGE ABHOR
EXCOMMUNICATE ABOMINATE ANGER SCORN INFURIATE BETRAY QUIBBLE

CONNIVE REVOLT TRADUCE RECANT RAGE RANKLE POUT GRUMBLE FIGHT NAG
REJECT ENVY DISLIKE DISPLEASE FLOUT DISOBEY CROSS UPBRAID CENSURE
CONDEMN DEPLORE DISSUADE PROVOKE SQUABBLE BANDY OBSTRUCT FLOUT
REFUTE REFUSE REBUKE RANT RAVE INVALIDATE SCOFF HAGGLE DENY
DISAPPROVE CHIDE COMPLAIN CENSURE CARP REPREHEND REPROACH DEMUR
OBJURGATE CRITICIZE DISGUST SHOVE TUG SHIFT DISPARAGE

48 — I N H I B I T

INHIBIT DEDUCT DEBIT CHECK CAUTION DEMUR CURTAIL DENY ENFEEBLE CAGE
ESCHEW ENTRAP ENJOIN ENERVATE CATCH DEPRIVE DISSUADE DISTRAIN
ILLEGITIMATE DISABLE EXHORT CIVILIZE PALLIATE MITIGATE ALLAY ALLEVIATE
STOP CHALLENGE HALT HOLD SHUT SUBDUE DISABUSE TACKLE EDIT EMEND ALTER
STIPULATE TAME DISCIPLINE PRESCRIBE ABATE ANNUL WILL DEPRIVE IRRADICATE
LIQUIDATE DISPOSE DEVASTATE DESTROY DESPATCH TERMINATE FINISH DELETE
DEMOLISH CRUSH EXTIRPATE EXPUNGE EXECUTE PURGE ERASE ERADICATE
OBLITERATE SLAY SLAUGHTER ANNIHILATE ABOLISH ELIMINATE EFFUSE
DISINTEGRATE EXPIRE EXPURGATE EXTINGUISH DEPRECIATE FAIL LAPSE WITHER
WILT ELAPSE ERODE DEODORIZE CRUMPLE EXPEND CRUMBLE ESTRANGE SWALLOW
EMBOWEL CONSUME DEVOUR GNAW GOBBLE ADJOURN DRINK CRUNCH
INCARCERATE IMMOBILIZE HANDCUFF CHAIN MANACLE TRUSS QUENCH QUELL
QUASH TRICE THROTTLE TERRORIZE TERRIFY PARALYSE PENALIZE PERSECUTE
OVERPOWER OVERWHELM REPRESS BIND TIE SQUASH SQUELCH STIFLE STUN
STULTIFY SUBJUGATE BENUMB ADMONISH MAIM DISABLE FRIGHTEN SCARE
INCAPACITATE DEMORALIZE CRIPPLE CHOP DEPRESS PUNISH MASH CRUSH IMPRESS
STUNT IMPRISON STICK SECURE FREEZE OSSIFY LOAF QUIESCE RUSTICATE REPOSE
DESIST BELAY BATTEN PIN BECALM IMPAWN JOIN EMBRACE BETROTH CONNECT
COMBINE WED ENTWINE MARRY CLING LINK YOKE ROUT INTERSPERSE SHOWER
SPATTER STAMPEDE BURST DISPERSE DIFFUSE HANG HIT HARASS IMMURE DIVEST
SUNDER OUTLAW ZONE CLEAVE EXCOMMUNICATE DETACH EXCLUDE SEPARATE
DIFFER DIVIDE LAME TRAP SCUFFLE TRAMPLE INHUME INOCULATE CONTENT
CONTRADICT DISSENT HAUNT LISP HUNT DEBATE DECLINE DEAFEN BICKER PROTEST
QUARREL REMONSTRATE HARP CONSERVE QUAIL RECEDE DISMISS INSULATE LIMIT
HINDER INTERCEPT SECLUDE SHACKLE SEAL SEGREGATE TIE THWART SEIZE
ISOLATE LOCALIZE LATCH THREATEN THRASH GARBLE IMMERSE JUMBLE SLOP
BOGGLE BOTCH PROHIBIT PREVENT REFRAIN GAG HESITATE EDUCATE AMPUTATE
FETTER DISCARD FRUSTRATE RESIST RESERVE FORBID FORBEAR REPRESS FOIL
WARD WARN RESTRICT SNARE WEDGE WEAN BAN ARREST SWADDLE SURROUND
BOLT ABSTAIN BIND BESIEGE BOUND STILL MUFFLE REJECT MILITATE REDUCE
SHRUG LEAP CLUTCH CONCEAL CONSTRICT CURB ENCHAIN PRECLUDE PINION
FORGET RETARD COLLUDE BETRAY CONNIVE PLOT CONSPIRE RECANT FIGHT
REPENT NAG DISLIKE EMBITTER REGRET TIRE DETER DISALLOW UPBRAID COMPLAIN
CONDEMN CENSURE CHEW CARP BLAME REPROACH BOTHER MIRE MEDICATE
DISAPPROVE DISTRACT COMPRESS DISHEARTEN DISCOURAGE CURSE CRITICIZE
CASTRATE REVOKE EMBARRASS MORTIFY SHAME BEWARE FOREWARN REFUSE
CURB CLUTCH HUSH IMPEDE SUPPRESS CONTROVERT

49 — E N T E R

INOCULATE INVEST PENETRATE ADMIT INSTALL MATRICULATE INVITE SIP RE-ENTER
INHABIT INHUME INTRUST INSERT INJECT ENTER X-RAY IMPORT INTRUDE
IMPREGNATE INFUSE IMPACT PROBE TRESPASS PIERCE PUNCTURE PRICK BOARD
INFILTRATE INVADE INUNDATE BREAK INRUSH STORM STAB PENETRATE SLASH SLIT
FORCE RAPE RAM RAID JAB IMPAWN CAMP PARK PERMEATE PERVADE EMBRACE
MARRY WED BETROTH TRANSFIX TRESPASS LANCE SHEATHE IMMERSE EDUCATE
INSINUATE IMMIGRATE ADVANCE INSTIL INVADE PRY

50 — D U P L I C A T E

DUPLICATE REPLACE RECEIVE RECIPROCATATE RESTORE REPLENISH EMULATE
TRANSMIT REITERATE REMIND REMEMBER REPEAT RECOGNIZE RECORD
RECAPITULATE DEPICT RETRACE REVIEW COMPREHEND REFER REHEARSE
PRACTISE REDUPLICATE REPRODUCE MULTIPLY RELAY ITERATE REPRINT

RELATE UNDERSTUDY QUOTE COPY SKETCH CHARACTERIZE IMITATE MIME
PORTRAY TESTIFY SUBSTANTIATE RECOUNT ENACT PRINT DEMONSTRATE
PARAPHRASE UNDERSTAND VALIDATE VERIFY REVIVIFY RETOUCH REPAIR
REJUVENATE REHABILITATE REGENERATE REFIT RECUR DISGUISE BEGET INBREED
PROCREATE BREED GERMINATE PROPAGATE TRACE IMITATE FORGE COUNTERFEIT
IMPERSONATE HIT INFRINGE RE-ENTER EMBODY DRAW COUNTERFEIT ENGRAVE
ETCH APPROXIMATE EDUCATE FAMILIARIZE VIZUALIZE DEFINE TYPIFY RECOLLECT
EXEMPLIFY PERSONIFY PLAY IMPERSONATE PAINT RECOMMIT TRANSLATE
CORRESPOND SPELL TRANSCRIBE

51 — WITHDRAW

EXTRACT EXTRADITE EVADE EXTRICATE GO DISMISS EMERGE YANK REBOUND
RECEDE RECOIL WITHDRAW FETCH RECALL ABATE SUMMON SCRATCH ADJOURN
JERK WRING WRENCH DESERT YANK DECAMP DRAW SNATCH EVISCERATE
DISEMBOWEL DRAG EXTRACT REPOSE RELAX RUSTICATE QUIESCE SIT PARK PERCH
IMPAWN CAMP RESIST STRAGGLE STRAY ROUT STAMPEDE DIVEST DISROBE DETACH
EXCOMMUNICATE EXCLUDE FILTER ZONE OUTLAW SEPARATE SUNDER UNCLASP
DIVERGE DIFFER SCRATCH CONCEDE DECLINE DISSENT QUAIL MIGRATE DEMUR
DISHEARTEN DISCOURAGE DENY EMBARRASS MORTIFY ESCHEW ENJOIN TUG
DEPRIVE DISSUADE VANISH RETREAT INSULATE HIBERNATE DISCARD SHRUG FAINT
EXHUME SUBSIDE WITHDRAW REGRET RESORT BOGGLE HESITATE EXACT LOSE
AMPUTATE HIDE RETRACT REFRAIN SHIRK SECLUDE

52 — SUBSTITUTE

BARTER COMPENSATE COST COUNTERFEIT DRAMATIZE EMBODY EXEMPLIFY
IMPERSONATE IMPROVISE INCARNATE INTERPRET MEAN PERSONATE PERSONIFY
PLAY PRETEND PUN PURPORT REBATE REPRESENT RECOMPENSE SIMULATE
SUBLIMATE SPELL SUBSTITUTE SUPERSEDE SUPERVENE TRANSLATE BETOKEN VOTE
RELIEVE DEPUTE ELECT VEST EMPOWER DELEGATE RECORD RECOUNT REMIND
REPLACE ENACT SKETCH CHARACTERIZE IMITATE MIME UNDERSTUDY TRANSCRIBE
PRINT RELATE PORTRAY REPRINT DEPICT MIMIC EMULATE MASQUERADE ACT
DISGUISE DUB SWITCH ADULTERATE PRETEND COUNTERFEIT IMPERSONATE FORGE
IMPAWN INSERT GARBLE BOTCH DECOY EDUCATE LIE DILUTE EXCHANGE VARY
INDEMNIFY SWAP SHIFT IMAGINE FIB

53 — COLLECT

COHERE CONVENE FUSE FORAGE FEDERALIZE GLOMERATE PACK RECRUIT RALLY
GLEAN GATHER SUMMARIZE LUMP ABSORB ACCRUE ACCUMULATE INTEGRATE
TROOP INCLUDE UNITE INCORPORATE UNIFY VISIT STACK AMALGAMATE
AGGLOMERATE AGGLUTINATE ADOPT AGGREGATE MINGLE PARCEL MOBILIZE
MONOPOLIZE PILE ENLIST COLLECT COMPILE CONGREGATE CONSCRIPT CONVOKE
CRAM CONCRETE COAGULATE HUDDLE RETICULATE NATURALIZE PELLET POUCH
COLLECT SALVAGE CONSIST COMPRISE COMPREHEND CANVASS RAID RUSTLE
SWAG SACK HERD CORRAL IMPRESS PRESS SITE IMPAWN CAMP LOCATE COMBINE
CONJUGATE MEET LOOT SORT CLEAVE MOB ZONE INVEST INTRUST ADMIT HUNT
LOCALIZE RUMMAGE JUMBLE EDUCATE EXACT SURROUND PAWN PREPAY CONNIVE
CONCENTRATE COLLUDE CONTAIN CATCH ENTRAP CAGE

54 — INVERTED HELP

BOTHER MIRE FOUL MEDICATE BEGRUDGE FUMBLE PUBLISH DISCUSS SUGGEST
ALLUDE SPEAK STOP CHALLENGE HALT HOLD SHUT TAME SUBDUE DISABUSE HOIST
TACKLE PEN IDENTIFY SUMMON CENSOR EDIT EMEND ALTER ADJUST SHAPE
MANIPULATE TEST REVEAL CONTRIVE INSTIGATE EAT DRIP TINGLE THROB PULSATE
SLUMP SMART SLOUCH SLIP SWELTER STINK SLAVE REACT GOLDBRICK REMIND
REPLACE SKETCH CHARACTERIZE IMITATE MIME PORTRAY DEPICT COPY QUOTE
RECOGNIZE REFER REMEMBER TESTIFY RECORD SUBSTANTIATE PAIN INVOLVE
INVENT CONCOCT ANNUL SLAY ABOLISH ANNIHILATE SLAUGHTER OBLITERATE
ERADICATE SUP ERASE PURGE EXECUTE EXPUNGE EXTIRPATE DELETE CRUSH
DEMOLISH DESPATCH DESTROY DEVASTATE DISPOSE FINISH

TERMINATE IRRADICATE LIQUIDATE TOPPLE DOOM SWALLOW GUZZLE SWIG SWILL
GOBBLE GNAW TIPPLE QUAFF WILT EMBOWEL DRINK DEVOUR CRUNCH CONSUME
NIBBLE ADJOURN ESTRANGE CRUMPLE CRUMBLE DEODORIZE EXPLODE EXPEND
ERODE FLAME WITHER VIVISECT ELAPSE LAPSE FAIL DEPRECIATE EXTINGUISH
EXPURGATE EXPIRE ENGULF RUIN DISINTEGRATE EFFACE ELIMINATE IMPREGNATE
INFORM MAR MUTILATE MOLEST PROSTRATE DISTURB EXCRUCIATE DEBASE
DEFACE CONVICT IMPLANT DEGRADE DEJECT DENOUNCE DEPRESS DISGRACE
DISHONOUR DESPOIL DERANGE DISMAY CRIMINATE DEMORALIZE CONFOUND
IMPOVERISH INCAPACITATE DISABLE MANGLE MAIM AGGRAVATE BESET ATTACK
BEDEVIL STALK SQUASH SQUELCH SPOIL VITIATE VICTIMIZE VEX UNSETTLE
UNNERVE INVERTED HELP WORRY OPPRESS OFFEND NETTLE PROSECUTE PLUNDER
REVENGE PLAGUE PESTER PERSECUTE RAVAGE PARALYSE TORTURE TORMENT
DAMAGE TROUBLE TRIP PARK LOCATE SIT SPRAWL BECALM SECURE STICK FREEZE
LOAF QUIESCE PIN RUSTICATE REPOSE RELAX DESIST IMPAWN ENTWINE YOKE
CONSORT FRATERNIZE CLING HAZE SHOCK SHRED LOOT INSULT ROUT RANGE
SHOWER STAMPEDE STRAY STREW BESTREW STRAGGLE BURST DISPERSE HECKLE
HIT HARASS HURT HARRY HOUND IMPLICATE AFFLICT IMPAIR IMPERIL AGITATE
DIVIDE DIFFER DIVERGE UNLOAD STRADDLE SUNDER SEPARATE OUTLAW ZONE
CLEAVE EXCLUDE EXCOMMUNICATE DETACH DIVEST ABUSE ACCUSE INFILTRATE
LOATHE TRESPASS SHAKE LAME TRAP INJURE INFRINGE INFLICT INVEST INSERT
INOCULATE INJECT INHUME ADMIT PENETRATE HAUNT HUNT DEBATE DECLINE
BICKER GROPE HARP REMONSTRATE QUARREL PROTEST CONCEDE CONTRADICT
CONTEND DISSENT QUAIL RECEDE EVADE EXTRACT HINDER INTERCEPT SHIRK
THWART COLLIDE GARBLE THREATEN IMMERSE RESORT RISK JUMBLE WISH SLOP
STUMBLE BOGGLE REFRAIN BOTCH EXCEED TRY HESITATE EDUCATE FRUSTRATE
COVET WANT DISCARD AMPUTATE LOSE FOIL SNARE BAN SWADDLE BESIEGE AMBLE
HURRY SHRUG SHOVE TOY SYMPATHIZE RETARD REJECT ENCUMBER SUFFER BEAR
END CONCLUDE SORROW ANNOY SENTIMENTALIZE CONNIVE BETRAY REVOLT
RECAN T PLOT CONSPIRE GRIEVE DENY CRITICIZE AGGRIEVE PRY EXHUME DISLIKE
DISTRESS DISPLEASE DESPAIR DETEST EMBITTER AMUSE CAPITULATE PERISH HATE
PUTREFY AVOID TIRE ROT NAUSEATE VOMIT RETCH SUBMIT SUBSIDE SUCCUMB
SWOON ENFORCE DISALLOW COMPEL COERCE EMBROIL AVENGE REPREHEND
REPROACH FULMINATE BLAME UPBRAID CARP CENSURE CHEW CONDEMN
COMPLAIN CHIDE INVERT COMMISERATE DEDUCT CAUTION CHECK CRITICIZE CURSE
DISCOURAGE DISHEARTEN DISAPPROVE DISTRACT MEDDLE MISLEAD ENFEEBLE
TRADUCE ENTRAP DISPARAGE DISABLE OPPOSE DISSENT CATCH DEPRIVE ENERVATE
FRET CONSPIRE IMPUGN IMPUTE GLOAT RANKLE PROTRACT BETRAY CONNIVE
MAKE CONNIVE PLOT REVOLT COLLUDE CONSPIRE ENSNARE COZEN DECEIVE
DEFRAUD DELUDE DEPOSE DEPRAVE INCRIMINATE CRIPPLE CHEAT TRICK IMPOSE
SWINDLE STAB VIOLATE VICTIMIZE UNDERCUT UNDERMINE WAYLAY FOMENT IRK
DAMAGE DUPE HARASS SHOCK SPATTER HORRIFY HIT HATCH HURT ACCUSE
GARBLE FOIL REJECT RETARD TURN DISCLOSE FORSWEAR FAIL HATE EMBITTER
DISPLEASE PROVE BOTHER DENY CAGE DARE SHAME MORTIFY ENTRAP CATCH
DEPRIVE SPY SCHEME DUPE PROSTITUTE PLANT KNIFE STOOL TALK SING TURN
LEAK

55 — I N V E R T E D C O N T R O L

MISLEAD MISFIT MISBEHAVE MEDDLE SUPPRESS SUBJECT FLURRY SENSUALIZE
SEDUCE TANGLE BEWITCH HYPNOTIZE CONFUSE CADGE ERR ELUDE ENCROACH
ENDANGER ENDEAVOUR EMBROIL MUDDLE MORALIZE MISTREAT MISTAKE MISS
MISPLACE RIOT CORRUPT CONVULSE DECOY CONTROVERT DISORDER DISOBEY
DISHEVEL CROSS DISCONCERT DISCOMPOSE DISBAND DISARRAY DISARRANGE
DISAPPOINT MISDEMEAN PROMISE PERSUADE THROW CONFRONT EXHORT APPEAL
RESPOND TRAIN TEACH FACE DRIVE SHOUT ASSASSINATE COERCE FLAY
FLAGELLATE SPANK GAG THRASH BEAT ENSLAVE SPREAD EAGLE SWITCH MURDER
KILL IMPALE IMPLANT PUNISH CAPSIZE CONVICT CANE WALLOP WRING WRENCH
WHIP WHACK DOCK PILLORY SMACK SLAP POISON SPAY NEUTER EMASCULATE
DOPE DRUG COLLIDE BURN GAS BULLY BRUTALIZE ELECTROCUTE KEELHAUL BRAND
SCOURGE INCARCERATE TAX COMMIT CROP CRUCIFY CASTRATE HANDCUFF
FETTER MANACLE TRICE SEIZE TRUSS CHAIN TORMENT TORTURE EXECUTE SLUG
PASTE FLOG RACK PRECIPITATE STINK

SWELTER SMART SLUMP PULSATE THROB TINGLE DRIP REACT SLAVE SLOUCH SLIP
WILL STRAGGLE INNOVATE TERMINATE FINISH IRRADICATE LIQUIDATE TOPPLE
DOOM DISPOSE DEVASTATE DESTROY DESPATCH CRUSH DEMOLISH DELETE
EXTIRPATE EXPUNGE EXECUTE PURGE ERASE ERADICATE OBLITERATE SLAY
SLAUGHTER ANNIHILATE ABOLISH ANNUL ELIMINATE EFFACE DISINTEGRATE RUIN
ENGULF EXPIRE EXPURGATE EXTINGUISH DEPRECIATE FAIL LAPSE ELAPSE VIVISECT
WILT WITHER FLAME ERODE EXPEND EXPLODE DEODORIZE CRUMBLE CRUMPLE
ESTRANGE ADJOURN EAT NIBBLE CONSUME CRUNCH DEVOUR DRINK EMBOWEL SUP
QUAFF TIPPLE GNAW GOBBLE SWALLOW SWILL SWIG GUZZLE BULLY MUTINY
IMPRESS VITIATE VIOLATE FORCE COERCE REBEL REVOLT STRIKE TRIP TROUBLE
JERK DAMAGE IRK TRIFLE TORMENT RAM GOAD GRAB PENALIZE PESTER PLAGUE
WRECK WORRY OVERWHELM DOPE DRUG VEX SPRAIN STRAIN SWAMP SUBJUGATE
BEDEVIL BELABOUR BESET PRICK DISABLE INCAPACITATE SAVAGE IMPOSE TRICK
CONFOUND EXPLOIT DEMORALIZE TAX SACK TRANSGRESS DERAILED DERANGE
DISAFFECT DEPOSE DEMENT IMPLANT DEBAUCH EXTORT DISTURB CAPSIZE PRESS
POACH MOB BUMP MAUL IMPAWN DESIST RELAX REPOSE RUSTICATE LAZE QUIESCE
LOAF ABIDE OSSIFY FREEZE STICK SECURE BECALM NESTLE RECLINE SPRAWL
PICNIC BASK SIT HAZE SHOCK SHREAD LOOT STAMPEDE STRAY STREW BESTREW
STRAGGLE BURST DISPERSE HANG HECKLE HACK HASH HARASS IMMURE HURT
HARRY HOUND INDICT INDENT INCRIMINATE AFFLICT IMPALE IMPERIL AGITATE
IMPEACH DIVEST DETACH EXCOMMUNICATE EXCLUDE CLEAVE ZONE OUTLAW
UNLOAD DIVIDE DIFFER IMPEACH ABUSE INFILTRATE EXTRACT EXTRADITE
EXTRICATE GO DISMISS YANK REBOUND RECOIL SHATTER SHAKE LYNCH LASH
LAME SENTENCE LICK INJURE SCUFFLE INFLICT INSTALL PENETRATE INHUME
INJECT INSERT DISSENT QUAIL RECEDE EVADE EXTRACT HINDER SHACKLE THWART
TIE COLLIDE GARBLE THREATEN THRASH RUMMAGE RESORT RISK JUMBLE WISH
SLOP STUMBLE BOGGLE BOTCH REFRAIN EXCEED TRY HESITATE EDUCATE FETTER
PETITION EXACT RESIST REPRESS SNARE COMPLAIN CHEW CONDEMN VACILLATE
COMMISERATE INVERT TAMPER RESENT AVENGE REPREHEND UPBRAID REPROACH
BLAME CENSURE CAUTION CHECK BEGRUDGE BOTHER MIRE FUMBLE FOUL CURTAIL
MORTIFY CRITICIZE DISCOURAGE DENY DISHEARTEN DISAPPROVE DISTRACT
ENFEEBLE REBEL MUTINY REVOLT DISSUADE DISABLE EMBARRASS SURRENDER
CACHE MISUSE SAG CRY DRAIN MISAPPLY BESIEGE ARREST SWADDLE BIND
ABSTAIN TRANSPORT TRUDGE SHOVE SHAMBLE TOY TURN TUG TUSSE LIMP
CUMBER EMANCIPATE LOOSE DISTRACT PROTRACT RETARD REJECT EMIGRATE
EVICT TOLERATE WITHSTAND UNDERGO SUFFER BEAR BROOK END CONCLUDE
ATTAIN SULK SLOBBER ABHOR ABOMINATE INFURIATE CONNIVE BETRAY IMPUTE
CONSPIRE REVOLT TRADUCE IMPUGN IMPUTE PLOT QUIBBLE FIGHT NAG PRY
EXHUME PROVE DISTRESS ENTREAT DESIRE DESPAIR ENFORCE DICTATE DISALLOW
CRIPPLE DOMINATE DEMAND CONVINCCE COMPEL COERCE STAGGER RETCH WOBBLE
WIGGLE WAVER SQUIRM VOMIT WINCE NAUSEATE ROT FALTER TIRE PUTREFY PANT
PUFF SHAME ENTRAP ENJOIN INTERFERE WHEELDE INVEIGLE FLOUT DEPRIVE
OBSTRUCT PERTURB DISTORT CAGE PUNISH CHASTISE CONSPIRE CONNIVE
DISCOLOUR CHANGE HAPPEN OCCUR TRANSPIRE BEFALL BETIDE COMPRESS
DISCOLOUR DIVERSIFY DREDGE PAINT ETIOLATE PEPPER SLOT PREFIX ENGRAVE
PRUNE PUCKER PRETTIFY PUDDLE PUNCTUATE PURIFY CALCIFY PURL CARVE ETCH
CAUTERIZE BISECT BLOAT BOB SYMMETRIZE MACERATE BRAID BRAISE EVAPORATE
DISSOLVE EVOLVE CHANGE CHIP CLARIFY CLASSIFY CLEANSE EXCHANGE
COMPOUND COCK CLIP CONDENSE CONTORT CRITICIZE CONVERT CORRUGATE
DEFORM CREMATE CRINKLE CURVE DESICCATE DISTEND DEVIATE DIGRESS DRAPE
DILUTE INTERCHANGE TRANSPOSE ZIGZAG WASH WRAP UNDULATE WIPE WHITTLE
OSCILLATE WIDEN WHET WET WEED WEAVE WELD SIZE SMELT SOAK VACILLATE
VARIEGATE SNIP VARY VARNISH SOLIDIFY SOPHISTICATE VIBRATE VOLATILIZE
SPRINKLE VITRIFY SPRAY VULCANIZE SQUIRT STAMP FOUL STERILIZE STEAM
STIPPLE STREAK STRETCH STITCH TUNE STROP SUPPLE AMEND SURFACE AMAZE
SWELL SWAP SWEETEN SWEEP APPROXIMATE BAKE ARTICULATE BESPRINKLE
BEAUTIFY BEND SURPRISE BROIL BREW MASTICATE MEANDER MIGRATE MINCE
PERCOLATE PERFECT PERFORATE PARCH MODERNIZE MODIFY MODULATE MOISTEN
PAVE PEEL PETRIFY PICKLE PIT ELABORATE EMBOSS PLUCK POLISH EMBELLISH
SCOOP SATURATE HOLLOW RUMPLE TACK TRANSFUSE SEW SERRATE SHEAR
UPHOLSTER TAMPER TAINT TEMPER TOUSLE SIMMER IMBUE TRANSFER SIFT
INTERVENE SIEVE

EMBITTER IMPROVE TRANSUDE TRANSVERSE LIQUEFY LENGTHEN TRANSMUTE
 TATTER SCRUB TRANSFORM TRANSPLANT TEAR TAPER TARNISH ADULTERATE
 TRANSFIGURE SEAM TRIM SCREW SCOUR LEVEL SLACK SKEWER KINDLE INVERT
 INTENSIFY DECANT DECOMPOSE DECREASE TWIST TINGE TIP TIGHTEN TINT
 LUBRICATE VARNISH RAREFY GLAZE GRAFT GRANULATE READJUST REAP GRATE
 GRAVE GRIND FABRICATE REFRIGERATE FADE FAG FERMENT FERTILIZE FLUCTUATE
 FORGE FRIZZLE RINSE RUFFLE THAW COMPLICATE SIMPLIFY PARAPHRASE EXTEND
 ENHANCE PREPARE EDIFY PERFUME REFORM REFIT RE-ENFORCE REHABILITATE
 REINFORCE REJUVENATE REPAIR RETOUCH CURE STRENGTHEN ENLIVEN DEVELOP
 DIVERT CIVILIZE BURNISH DEMAGNETIZE DILATE ELONGATE EMPHASIZE EXPAND
 ENLARGE MIX SPACE AMPLIFY MAGNIFY EDIT EMEND CORRECT SHAPE ADJUST
 ALTER SPARK SWITCH SICKEN DAMAGE GASH RASP PARALYSE PAUPERIZE RIP RAZE
 GRILL REND POUND WRY WRINKLE WARP SIZZLE SLIT UNSETTLE SLASH SLICE
 NEUTER SMASH SMOKE SOIL SPLIT STAIN SPOIL SQUASH SQUELCH STARTLE STUN
 STULTIFY STUPEFY SULLY BEFOUL BENUMB BESMEAR BESMIRCH BESPATTER BOIL
 BREAK MAIM MANGLE INCISE INCINERATE SCORCH SCALD SMUDGE AXE CHOP
 DRENCH DISMEMBER DISSECT DEPRESS CUT DEPRAVE DEPOSE CROP Demean
 DEJECT DEGRADE DEFLATE DEFACE DOUSE PULVERIZE PUNCTURE FRACTURE
 PIERCE BURN BRUTIFY BRUISE MANGLE CRIPPLE DISLOCATE DENT MUTILATE MASH
 MAR YOKE IDENTIFY CONSORT COMBINE EMBRACE LINK CONNECT JOIN SPLICE KNIT
 ATTACH INTERSECT APPEND REUNITE REJOIN ENTWINE CLING SHRED SPATTER HEW
 IMPAIR AGITATE DECOCT REFRACT FILTER GARBLE JUMBLE EDUCATE AMPUTATE
 DISCARD DISSUADE DEDUCT SHIFT SCRAPE CHEW TURN IMMIGRATE ADVANCE
 SHIFT PROTRACT RETARD SHED SCATTER ADAPT INURE PUTREFY SHRED ROT
 PREPARE VACATE SUBVERT INVERTED CONTROL

56 — I N V E R T E D C O M M U N I C A T I O N

DISGUISE DUPE CAMOUFLAGE DOGMATIZE DERIDE DRIVEL DISSEMBLE DEPRECATE
 DEPLORE EXECRATE EXCORIATE EXAGGERATE COZEN CAVIL DISTORT CANT
 CALUMNIATE HUFF MURMUR DRONE CLAMOUR CAJOLE CACKLE PREJUDICE
 PRATTLE PRATE MUMBLE PERTURB MOCK MISSPELL MISREPRESENT MISNOMER
 MISAPPREHEND BUZZ MEW MALIGN BRAY BOYCOTT ALLEGE BOOM BLEAT
 STIGMATIZE BLARE BEWILDER BEWAIL BEMOAN BELLOW BELIE BEGUILLE BEDAZZLE
 BAWL BANTER BANDY BAMBOOZLE BAFFLE BACKBITE BABBLE VILIFY GRUNT
 SUBVERT STUTTER STARE STAMMER SQUINT OBVIATE OFFSET OBSCURE OBSTRUCT
 SPURN SPUTTER SQUAWK SPY SQUEAK SQUABBLE SPOUT SPLUTTER SOUR SPAR SOB
 SOLICIT SNUFFLE SNIGGLE SNUB SNIVEL VAGUE SNOOP SNORT SNEAK SNEER
 SNICKER SNIGGER SMUT SNAP SMUGGLE SMIRCH SNARL SLUR SMIRK SLANDER
 SIMPER RETORT WHIMPER UNBELIEVE WHEEZE SWEAR WHEEDLE WHINE WHISPER
 OBTRUDE OVERHEAR ROAR RIDICULE RIB FOOL FLOUT FIB SIBILATE FEIGN FALSIFY
 REHASH REFUTE REFUSE PROFANE RECRIMINATE POLLUTE REBUKE REBUFF
 PERJURE RAVE RATTLE RANT RAG GIBE GAPE GABBLE TITTER TWITTER QUIP HOWL
 DEFILE DEFAME DECRY DAMN JEER INVESTIGATE JIB INVEIGH KID JIBE INVALIDATE
 INVEIGLE TITTLE SHRIEK INTERRUPT INTERPOSE INTERFERE LEER INSINUATE LIE
 SHADE SHAM SERMONIZE SEEM SCRAWL SCOWL SCRIBBLE ARGUE TATTLE HOOT
 HISS SCREECH SCREAM INFER SCORE SCOFF SCOLD SATIRIZE IMPEDE HINT HAGGLE
 TAUNT INVERTED COMMUNICATION PERSUADE EXHORT REPAY ALLUDE DISPUTE
 SUGGEST LECTURE TEACH PREACH SPEAK INTRUDE STOP CHALLENGE HALT HOLD
 SHUT SET SUBDUE DISABUSE GAG POISON SHOOT BOMBARD BOMB SHELL MOTIVATE
 INSTIGATE CONTRIVE INVOKE TINGLE THROB SPARKLE SWISH PATTERN PULSATE
 STINK REACT SMART SLUMP SWELTER JINGLE GLISTEN REVERBERATE RING RIPPLE
 PEAL CLINK CLANG CLACK DRIP GOSSIP FIB PREVARICATE STIMULATE STIR
 PROVOKE FORGET DEAFEN BLIND INVOLVE GAG ENGULF RUIN DISINTEGRATE
 EFFACE ELIMINATE ANNUL ABOLISH ANNIHILATE SLAUGHTER SLAY OBLITERATE
 ERADICATE ERASE PURGE EXECUTE EXPUNGE EXTIRPATE DELETE DEMOLISH CRUSH
 DESPATCH DESTROY DEVASTATE DISPOSE TERMINATE FINISH IRRADICATE
 LIQUIDATE TOPPLE DOOM GUZZLE SWIG SWILL SWALLOW GOBBLE GNAW TIPPLE
 QUAFF SUP EMBOWEL DRINK DEVOUR CRUNCH CONSUME NIBBLE EAT ADJOURN
 ESTRANGE CRUMPLE CRUMBLE DEODORIZE EXPLODE EXPEND ERODE FLAME
 WITHER WILT VIVISECT ELAPSE LAPSE FAIL DEPRECIATE EXTINGUISH EXPURGATE
 EXPIRE SMEAR INVENT DUB

CONCOCT GRIPE SNIPE ROUSE AROUSE TEASE TEMPT FLIRT WOO ELECTRIFY EXCITE
ENKINDLE ALLURE SCINTILLATE TRANCE IMPRESS ATTRACT TANTALIZE TOUT
CAPTIVATE FASCINATE QUARREL SMUGGLE PRETEND DUPE FORGE COUNTERFEIT
IMPERSONATE COZEN IMPAWN DESIST RELAX REPOSE RUSTICATE QUIESCE LOAF
OSSIFY IMPOSE TRICK CONFOUND CHEAT DENOUNCE DELUDE IMPLANT DEFRAUD
EXPOSE DAZE DECEIVE EXILE MAROON BOMBARD AGGRAVATE ADMONISH ATTACK
STUPEFY STULTIFY STARTLE QUARREL OSTRACIZE WRANGLE PLAGUE GOAD GRILL
PESTER INTERDICT INTERROGATE INTIMATE HAZE SHOCK INSULT BITCH
INTERSPERSE SPATTER STAMPEDE STRAY STREW BESTREW STRAGGLE DISPERSE
HORRIFY HECKLE HIT HARASS IMMURE HATCH HURT HOUND INCRIMINATE
IMPLICATE DIVIDE STRADDLE UNLOAD SUNDER SEPARATE OUTLAW ZONE FILTER
EXCLUDE EXCOMMUNICATE IMPEACH ACCOST ABUSE ACCUSE SCORE INFILTRATE
INDISPOSE LOATHE TRESPASS TUT SENTENCE INJURE INFLICT CONTRADICT
CONCEDE COAX PROTEST QUARREL REMONSTRATE HARP BICKER DEAFEN DECLINE
DEBATE LISP HAUNT HUNT QUAIL EVADE EXTRACT INSULATE LIMIT HIBERNATE HIDE
SHUN SECLUDE SEAL SEGREGATE THWART ISOLATE SHEATHE LATCH GARBLE
THREATEN HUMOUR RUMMAGE RESORT RISK JUMBLE WISH SLOP STUMBLE BOGGLE
PREVENT BOTCH REFRAIN GAG EXCEED HESITATE EDUCATE SECRETE RESERVE
FORGO WARN FORBID WARD RETRACT RESTRICT BAN STILL MUFFLE SHRUG SHOVE
SHEER ABSTAIN SHAMBLE TOY TURN SHIFT CONCEAL CLAM MUZZLE FORGET BLAB
PEACH DIVULGE PROTECT PET SNARE GLOZE DISDAIN DISPARAGE DEROGATE
DISCREDIT DETRACT REJECT CROW POSTURE BRAG BOAST SULK OUTCRY WAIL
OUTRAGE SLOBBER ABOMINATE ABHOR ANGER ANNOY SCORN INFURIATE
SENTIMENTALIZE CONNIVE COLLUDE BETRAY IMPUGN IMPUTE CONSPIRE PLOT
RECANT SIGH QUIBBLE IMPLORE RAGE GLOAT GROWL POUT GRUMBLE FIGHT NAG
YELP YAP YELL MOAN PRY EXHUME DISGUST ENTREAT DESPAIR EMBITTER
CONVINCE DEMAND DICTATE DISALLOW SWERVE SUCCUMB RETCH WAVER WRITHE
SQUIRM VOMIT WINCE NAUSEATE FALTER TIRE HATE PANT PUFF CAPITULATE CRY
IGNORE CACHE PUZZLE CURSE CONSPIRE CONNIVE DISSUADE PROVOKE DEPRIVE
INTERVENE INTERSECT INFORM SLANT HUSH IMPLICATE SURPRISE DEMUR
OBJURGATE AMAZE INCULPATE COMMISERATE FABRICATE TWIST INVERT MORTIFY
ESCHEW SHAME DISHEARTEN DISAPPROVE DISTRACT FOUL BOTHER MEDICATE
MISCONCEIVE CHIDE COMPLAIN CONDEMN CHEW CENSURE CARP BLAME UPBRAID
FULMINATE REPROACH REPREHEND AVENGE ASCRIBE RESENT IMPLY EMBARRASS
DECOY EMBROIL MORALIZE MISLEAD DIGRESS CRITICIZE CURSE DISCOURAGE DENY
PRAY KID LIE PREVARICATE PRETEND CRITICIZE SUSPECT RANKLE WORSHIP WHOOP
INTEND TO NOT COMMUNICATE

57 — D I S P E R S E

STREW STRAGGLE DISPERSE SPREAD SHOWER RADIATE RANGE BURST SPATTER
STAMPEDE BESTREW ROUT INTERSPERSE DIFFUSE DISPERSE DISTRIBUTE DISPENSE
DEPLOY SOW PROPAGATE DISSIPATE PULVERIZE SCARE UNSETTLE STRAFE CHARGE
DISMEMBER DEMENT UNNERVE LITTER HOUND SCATTER AGITATE SHATTER QUAIL
EVADE RUMMAGE JUMBLE BOGGLE BOTCH DISCARD OUTBREAK SCATTER
EMBARRASS SHUDDER PANIC SWERVE SQUANDER EXPORT DISPEL VOLATILIZE
SPRINKLE DISBAND FLURRY DISTRACT DISTRIBUTE STRAY

58 — I N V E R T E D I N T E R E S T

INDULGE INCITE INCULCATE SCANDALIZE ASTOUND INDUCE LIKE LUST INFLAME
INFATUATE WALLOW GIGGLE THRILL TITILLATE TITIVATE QUIRK PEEP MYSTIFY
ENCHANT PROSTITUTE IMBIBE INEBRIATE INVERTED INTEREST BENUMB BELABOUR
MASH MAR MANGLE MAIM BESPATTER BESMIRCH PERFUME BESMEAR BESLOBBER
BESLAVER BESET BIND CAMP SOJOURN ABIDE RESIDE DWELL LOCATE IMPAWN
REPOSE NESTLE LOAD DISABLE TRUSS TOY PLAY WED BETROTH MARRY PERVADE
PERMEATE TOUCH ACCOMPANY REUNITE ATTACH KNIT SPLICE JOIN CONNECT LINK
EMBRACE COMBINE CONSORT YOKE ENTWINE CLING MURMUR TWEAK CRAVE PRICK
PRESS FRACTURE MOLEST PENETRATE PIERCE MUTILATE PINCH BUTCHER BUTT
MOB BRAND BURN BUMP MAUL BRUTIFY AWAKEN AROUSE SATISFY GRATIFY
STIMULATE EXCITE BRUISE HABITUATE ENUMERATE DETAIL

OPERATE TEST DISCIPLINE MANIPULATE PRESCRIBE PREDISPOSE COMPLY REMAND
SUMMON STOP ELONGATE DILATE ENLARGE EXPAND EMPHASIZE CORRECT EMEND
EDIT MAGNIFY AMPLIFY ALTER ADJUST SHAPE RIFLE RANSACK SPY INFILTRATE
PRY GRILL PERSECUTE PERSEVERE MAINTAIN PERPETUATE PERSIST PROLONG
RESPIRE NURTURE NOURISH RECONSTRUCT RENOVATE REINSTATE MATURE FIX
MARTYR SURVIVE BULLY PREDESTINATE DROOL SLAVER VIOLATE REACT STINK
SLUMP SMART SLAVE SWELTER SLIP SLOUCH PULSATE PATTERN SWISH SPARKLE
THROB TINGLE DRIP CLACK CLANG CLINK PEAL RIPPLE RING REVERBERATE GLISTEN
REPRODUCE RETRACE QUOTE COPY REMIND SKETCH CHARACTERIZE IMITATE MIME
PORTRAY DEPICT REPLACE RECOGNIZE REMEMBER TESTIFY SUBSTANTIATE RECORD
RECOUNT ENACT PRINT EMULATE RESTORE DUPLICATE RECIPROCATE RECEIVE
REPLENISH TRANSMIT PRACTISE REHEARSE MULTIPLY REITERATE REPEAT
RECAPITULATE REVIEW REDUPLICATE BANG SCREW RUIN STIMULATE STIR
PROVOKE MAKE GUZZLE SWIG SWILL SWALLOW GOBBLE GNAW QUAFF SUP
EMBOWEL FRATERNIZE DRINK DEVOUR CRUNCH CONSUME NIBBLE EAT ADJOURN
ESTRANGE CRUMPLE CRUMBLE DEODORIZE EXPLODE EXPEND ERODE FLAME
WITHER WILT VIVISECT ELAPSE LAY INHALE GROW CONJURE JINGLE TIPPLE LAPSE
FAIL DEPRECIATE EXTINGUISH EXPURGATE EXPIRE ENGULF RUIN DISINTEGRATE
EFFACE ELIMINATE ANNUL ABOLISH ANNIHILATE SLAUGHTER SLAY OBLITERATE
ERADICATE ERASE PURGE EXECUTE EXPUNGE EXTIRPATE DELETE DEMOLISH CRUSH
DESPATCH DESTROY DEVASTATE DISPOSE DOOM TOPPLE LIQUIDATE IRRADICATE
FINISH TERMINATE ENSNARE DISPLAY ENGROSS ENKINDLE CAPTIVATE EXCITE
FASCINATE FLIRT ROUSE AROUSE ATTRACT IMPRESS TRANCE SCINTILLATE ALLURE
GOGGLE MARVEL ELECTRIFY TANTALIZE WOO TEASE TEMPT INTOXICATE SMUGGLE
DEPRAVE FETTER FORCE WINE BED SLEEP LIE UNDRRESS DRESS DIVERT CULTIVATE
DELIGHT COMFORT EXHILARATE ENLIVEN SUCKLE WILE SOOTHE SOLACE OBLIGE
RELIEVE REJUVENATE INNERVATE SATISFY PERFUME PERMIT PLEASE ENCOURAGE
ENDEAR ENHANCE BESTOW SURFEIT CONSOLE BEDEVIL ATTACK BEAT BEFOUL
BATTER ASSAULT BASH ASSAIL SWEAT SULLY SUFFOCATE SUBJUGATE STUPEFY
STUN STRAIN STRANGLE STRIKE STIFLE STALK SPOIL STAIN VIOLATE SPRAWL LOLL
VICTIMIZE SOCK SOIL UNDERMINE HANDCUFF MANACLE FETTER CHAIN SMEAR
GRASP COERCE POUND POKE REVENGE GRILL PLAGUE PESTER PERSECUTE RIP GRAB
GOAD PARALYSE RACK GASH TORMENT END TOLERATE IDOLIZE PET FORGET
PHILANDER CLOY PINION CLUTCH CRAVE HANKER PANT MASTURBATE JOLT
RETALIATE FORCE FLAY FLAGELLATE SLASH SLICE SLAP SLIT TYRANNIZE EXHAUST
WHACK WHIP WOUND OVERWHELM OVERPOWER WARP WRENCH WRING TWIST WRY
ROUGH WALLOP OPPRESS OFFEND NIP NICK SMACK SMITE SLAM NEUTER
EMASCULATE SPAY SMOTHER DROWN DOPE DRUG SMASH NIBBLE SNIFF STROKE
RUB APPEAL ATTRACT ENTICE FRIG COHABIT FUCK FORNICATE COPULATE LAY
MAKE JAZZ DRUG JERK PLAY TEASE TWITCH DESPAIR DELIVER COME TRIFLE TRICE
JAB SICKEN INTIMATE INTERROGATE TWIST BRUTALIZE HAMMER HAZE SHOCK
INSULT SPATTER STAMPEDE STRAY BESTREW BURST DISPERSE HANG HORRIFY
HECKLE HIT HARASS IMMOLATE HURT HOUND HARRY SCAR AFFLICT IMPALE
AGITATE ZONE DISROBE EXCLUDE OUTLAW SEPARATE DOPE SUNDER UNLOAD
DIVERGE TOSS ROLL WRITHE DIFFER DIVIDE DIVEST LASH ACCOST ABUSE
INFILTRATE LOATHE TRESPASS LYNCH LAME LACERATE LICK INJURE SCUFFLE
SCRATCH INFLICT INJECT INHUME PENETRATE ADMIT INVITE INOCULATE INSERT SIP
HAUNT YANK EXTRACT HIDE SHUN SECLUDE SHACKLE SEIZE THWART TIE COLLIDE
GARBLE THREATEN THRASH THRALL IMMERSE RUMMAGE RESORT RISK SLOP
STUMBLE PROHIBIT REFRAIN GAG EXCEED TRY FETTER FRUSTRATE SECRETE GO
COVET EXACT CONSERVE LOSE PETITION AMPUTATE DISCARD WANT FORBID
REPRESS SPECIALIZE SNARE TWEAK TONGUE ENJOY LOVE LIKE SUCKLE SQUEEZE
TARNISH TAINT SCREW KINDLE INVERT INTENSIFY HUMILIATE DEGRADE REGRET NIP
COMMISERATE LURK JUMBLE FONDLE NUZZLE SUCCUMB SWOON BURY EJACULATE
COME STAY SLEEP PROCURE COVER PAW CACHE DEFILE DALLY DISLIKE DISTRESS
DESIRE DISGUST SIGH GLOAT GROAN AGONIZE MADDEN PALPITATE MOAN EAT
EXHUME COLLUDE RECANT TRADUCE BETRAY SENTIMENTALIZE CONSPIRE PLOT
CONNIVE SHUDDER SUFFER CONCLUDE ACHIEVE ATTAIN WAIL OUTRAGE WEEP
SLOBBER CULMINATE ENDURE SHIVER TRANSPORT SHAMBLE SUSPEND BIND TURN
TUSSELE LIMP PROWL DABBLE ENFEEBLE FONDLE ABUSE CORRUPT TUG EMBARRASS
SHAME MORTIFY ENTRAP ALLURE PINCH REVEL SQUIRT SOPHISTICATE PUCKER
CRITICIZE CONTORT BOTHER FOUL DEFORM DEVIATE

BEWITCH SEDUCE SENSUALIZE CATCH ENERVATE INSINUATE LEER DEFILE TITTER
POLLUTE TOY WHISPER DEPRIVE SMIRK SMIRCH CORRUPT SNIGGER SMUT SNEAK
SOLICIT RAPE RAVISH PASSION PERVERT FOREBODE FOREWARN YEN OBSESS SUCK
BESOT BEWARE BITE BAN PROCURE BEGUILÉ CREEP STRIP INITIATE FEEL BARE PRY
PAINT KISS LICK TATTOO FLOG CASTRATE HYPNOTIZE WHIP SEDUCE CARESS TICKLE
DISABLE BIND TORTURE IMPLICATE IMPOSE SCALP SAVAGE INCISE SCOURGE SKIN
KNOCK SIN TRICK WRIGGLE KICK SMUDGE DAZZLE SNATCH EMBROIL CRIPPLE
DEMORALIZE CRIMINATE EXPLOIT COMMIT SCRATCH CLAW CHOP TRANSGRESS
CHEAT DISSECT DISMEMBER DISGRACE DISHONOUR DRAG DESPOIL DERANGE
DISEMBOWEL EVISCERATE DISLOCATE DEPRAVE CRUCIFY CROP DEMENT DEMEAN
DELUDE DEGRADE ERECT DEFACE DISSIPATE EXPOSE DECEIVE CANE DEBAUCH
DEBASE EXCRUCIATE EXTORT CAPTURE CONQUER CUT PUNISH PUNCTURE PUNCH
DETRACT CLEAVE

59 — THINK

CONSTITUTE COMPRISE CONSIST NEOLOGIZE SCHEME WONDER OUTLINE JUSTIFY
NUMERATE THEORIZE GENERALIZE THINK PARTICULARIZE RATIONALIZE PERCEIVE
REALIZE CONCUR CONCERN CONCENTRATE CONCEIVE COMPARE COGITATE DOUBT
DISTINGUISH DISPROVE DISQUALIFY CALCULATE PRESUPPOSE PRESUME PREPENSE
PREJUDGE PREFER PREDICT EDUCE PREDICATE PRECONCEIVE PHILOSOPHIZE
METHODIZE BETHINK BEMUSE BELIEVE ASSUME SYMBOLIZE SYSTEMATIZE ANALYSE
SURMISE SUSPECT SUPPOSE SPECULATE EXCOGITATE VISUALIZE SOLVE WEEN
EQUATE AMOUNT COMPUTE INFLECT DERIVE DENOTE DEFINE DEEM COUNT
CONTEMPLATE CONSTRUE CONSIDER ASCERTAIN ASSESS TRANSCEND ASSOCIATE
LIST DECIDE DEDUCE QUALIFY ITEMIZE QUANTIFY PLAN RECKON PONDER
RECOLLECT POSTULATE RECONSIDER PREDETERMINE REFLECT FORECAST RESOLVE
RUMINATE TOT TYPIFY DISCERN TABULATE TALLY IMAGINE PUZZLE THINK
UNDERSTAND RECALL REVISE SIMPLIFY IDENTIFY ASSORT STIPULATE DETAIL
ENUMERATE GRASP RECOGNIZE REMEMBER REMIND RECORD REVIEW RETRACE
RECAPITULATE MULTIPLY REPRODUCE DEPICT COMPREHEND REFER FORGET
ELIMINATE MANUFACTURE CONCOCT CONSTRUCT INVENT ESTABLISH DEVISE
EVOKE PROBE PURSUE EXPLORE DETERMINE APPEND ADJOIN INTERSECT COMBINE
LINK CONNECT PERMEATE PERVADE CONJUGATE STULTIFY STUPEFY DAZE BENUMB
DEMENT DERANGE DIVIDE DIFFER EXCLUDE SORT SEPARATE EXTRACT WISH
BOGGLE EDUCATE MISCONCEIVE FUMBLE BOTHER REGRET CLASSIFY CRITICIZE
INFER INFORM RECALL WORRY REGARD GRADE RATE RANK VALVE ADJUDGE
ADJUDICATE PROVE DESPAIR MUSE SUMMARIZE APPREHEND ESTIMATE TROW
IDEALIZE CONCLUDE CONFUSE INSPIRE ADDUCE

60 — CREATE

GENERATE ISSUE MOTIVATE EMIT EMANATE ENGENDER PERPETRATE INVOKE
TRANSACT COMMENCE CONTRIVE PREDESTINATE CONJURE INSTITUTE NOMINATE
DESIGN ORIGINATE PRECIPITATE INSTIGATE PROPAGATE BEGET POPULATE
PROCREATE INBREED BREED IMPREGNATE GEMINATE DEVISE INCUBATE VIVIFY
ORDAIN VITALIZE DECORATE INVENT MANUFACTURE CONSTRUCT SPROUT
INCREASE DUB CONCOCT ESTABLISH ANIMATE GLOW ATTRIBUTE INNOVATE WAGE
CREATE WRITE PEN DISCOVER EXPRESS ENDOW RECREATE REGENERATE PLANT
MATERIALIZE BUILD MAKE PRODUCE SOW SPAWN CREATE STAY PLACE CLING JOIN
EMBRACE LINK MEET LOCATE FOMENT IMPROVISE IMAGINE ERECT NARRATE

61 — OBSESSIVE CAN'T HAVE

DISAVOW DISBELIEVE DISCLAIM DUMP DISOWN EMACIATE EMBEZZLE YEARN
OPPOSE OWE SKIMP STARVE STEAL STINT STRIP SWIPE SURCHARGE BEREAVE
MISAPPROPRIATE MISTRUST MOULT ECONOMIZE PILFER PINE LACK REMOVE FAST
RATION THIEVE THIRST RID SCRIMP SCAMP SAP SACRIFICE HOG ABORT ROB
RETRENCH REVOKE OBSESSIVE CAN'T HAVE DISBURDEN CURE RAID PRE-EMPTY SEIZE
DEMOLISH CUT GUT TAX GORGE SLAVE STINK SLIP SWELTER SLOUCH REPLACE
REACT DUPLICATE REHEARSE PRACTISE REDUPLICATE REPRODUCE MULTIPLY CROP
DOCK DEPRIVE STEAL OBLITERATE DEMAGNETIZE TERMINATE FINISH IRRADICATE
CRUSH

LIQUIDATE TOPPLE DOOM DISPOSE DEVASTATE DESTROY DESPATCH DEMOLISH
DELETE EXTIRPATE EXPUNGE EXECUTE PURGE ERASE ERADICATE OBLITERATE SLAY
SLAUGHTER ANNIHILATE ABOLISH ANNUL ELIMINATE EFFACE DISINTEGRATE
CENSOR RUIN ENGULF EXPIRE EXPURGATE EXTINGUISH DEPRECIATE BATTEN FAIL
LAPSE ELAPSE VIVISECT WILT WITHER FLAME ERODE EXPEND EXPLODE DEODORIZE
CRUMBLE CRUMPLE ESTRANGE ADJOURN EAT NIBBLE CONSUME CRUNCH DEVOUR
DRINK EMBOWEL SUP QUAFF TIPPLE GNAW GOBBLE SWALLOW SWILL SWIG GUZZLE
REQUISITION INTERDICT GUT KIDNAP ANNEX IMPOUND OSSIFY LOAF FREEZE
QUIESCE CLING ENTWINE YOKE CONSORT LINK JOIN ATTACH ACCOMPANY CRAVE
EMASCULATE NEUTER ALTER SPAY RIFLE RANSACK TAX SACK IMPOVERISH SCALP
FLAY SKIN SNATCH RUSTLE EXPLOIT CHEAT DESPOIL CROP DECORTICATE DEFRAUD
CAPTURE EXTORT POACH PINCH BEHEAD SWINDLE SPOIL WRING WREST OSTRACIZE
PLUNDER GRASP RAVAGE RAZE PAUPERIZE DECAPITATE BESIEGE SIEGE
COMMANDEER SHRED LOOT SHOWER STREW BESTREW STRAGGLE DISPERSE
IMMOLATE EXCOMMUNICATE EXCLUDE FILTER SEPARATE ZONE OUTLAW SUNDER
STRADDLE UNLOAD DETACH DIVERGE DIFFER DIVIDE DIVEST PURLOIN DISMISS
EVADE SHATTER INFRINGE REMONSTRATE BICKER GROPE DECLINE DEBATE HUNT
HAUNT DISSENT CONTEND CONTRADICT CONCEDE PROTEST QUARREL HARP RECEDE
RECOIL YANK EXTRACT DISMISS INSULATE LIMIT HINDER SHUN SEGREGATE
THWART ISOLATE SEIZE LATCH COLLIDE GARBLE IMMERSE RUMMAGE RISK RESORT
JUMBLE WISH SLOP STUMBLE BOGGLE BOTCH PROHIBIT PREVENT REFRAIN TRY
HESITATE EDUCATE WANT DISCARD PAWN FRUSTRATE RESIST SECRETE AMPUTATE
LOSE COVET CONSERVE FORGO FORBID WARN RESTRICT WEAN BAN ABSTAIN SHOVE
SHEER LEAP SHAMBLE TUG SHIFT FORGET RETARD REDUCE DISDAIN CRIMP DEVEST
REJECT FORSWEAR VACATE FORSAKE EKE REPUDIATE RENOUNCE RELINQUISH SHED
ENCUMBER INURE WAIL WEEP SORROW ABHOR ABOMINATE RECANT SIGH GRIEVE
FRET DREAD MOAN MOPE MOURN ENVY DISGUST DISLIKE DESPAIR SUCCUMB
PUTREFY ROT NAUSEATE VOMIT ABDUCT DISARM SURRENDER SACRIFICE DEPOSIT
AMASS POSSESS ACQUIRE RETAIN CAUTION CACHE BEGRUDGE ESCHEW CONDEMN
SHEAR SOAK DEDUCT TAKE DEMUR CURTAIL PLUCK PRUNE BOB DISAPPROVE
DISHEARTEN DENY DISCOURAGE CLIP CRITICIZE FOUL BEGRUDGE MIRE DESICCATE
ENFEEBLE ENCROACH CADGE CAGE DISCARD DISPOSE POACH PURLOIN IMPOVERISH
RUSTLE ENTRAP ENJOIN ENERVATE HAGGLE CATCH DEPRIVE DISSUADE COZEN
DISABLE CASTRATE CHEAT DESIRE DESPOND ENFORCE RETCH

62 — E F F E C T

EFFECT REACT SLOUCH SLUMP SLIP PULSATE SMART TINGLE THROB SWELTER
STINK SPARKLE GLISTEN PATTERN SWISH CLACK CLANG CLINK PEAL JINGLE
REVERBERATE RIPPLE RING DRIP SLAVE RESPOND THUMB CONSOLE SURFEIT
REPLETE ENLIGHTEN ENHANCE ENERGIZE PREPARE ENCOURAGE EDIFY PERK
PERFUME HABILITATE SALVE HEAL INNERVATE INSTRUCT LEAD REASSURE REFORM
REFRESH REGENERATE REHABILITATE REJUVENATE RELIEVE REPAIR RESPITE
RESCUE RESUSCITATE RETOUCH REVIVE SMOOTH SOLACE SOOTHE STRENGTHEN
SUCCOUR SURCEASE SUPPORT EXHILARATE ENLIVEN CHEER COMFORT DELIGHT
CULTIVATE DEVELOP DIVERT DRESS DRIVE WINE CALM CIVILIZE BURNISH CURE
INVIGORATE SMELL FEEL WILL ORDAIN IMPOVERISH SCALD INCAPACITATE SCORCH
INCISE KNOCK KICK SMUDGE CRIPPLE DEMORALIZE CONFOUND CHOP DRENCH
DRAG DISAFFECT DERANGE DEPRESS DISMAY DISLOCATE CUT DEPRAVE DENT CROP
DEMENT DEJECT DEGRADE DEFLATE DEFACE DAZE DEBAUCH DEBASE EXCRUCIATE
EXTORT CAPTURE CONQUER DOUSE DISTURB PULVERIZE PUNISH PUNCTURE PUNCH
PROSTRATE CAPSIZE PRICK PRESS PIERCE MUTILATE MOLEST BUTT BURN BUMP
MASH BRUISE MAR MANGLE MAIM BREAK BOIL AGGRAVATE BESET BENUMB
BELABOUR BEDEVIL BEFOUL BEAT BATTER BASH APPAL SWEAT SULLY SUFFOCATE
SUBJUGATE SWAMP STRAIN STORM STRANGLE STIFLE STARTLE SQUEEZE SQUELCH
STAIN SQUASH SPOIL SPRAIN SPLASH SPRAWL SPLIT SPILL VICTIMIZE VEX SOIL
SMOKE UNDERCUT UNDERMINE SMEAR SMOTHER SLAM SINK SIZZLE TYRANNIZE
WEARY ULCERATE UNNERVE WORRY WOUND WRY WRING WRINKLE OPPRESS
JOSTLE JOLT FLOOR PLAGUE PESTER PERSECUTE GOAD RASP RAP TERRORIZE
THUMP TICKLE QUELL QUENCH QUASH IRK DAMAGE JERK SICKEN TROUBLE HOUND
HARRY HURT HARASS HIT HECKLE

HORRIFY INSULT SHOCK HAZE HAMMER AFFLICT SCAR IMPAIR AGITATE ABUSE
ACCUSE INDISPOSE SHATTER SHAKE LACERATE LAME INJURE QUAIL THREATEN
MORTIFY COMMISERATE REGRET FOUL MEDICATE MIRE DISTRACT DISHEARTEN
DISCOURAGE CURSE EMBARRASS SHAME BLANCH

63 — N O E F F E C T

VANISH MINIMIZE OMIT NO EFFECT PARDON EXCUSE PARRY CONTRACEPT VITIATE
PETRIFY ABIDE FREEZE STICK SECURE BECALM IMPAWN DESIST QUIESCE OSSIFY
STAVE DUCK EVADE INSULATE HIBERNATE SECLUDE THWART HUMOUR PREVENT
REFRAIN TRY CONSERVE WARD DENY ENFEEBLE WITHSTAND DESPAIR DESPOND
SHRUG WAIVE REJECT FORSAKE RETREAT RETIRE FORSWEAR RESIGN DISSUADE

64 — C A U S E

BUILD MAKE PRODUCE MATERIALIZE PLANT EFFECT AFFECT SOW ERECT SPAWN
BEATIFY STIMULATE SPARK NECESSITATE PROVOKE INVOLVE WILL CAUSE PROJECT
PURPOSE DISCOVER EXPEDITE INVIGORATE CIVILIZE DRIVE DIVERT DEVELOP
CULTIVATE DELIGHT EXCEL ENLIVEN EXHILARATE ENABLE STRENGTHEN SPONSOR
VERIFY VALIDATE UPHOLD UNDERTAKE REVISE FURTHER REPAIR REHABILITATE
FACILITATE RE-ENFORCE RECTIFY RAISE LEAD INSTRUCT ASSIST HEAL SUSTAIN
ASSURE ALLEVIATE PREPARE ENERGIZE SUPPLY REplete SURFEIT FILL FULFIL
EXTEND CONTRIBUTE CO-OPERATE COMMAND PRESIDE RULE REIGN JUDGE JOCKEY
JUGGLE USHER NAVIGATE PILOT OFFICIATE REGULATE DIRECT UNTANGLE ORDER
ORIENTATE ORGANIZE OPERATE ADMINISTER SUPERINTEND SUPERVISE MANAGE
MASTER CONSTITUTE INSTITUTE ORIGINATE GENERATE CONTRIVE CONJURE DESIGN
ENGENDER MOTIVATE SUFFUSE ORDAIN ATTRIBUTE INVENT INNOVATE INITIATE
LOCATE SITE TEMPT INSPIRE PERVADE PERMEATE FOMENT TROUBLE SICKEN
DAMAGE QUELL TORMENT TERRORIZE RAID PARALYSE PAUPERIZE PENALIZE
PERSECUTE PROSECUTE FORCE OFFEND OPPRESS WORRY WHELM WEARY
TYRANNIZE UNSETTLE VEX VICTIMIZE SPOIL VITIATE SUBJUGATE APPAL BELABOUR
AGGRAVATE PRESS DISTURB DISSIPATE DEPOSE DEPRESS DERANGE DESPOIL
DEMORALIZE DISAFFECT DISGRACE COMMIT CONFOUND EXPLOIT INUNDATE INVADE
IMPOVERISH INCAPACITATE IMPOSE RADIATE SHOWER SPATTER BURST FILTER
EXCLUDE ZONE SEPARATE OUTLAW SUNDER DIVERGE DIVEST DIVIDE INDISPOSE
INFLICT COAX BOTHER FABRICATE DICTATE DEMAND DISALLOW CONVINCE EXERT
DOMINATE COMPEL ENFORCE COERCE INAUGURATE FOSTER PREDETERMINE
POSTULATE CONCEIVE DIFFER SORT STIR

65 — F A I T H

HOPE CREDIT FAITH ENTRUST DEPEND MEDITATE CALM DISBURDEN COMFORT
EXCULPATE CHEER PROVIDE SUPPORT SURCEASE SUCCOUR VINDICATE VOUCH
SOOTH SOLACE OBLIGE REVIVIFY OFFER CURE REVIVE RESPITE FORGIVE RELY
RELIEVE REJWENATE REGENERATE REFRESH REFORM RECREATE RECTIFY REDEEM
RECONCILE REASSURE IRRADICATE LEAD SERVE TRAVAIL HEAL SALVE HELP
SUSTAIN ASSURE BESPEAK ABSOLVE ALLAY MITIGATE PARDON PALLIATE EASE
EDIFY ENCOURAGE ENHANCE ENLIGHTEN ENDOW BESTOW SUFFICE CONSOLE AVAIL
PREDESTINATE TESTIFY EMULATE REPLENISH TRANSMIT NEOLOGIZE INSPIRE
REPOSE IMPAWN DWELL SOJOURN ABIDE RESIDE DENOUNCE PROSELYTIZE CONVERT
CONFESS CONFIRM BAPTIZE IMPLANT CLING YOKE JOIN PERMEATE PERVADE REJOIN
COMBINE EMBRACE CONNECT REUNITE FRATERNIZE WED MARRY BETROTH
ENTWINE BESET BELABOUR BESMIRCH ADMONISH BREAK BURN MOB MOLEST
PROSTRATE CONQUER DEFLATE DEFRAUD DELUDE DENOUNCE CRUCIFY DEPRAVE
DISAFFECT CHEAT CONFOUND DEMORALIZE DAZZLE SIN TRICK SCOURGE
FLAGELLATE IMPRECATE IMPOSE TRANSGRESS TRESPASS UNFROCK BEDEVIL
ASSAIL SWINDLE SUBJUGATE STUPEFY STULTIFY VICTIMIZE VANQUISH UNDERMINE
SMITE WREST PERSECUTE PARALYSE RACK QUENCH INTIMATE RADIATE HEW
CLEAVE EXCOMMUNICATE REBOUND EMERGE IMMERSE WISH REVERE DEIFY AWE
WORSHIP ACHIEVE ATTAIN LOVE TRUST ASCEND TRANSPORT ASPIRE BELIEVE
EXCLUDE

Franchise

RELEASING AND PREPARING A CASE FOR S.O.P. GOALS

S.O.P. Goals takes a great deal of accurate Scientology to run. One has to be the kind of expert one would become from studying at Saint Hill or under a person who has been here who graduated with honors.

One has to have his TRs 0 to 4 *perfect*. One has to know an E-Meter backwards and forwards. One has to know Model Session so well that he or she can pass all TRs while doing it. And one has to know assessment.

There is nothing, however, so bad as to get a wrong S.O.P. Goals Assessment on a case. It condemns the pc to an infinity of auditing. He or she will never get Clear until a *right* assessment is done. And the auditing in between is wasted.

So until you get to Saint Hill or get a special course in S.O.P. Goals from a Saint Hill honor graduate, or from Australia's Peter Williams, whom I taught in South Africa, or unless I am right on the other end of a Telex as I am for London, may I please ask you to content yourself (and get marvellous case gains) releasing people with the preparatory steps of S.O.P. Goals and skip trying to run S.O.P. Goals on wrong assessments.

These Steps release people.

The Preparatory Steps of S.O.P. Goals consist of only two things:

1. The Johannesburg Security Check, well done (the revised issue of which will come to you next week), and
2. General runs on the Pre-Hav Scale after proper assessment of the *pc* on that scale.

You can easily learn to give a "Joburg". You can easily learn to assess on a Pre-Hav Scale. And you can't do any real damage and can get the fastest case gains you've ever seen.

THE JOBURG CHECK

If withholds make the pc get no gains, then what better way to clear them up than by a fabulously thorough check on withholds such as is found in the "Joburg Check".

Ask every question in various ways until the pc gets no further needle action on that question with sensitivity raised way up.

The General Runs on Pre-Hav: Assess the Pre-Hav Scale saying each level once to the pc on the meter going up it. Saying each level *once* to the pc going back down it. Write down every fall, theta bop or rock slam and how much. Take the level which gave the *most* reaction going up and down.

Take that Pre-Hav level that reacted most.

Using your good sense, make up a five-way bracket auditing command from the level.

Suppose the most reactive level was *Overts*. This translates as “DONE TO”. The 5-way command is “What have you done to someone?” “What has someone done to you?” “What has someone done to another?” “What has another done to others?” “What has someone done to himself?”

Run the process watching the meter Tone Arm.

When the Tone Arm moves more than 1/4 of a Tone Arm Division movement up or down (no matter how many times it went up or down), continue the process, no matter what the pc says about its being flat.

When the Tone Arm moves less than 1/4 Of a division of the Tone Arm Dial in 20 minutes, change the process. Bridge out, reassess on the Pre-Hav Scale as before. Take the next level, make up a five-way bracket the pc can do and flatten it off as above.

Audit by the Tone Arm (except in rock slam). Assess by the needle. For rock slam, just run the slam out of the level until it’s gone for 20 minutes.

Then, with two Pre-Hav levels flat on the Tone Arm, do a new “Joburg” Security Check.

It will have changed!

Do it all in Model Session. Handle the Rudiments. Do a “Joburg”, then a couple of Pre-Hav levels, then a “Joburg”, then a couple of Pre-Hav levels, then a “Joburg”, etc, etc, on and on.

The case will soar.

RELEASE

This is the production of a Release.

It is the simplest and fastest way to produce a Release.

It has to be done anyway to set a case up for an S.O.P. Goals Assessment.

MISTAKES

You can louse up a pc by:

1. Failing to get a nul needle on every “Joburg” question as and when you ask it. Get each question cleared, not by Auditing, just by watching the needle and asking until the pc tells you the withhold.
2. Running several levels without flattening any. This puts the whole case in a stew. The movement of the Tone Arm as you run it tells you when something is still unflat. As long as the Tone Arm of the Meter is moved by the process, continue the process. It’s a code breach not to!
3. Running a level too long. You can stick the Tone Arm by overrunning the level. This is more serious than leaving one slightly unflat. If a Tone Arm for twenty minutes is only moving between, say, 3.25 and 3.35, you are already in danger of sticking the Tone Arm. Get off of it! If you *do* overrun, it’s hard to reassess for the new level and hard also on the pc. A remedy for overrunning is to assess the auditor on the Pre-Hav Scale and run the auditor out of the pc for about ten, fifteen minutes—if the needle moves at all.
4. Dwelling on levels in the Assessment, repeating them over and over instead of just once each, can start an avalanche on the pc. Don’t do it. Take the meter needle reads when they happen. Jot them down. Then take the most reaction. That’s it.

5. Sad to relate, it's been done. But *don't* think you just take the first level of the Pre-Hav and run it and then go up one and run it and then the next one up. That's murder. Assess them with an E-Meter and run the levels of the Pre-Hav that react when they react.
6. Don't skip the "Joburgs" because they make pcs squirm. This is how you find and get the withholds off. The case won't move if you don't. And give *many* Joburgs, one after every long Pre-Hav run, one or two levels, for the case responsibility comes up and as it comes up new overts are realized and they've got to come off.

SUMMARY

You'll do the most for the pc by taking him or her to release with Preparatory S.O.P. Goals runs.

This is strong, powerful auditing. The pcs will thank you. They won't if you try S.O.P. Goals when you don't know how. That's the way to make enemies.

E-Meter Essentials is coming out soon. A new Pre-Hav (same one you have but extended) Scale is being issued in another Clearing Series book. And I'm giving you straight dope and the best tools in these Bulletins. How can you lose. You're sunk. You can't!

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :im-.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURE
26 May 1961

** 6105C26 SHSBC-4 On Auditing

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 29 MAY 1961

Central Orgs

CLARIFICATION OF “CHANGE PROCESSING”

The following despatch to D of P Washington, D.C., who had been using “Change” exclusive of the whole Pre-Hav Scale and had been having trouble, is of interest to all Technical staff.

29th May, 1961

Wayne—

Change is only one part of Pre-Hav Assessment. It is the only one that has a Secondary Scale. To “Assess on Pre-Hav” means to assess the whole Pre-Hav Scale of which Change is a part.

Change belongs at “Inverted Control”. Cross out “Inverted Control”, write in “Change” instead. Assess only on the whole Primary Pre-Hav. If and only if you get a reaction on “Change”, you assess Change Scale. When a level is flat you return to the whole Pre-Hav Scale and assess the whole scale.

Every Pre-Hav Level of the Primary will soon have its own Secondary Level. You always assess on any new assessment for level the whole Primary Pre-Hav Scale. You choose the most reactive (reacting on the needle) level of the Primary. Then you move over into that level’s Secondary Scale. You find the most reactive Secondary Level. You run just and only that level flat. Then you take the whole Primary Pre-Hav Scale for the next assessment. Once more you find the most reactive Primary Level. Then you move over into its Secondary and so on.

“Change” is the first one to have a Secondary Level. Every level now has one and they will be issued shortly.

So put “Change” at “Inverted Control” instead of “Inverted Control” and carry on.

The best routine is HCO Bulletin of May 13, 1961. It modifies nothing of this but gives you a sure approach to release, provided you keep rudiments cleaned up every session.

Best,
Ron.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jl.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[HCO B 13 July 1961, *Change Processing and CCHs*, which had a “Franchise” distribution, was a combination of the above HCO B, with the last paragraph deleted, and HCO B 23 June 1961, *Running CCHs*, page 347.]

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURE

1 June 1961

** 6106C01 SHSBC-5 Flattening Process and E-Meter

Ability

Issue 129

[June 1961]

The Magazine of
DIANETICS and SCIENTOLOGY
from
Washington, D.C.

The Sad Tail of PDH

L. Ron Hubbard

Every time we get up to a high roar, such as now when we're clearing people as never before, we measure our progress by the violence of reaction in squirreldom.

They come down from the trees and start looking for nuts to convince how we're all wrong. If they weren't paid to do it I'd be happier.

The latest brainwave to greet our highest peak of helping Man is rumors of "PDH." This is Pain-DrugHypnotism as practiced by the Communists. Brainwashing, in fact. It is interesting that when the Commies fight you, they try to convince people that you're guilty of their own overt. It is also fascinating that a Commie rumor line is international in scope. The same rumor bursts out in a dozen quarters around the world, spread by paid agents at the same time.

This rumor of PDH started in Australia, where Scientologists laughed at it, went to South Africa where Scientologists got mad about it and then sprang up in the U.S. where some Scientologists "didn't know." Well, disregarding the fact that such don't know anything anyway, we now know who is helping the little red brothers with the sickle in one hand and the hammer in the other to make trouble in the U.S.

Anyway, I'm not writing this article to scold. I'm really laughing at the idiocy of it.

I've been showing the students here at Saint Hill who've come for special briefing and clearing (and who are getting clear) how to convince a pc, by flagrant meter reaction, that the cat has "PDH'd" him. It's very funny. But you'd have to know how an E-Meter works to appreciate the joke.

Here is the drill:

You put anybody on an E-Meter and say, "Have you ever been a victim of Pain-Drug-Hypnotism?" The meter reacts strongly. So of course the test subject on the meter is startled. He begins to gape. The meter action is so strong. It's so convincing.

"Now," you say, "who did this to you? Was it _____?" and name some person the subject knows or knows of. And we see another fall. The subject gapes, astounded. Has dear old Frank been giving him PDH's? How horrible. He never would have thought this of poor old Frank. And you leave it at that and your test subject

now believes he has been brainwashed by his best friend. But you don't leave it at that.

"All right," you say, "do you know of any pets?"

The test subject says, "Yes. I have a cat."

"Well!" you say, "did this cat give you a dose of Pain-Drug-Hypnosis?"

And the meter falls!

The test subject is bewildered or ridiculing now. But there it is.

"Did your cat make you a victim of Pain-Drug-Hypnosis?" you insist.

And the meter reacts!

"What date?" you say. And the meter reads for midnight 12 July 1960.

Our subject now has horrible visions of his cat sitting on his chest while he sleeps PDHing him.

Why?

Well, people who believe bad things instinctively often aren't capable of learning. But you are capable of learning so here's the explanation:

You say to the test subject, "Is this meter falling on the word: PAIN?"

The subject wriggles. Giggles. "I sure don't like pain," says the subject. The meter clears up on it.

You say, "Is the meter falling on the word: Drugs?" And that fall comes off as the person says, "No, drugs are pretty bad."

"Is the meter falling on the word: Hypnotism?" And that fall comes off because the subject realizes that he doesn't like hypnotists and says so.

"Or did the meter fall on the word: VICTIM?"

The subject now laughs or responds.

The meter is cleared up in this way.

"Now," you say, "have you ever been the VICTIM of PAIN-DRUG HYPNOTISM?"

The subject laughs. You repeat the question. The meter doesn't react at all.

"Now how about this cat?" you say. (Or J. Edgar Hoover or whoever.) "Did you ever kick this cat? Do you have overts on this cat?"

"Well, yes," says the subject. "I didn't kick the cat. I drowned a cat once."

"When?"

And after dating it on the meter, "Midnight 12 July 1960!!!" The exact date of the "PDH" (or one should say, the overt on the person [cat]).

For the meter reacts on any person or thing on whom the *subject* has committed *overt acts* !

And when these things are inquired into, the question, "Have you ever been the victim of Pain-Drug-Hypnotism?" draws a nul meter. If it were really true, the meter would still respond.

You have to *compartment* any meter question to get the truth. The E-Meter never lies. But you can ask a sloppy question. When a question, the basis of which is false, contains restimulative or charged words, one has to break the question down to phrases or words, get the charge off them and *then* ask the question again. *Now* if the fact is true the meter reacts on the *question* not the *words* in the question.

Example: (asking a pc about a goal) "Do you want to be a freeman and climb ladders and rescue beautiful women?" The meter falls madly. What is it falling on? To sort the goal out one must know. The whole goal is true or part of it or none of it. So one asks, "Do you want to be a fireman?" Meter is nul. "Do you want to climb ladders?" Meter is nul. "Do you want to rescue?" Meter is nul. "Beautiful women?" Meter falls off the pin. "Do you have a goal to have beautiful women?" Meter falls off the pin again. It was Beautiful Women, not Fireman that made the meter fall.

Meters are *accurate*. But sometimes people are sort of stupid.

L. RON HUBBARD

PS: If there were any advantage in Brainwashing (which there isn't) and *if* anybody *were* really PDH'd, it will clear up in a few minutes by assessing the PDHer on the Pre-Hav Scale and running the person off the bank. Takes about 30 minutes by the new processes. It takes the Russians 70 days to lay one in.

We're winning.

LRH

PPS: If the meter falls only on Overts, won't somebody *please* tie these squirrels down for a Johannesburg Security Check? Their PDH screams rather point the bony finger! Certificates must be in clean hands. Any HCO will give any certified auditor a security check, with or without witnesses. And any HCO can now stamp certificates "Clean Hands 1961." Personally I wouldn't let myself be audited by people who haven't had security checks. Every person in a Central Organization is security checked. There you *are* in clean hands. And don't try to tell people otherwise after all the work I do to keep orgs clean for you or I'll revoke not only your certificate but your Thetan, too.

LRH

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 1 JUNE 1961

Central Orgs
Tech Staff

ASSESSING

Clarifying how to do assessment on the Pre-Hav Scale, Primary and Secondary:

Assess Primary Pre-Hav. Locate most reactive level by most reactive needle response. If several levels react, clarify them by asking about one, then another, very briefly.

At the Primary Level you discovered (say “withhold”) move over to Secondary Scale (say, Withhold Secondary) for that level. In the same way as on the Primary Scale, find the most reactive verb on the Secondary Scale (say the Withhold Secondary).

Run that verb only. Don't try to run nothing but that Secondary Scale for the next 5000 hours. Run only the one verb, made up into a multi-bracket command.

When that one verb no longer produces Tone Arm motion (less than 1/4 of a TA Division of motion in 20 minutes of auditing means flat, get off) the “level” assessed is flat.

You now assess again on the Primary Scale. You find the most reactive level of the Primary Scale as before.

Taking this Primary Level you move into *its* Secondary Scale. You assess the Secondary just like you assess the Primary.

You find one word, (one level) of this Secondary Scale, just one verb that reacts on the needle more than the rest. You choose this one verb. You run it flat on the Tone Arm. You don't reassess inside this Secondary again unless its Primary comes up again in new assessments. You assess newly on the Primary Level, etc.

It is always the same system. You always do the same steps of selection. Find Primary Level. Find the One Point of its Secondary that reacts. Make up a command with brackets. Run the Tone Arm flat. Assess again on the Primary Scale. Go to its Secondary. Find the Secondary. Make up command and run the Secondary flat, etc, etc, etc.

At this writing only one Primary Level has had its Secondary Scale issued. That is Change which belongs at Inverted Control. But as this is written, all the Secondary Scales for 65 levels of the new Primary Scale are sitting in a box near my desk, being mimeoed one by one. Mary Sue, Jan and Dick Halpern assisted in the assembly for nights on end or it wouldn't have been ready for 20 years if done by Ford Foundation or U of Pishtush standards.

So very shortly you will have *all* Secondary Levels complete. I will later cull them out and arrange them a bit neater in gradients but you need them and so they are being mimeographed and sent as they are.

When you have them all, don't do as one person did—read that you ran the “Secondary Level” and so ran every one of the words in the whole Secondary Scale without further assessment. Ruined more pcs it did.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jl.rd
Copyright ©1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 5 JUNE 1961

CenOCon
Franchise

PROCESSES ALLOWED

(Cancels earlier Process directives)
(D of P Re-evaluate *all* cases, staff and public, on the basis of
this bulletin and apply this bulletin at once to all cases.)

As of this date only the following processes may be used in HGCs, Central or City Offices, excepting only Academies where any process may be used for training.

Process Routines

Routine One

For all cases that show one or more points near the very bottom of the graph on Traits A, B, C, D, E, F, and G regardless of other test or meter criteria, and for all cases that show all points within 25 points of the top of the graph, again regardless of other meter or test criteria:

1. CCHs.
2. Joburg Processing Checks.

1. The CCHs are to be run by their earliest criteria—London '57—which is to say CCHs 1, 2, 3, 4, are run in rotation and each only so long as it produces change and no longer. Change is measured by Comm Lag or alterations of pc in doing process. Do, for instance, CCH 1 only so long as it is producing changes in pc's responses to doing it. Twenty minutes of no-change of response should be regarded as nul for the moment. One then goes on to CCH 2. The same rule applies. Only if pc's responses are faster or slower or different each time, continue the process. Test for twenty minutes, again all of which must produce no marked difference of response to the process. If process is now nul, go on to CCH 3. Same rules apply. Go on to CCH 4. Same rules apply. Go to CCH 1. Same rules apply. Etc, etc. It is a Code Break (Clause 13) to change the process while the pc is giving differences of timing (comm lag) or attitudes of response. It is a Code Break (Clause 13) to fail to change the process when the pc is not giving any differences in timing or attitudes of response.

If done this way and with good Tone 40 wonderful results are achieved by the CCHs.

The case criteria is meant to embrace the “no auditor” case at the bottom and the “Theetie Weetie Case” (sweetness and light) case at the extreme top of the graph (who will go to graph bottom before the case starts up again as though the profile were a cylinder which when it goes off the top, then appears on the bottom when people are in “serene” valences [meaning they are wholly overwhelmed as a thetan].)

2. The Johannesburg Processing Check is the same as the Joburg Security Check only it is now being used for processing purposes with great results. I have rewritten it in HCO WW Form 3 as the Joburg Security Check and will rewrite it as HCO WW Form 4 calling it “HGC Gain Control Check” or some such name, but the questions are about the same. Meanwhile use Form 3 as is in HGCs. Don't rewrite or omit.

The directions are on the Check form. The difference is that in using the Joburg in Processing, these rules apply:

1. Clear *all* needle reaction from any question before going on to the next question. By-pass no reaction you see on the meter to the question. If you do let one slide, the pc will shortly complain about being given the check. If a pc starts complaining about the check, you have either passed a hot question without getting the withhold, or he has a hot withhold. Remedy: if pc complains continually while being checked during processing (*not* in pure Security Checking for the Org but in using the check in processing) you go back to the beginning and start over.

2. The Joburg used in processing only is done in Model Session only. However on the question, "Are you withholding anything?", don't spend more time than needed to clear PT withholds on the auditor as the whole check is devoted to withholds.

3. If pc refuses check altogether and you can't get on, return pc to CCHs, do them a few more hours and try the check again.

This is all there is to Routine One. CCHs and Joburgs. And the graph is now the full criteria of when you use Routine One.

Routine Two

This is covered very fully in HCO Bulletin of May 25, 1961, "Releasing and Preparing a Case for SOP Goals" and other current HCO Bulletins.

Routine Two consists of two steps *only*.

1. Joburg checks, given as above in Routine One.
2. General Runs on Pre-Hav Scale without terminal, using Primary and Secondary Scales.
3. On PT Problems of Long Duration (years or within this lifetime only) assess on meter for terminal and nul the Tone Arm for each level, level after level, using mainly the Primary Scale.
4. Find the pc's Havingness and Confront Processes and use them briefly early in each session and at each session's end and where needed.

For every general level flattened fully on the Pre-Hav Level found, do a Joburg. For every PTP of Long Duration, completed, run a Joburg.

The Hav and Confront Processes can be found at any time but are better found after one Joburg and one general level flattened.

Why all these Joburgs? As a case gains it gains in responsibility. As it gains in responsibility, the pc remembers more withholds and considers the things he has done more in the light of having been overts. If the case isn't given a chance to get rid of these, it stalls. Or the pc is half killed by realizations that he has been bad when the targets of his *overts* lessen from pigs to people. Therefore it is brutally unkind to improve a case without then removing the withholds now realized. This is also an excellent therapeutic mechanism. It is also an excellent test of a pc's progress, i.e: if he has no more withholds on a new Joburg that weren't found on his last, the pc isn't progressing. On successive Joburgs if no new overts and withholds show up that weren't there before, the pc is *not* progressing. Yes, I've found why cases stalled and gained only so far and then blew. Your thanks are in order.

This Routine Two, closely followed and carried out, will bring out the state of Release in from 50 to 75 hours.

Routine Three

1. SOP Goals Assessments for goals and Terminals;

2. Running SOP Goals Terminals Flat on every level;
3. Joburg Processing checks (as in One and Two above);
4. Use of Hav and Confront Processes as in Routine Two or finding new Hav and Confront Processes as case gets more able.

This is the full extent of the things used in Routine 3.

Routines 2 and 3 are not crossed or intermixed.

Routine 3, if one is expert indeed, can be done on any case *but* one can make mistakes, find the wrong goal or terminal, and so, until fully briefed and flawless in TRs, E-Meter, Model Session and Assessing, an auditor will get more case gains per unit of time by using Routine Two. When he or she is a Release, it is much easier some day to have Routine 3 then completed if the person is Released first.

In short, for *sure* gains until you are sure of your tools, as listed above, use Routines 1 and 2. *When you* are perfect in handling SOP Goals, do Routine 3 on pcs.

W A R N I N G

On running general runs and SOP Goals Terminals on Pre-Hav Levels, the most serious mistake that can be made is not flattening a level before reassessing.

On a rough case, the TA motion required to end is present at the beginning and so auditors leave the level and leave it unflat.

If two or more levels are run and left unflat, the pc can feel he is spinning!

Flatten levels in this wise:

1. Run until TA is showing better motion.
2. Run until needle is practically stuck for the whole of 20 minutes.
3. Reassess.

Example on a sticky meter case:

Level Assessed: "Build"

First three hours of running:

Tone Arm dial reads:

4.2, 4.3, 4.1, 3.9, 4.2.

Second three hours of running:

4.2, 4.4, 4.1, 4.6, 4.0, 3.75, 4.9, 3.5, 4.3, 3.25.

Third period of two hours:

3.25, 3.5, 3.2, 3.6, 3.9, 4.1, 4.0, 3.0, 3.5, 4.7, 3.6, 4.8, 5.0, 4.7.

Last twenty minutes:

4.7, 5.0, 5.0, 5.0, 4.9, 5.0, 5.1, 5.0.

Note that the "Leave it when the TA moves less than a 1/4 of a TA Dial in 20 minutes" seems to apply to first three hours. Actually the TA, on a rough case (sensitivity 2 to get a 1/3 dial drop) does not *begin* to move for quite a while. Then it begins to move. Then it nuls.

So be careful. It is better to have a TA stuck for 20 minutes than to leave a level unflat.

SUMMARY

Since February, 1961, I've been teaching auditors close up and far away how to clear.

I have now a pretty good grip on what they *can* and *will* do. I have been modifying the tools to fit hands more than to fit cases. They already fit the cases and have since February.

The auditor who can do CCHs and has a fair command of Routines 1 and 2 and who "keeps the Rudiments in" and doesn't Q and A and who has a good D of P behind him to see that he does, can get wonderful case results with Routines 1 and 2.

Only the auditor who has perfect TRs, a total command of the E-Meter, Perfect Model Session, a good grip on assessing, and whose case is in excellent shape, should attempt SOP Goals—and that right now isn't two dozen and aside from Peter and Eliz Williams, their two new ACC Clears and a few of their ACC Students, aside from the South African Clear Jean Kennedy and a very few S.A. ACC Students, the rest are right here at Saint Hill. At this moment there are *none* in America and there will only be one there by July 30th, 1961. There are none in England outside the boundaries of Saint Hill who could clear and only one genned in on Routine Two at HASI London.

So there's what I've found out after an awful lot of work with you guys. I've found most of you can do Routine One, some of you can do Routine Two. None save the above named can (not by permission but by actual fact) do Routine Three.

I've also found out that all this is *very* easy to remedy and that your willingness is superb.

Our work is cut out for us, but boy, do we know where we're going.

We have to get all auditors perfect on the TRs, Model Session, E-Meter, Security Checking, Pre-Hav Assessing and SOP Goals. And it can be done very easily. When we've got that we'll have loads of Clears.

And what do you think *that* will do to this society?

LRH:jl.bh
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

[See also HCO PL 24 August 1961, *HGC Allowed Processes*, page 369.]

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES 5—7 June 1961

** 6106C05	SHSBC-7	Routine One, Two and Three
** 6106C06	SHSBC-8	Routine One, Two and Three
** 6106C07	SHSBC-9	Points in Assessing

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 7 JUNE 1961

Central Orgs

ACADEMY SCHEDULE, CLARIFICATION OF

There is apparently a considerable confusion going on as to what should be taught in an Academy. Some schedules and advices from various people have been handed about that didn't really duplicate the intention well, and I have not before clarified since the issue of the Pre Hav.

A review of Academies and auditors and their skills at the time of examination, and in application for and early service in HGCs, shows that Academies have for some time been in violation of one of the stable data about new auditors. A new auditor should be trained up to a point where he or she can be employed at once as a staff auditor and put on a pc without the D of P giving them endless hours of additional training.

This does not mean that all auditors graduating should be employed by the HGC. It means all graduating should be capable of being employed. Why? Well, these auditors are going out to audit and haven't got a D of P to further train them, so they are being handed a career failure if they cannot audit people without further training.

The attention of all Assn Secs and Ds of T is vigorously called to the technical calibre desired from an academy student and the necessary training reality.

You are *not* training auditors if when they graduate they cannot audit. Now whatever schedules, classes and other fancy ways of dodging the necessity to confront students have been employed, just tear them all up. They are not a good substitute for training. Because we have all been trained in the educational system circa mid twentieth century we are liable to think that forming people up into classes and getting them to jump over books on schedule will educate them. Well it won't. We are here to train auditors not to educate them. So just train them.

How?

Well you do it by check sheet. You make up a check sheet of all the items this person must actually know in order to practise auditing effectively. Then each time the person passes a level he is examined and checked off on the check sheet, and goes on.

Here is the leader in all this data: You can dawdle around with theory outside an Academy, read books and so on. But in an Academy only can you *LEARN* certain things and not all the books in the world will teach them.

These things are as follows: the TRs 0 to 9, the Model Session while obeying the TRs, the E-Meter, the CCHs, the Pre Hav Scale and its use in assessment. The running of general Pre Hav levels, how to do a Security Check.

Those are the things they can't learn anywhere else. Therefore all training should not be of a class, for this terminal called a class will never audit anybody. All training should be of student individuals who will audit people, for only an individual student, not a class, will do any auditing.

Now you will also find that if the student doesn't listen to at least fifty taped lectures of mine he won't know the mood or flavor of all this, and so will develop rather weird ideas of what we're all about and charge around making nothing out of people, so a daily hour of tape is quite important for the whole eight weeks the student is there.

All right, he also has to know the Auditor's Code. And he should know the Code of a Scientologist. And he should know his axioms.

What else? Not another blistering cotton picking thing, that's what. *NOTHING* else. If you try to teach anything else you've had it.

So your check list should be composed of the various parts of just those things. Now all this frantic motion of getting the student into classes and regimented doesn't fit in with what we're doing. So it is pure silliness to say, "How can we enter a student in a Comm Course when we only run one every few weeks and er what gee can't well er can't dogs alter-is let's see" Actually the first and last part of the sentence make the same sense. *NEITHER* make any sense of course.

So you have two *UNITS*. These two units are called unit one and unit two. They are not so called because of weeks present or cats on the belfry or diabums on the scollery. They are called units one and two because the students in unit one are studying techniques and the students in unit two are studying processes or applications.

Thus we know a unit one student not by the colour of his glasses or his voucher of payment. We know him because he has a check sheet in his paw which says unit one on the top of it and which has under it Code of an Auditor, the listed TRs, the Model Session, the E-Meter and the CCHs. Then we have a unit two student and he is obvious not because he has a time clock in his hand but because we can clearly see that he has in his paw a sheet which has on it Code of a Scientologist, the Pre Hav Scale, Assessments how to do, commands how to make up, Security Checking, and character of auditing review and the axioms, and then follows a list of fifty or sixty tapes.

All these items have little tails after them four times so he can be examined four times by instructors and flunked the first three.

Now when he gets out he can take an Extension Course and complete his theory, but he can also do a creditable job of Routine One and Routine Two as covered in HCO Bulletin of June 5, 1961.

No classes. He reports. He works with other students. He sweats it out. He gets no auditing, but may be security checked and security check other students. He may assess people, but as long as he is in unit one he only concentrates on mechanics, and can't go on to unit two before he is perfect perfect perfect perfect perfect perfect perfect in unit one. He can only leave unit two when he is safe safe safe safe safe safe to employ at once in the HGC. A student may not be examined by HCO until those check sheets are all initialled as perfect by instructors.

What's this do to training? It demands that our instructors are all letter-perfect on the above material and that they impart the personal touch to every student, and not in big masses but with hammers on individual heads.

I herewith forbid classes and authorize only one daily seminar. I forbid more than the above to be taught in the Academy. I forbid as well length of time present to operate as any criterion of the skill of an auditor.

Now that's an Academy. Write down your questions and mail them to me fast.

Then read this again for it's all I will say.

LRH :jl.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

[This HCO B has been amended per HCO PL 9 October 1961, *HPA/HCA Rundown Change*, which said only that the Auditor's Code should be inserted in Unit One and omitted from Unit Two.]

HCO BULLETIN OF 8 JUNE 1961

Sthil Students
Central Orgs
Tech Staff

E-METER WATCHING

ARE YOU WAITING FOR THE METER TO PLAY DIXIE?

I have been a bit surprised by the length of time it is taking people to do assessments on the Pre-Hav, on Security Checks and Goals.

A query into this, which may reveal more, has discovered that students wait patiently for the meter to react, which Mary Sue has noticed.

It dawns on me that auditors believe they are doing an *Analytical* assessment on the Pre-Hav, etc. *This is wrong.*

The Pre-Hav Scale is not a picture of analytical thought. It is in the order it is in because it is a picture of reactive thought. It is how the reactive mind is stacked up. (See *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* for the chapter on the Reactive Mind.)

Now an E-Meter reacts only on the reactive mind. A Clear doesn't react because he is able to be conscious. An aberree reacts because he can't think without thought exciting the reactivity of the reactive mind. This, being composed of mass, energy, space, time and thought, responds to tiny electrical impulses.

If your auditing was not aimed at reactivity it would not register on a meter. Thus, you run what reacts because it reacts and is therefore part of the Reactive Mind.

The Reactive Mind responds instantly on data a billion years ago. How is this? Time in the Reactive Mind is out of order. So is Space. So is Matter, so is Energy. Pin a sign on the Reactive Mind: "Out of Order". It connects wrong connections. Hence, the E-Meter.

What is wrong with the pc is not known to the pc. Therefore if a pc knows all about it, it isn't wrong with him.

That's why you never run what the pc says. You run *only* what the meter says. Example—pc is *sure* his current general Pre-Hav level that should be run now is "Order or Command". "Order" rapidly vanishes. "Command" follows suit. *CONQUER* stays in. This is an actual example. I just assessed it a few minutes ago on a pc who is in pretty good shape. He didn't like *CONQUER*. He said Order and Command were long track. Somebody running a Q and A on his assessment would have said, perhaps, the pc knows best, so we'll run Order. Even if it doesn't fall. But when I said it was *CONQUER* that we were going to run as only *it* now fell, the pc sighed and gave in. Finding the Conquer level questions produced a very responsive meter needle. It was wrong with the pc because he didn't know about it. It was part of his reactive mind. Order and Command were analytical responses prompted by an entirely different thing *CONQUER*. If Order or Command had been run the pc would have had a lot of auditing time wasted on him.

Now, why are assessments wrong sometimes? Because the auditor is persuaded by the pc, not the meter. If the pc and the meter agree, so what. You can still run it. But only if the meter says so, for only then is it reactive.

Now, what about *slow* assessments? Well, the auditor thinks the pc must consider things before he answers, waits for the pc to answer and waits for the question to sink in so the meter will react.

This is entirely wrong. Based on a misunderstanding of assessment, the meter and the reactive mind.

1. The pc does not have to be given a chance to think before the needle responds.
2. The pc does not have to answer or say one word to make the needle respond.

3. All needle response is reactive.
4. There is no time in the Reactive Mind.
5. If the pc knew what was wrong with him it wouldn't be wrong.
6. Only the meter knows.
7. The auditor has more control over the pc's Reactive Mind than the pc since the pc is influenced by the Reactive Mind responses and the auditor is not so influenced.

The Meter responds instantly. The reaction you will get on the needle starts to occur on the needle a fraction of a second after you utter it.

There is no need to sit there afterwards waiting for the needle to respond again, for it won't until you push that button again.

The only wait is caused by letting the needle come back at the end of a fall. This may take one second.

Therefore: TO WAIT MORE THAN THREE SECONDS BEFORE UTTERING THE NEXT WORD ON THE LIST IS A COMPLETE WASTE OF AUDITING TIME.

All the response you want will begin to occur instantly after you utter a goal, terminal, level or security question. Thus the maximum time between questions on the Pre-Hav level is at most a three second interval of silence while you digest the data.

Further, on an assessment for a Pre-Hav run on the General Scale (as in Routine 2, HCO B 5 June, 1961), you do not now say, "Do you . . ." or any other dunnage. You just say the level itself, note response, put a pencil point down on the level if it responds, say the next word, etc, etc. Takes about 5 minutes to run the Primary Scale up and down to find its level. You start at the bottom. You just say the word. If it responds you dot the sheet (using different symbols to tell them apart like dots, X's, lines). Then go back down the scale touching only those you marked going up. Add another dot if they still fall or react. Then play off those left one against the other, saying a level only once each time. The remaining level is now the only one that reacts. So you assemble your 5-way bracket and carry on with auditing.

The pc doesn't have to say a word throughout the whole assessment. You can even ask him politely not to, as breath going in and out in speech can vibrate the needle.

When you assess over into the Secondary Scale of the level you found, you do exactly the same as above. You read them all off once, then only those that reacted, eliminate them and you've got it. (And, by the way, if you go over the Secondary Scale, you then don't only run levels on that Secondary forever; in each new assessment you use the Primary Scale again to find a new Secondary Level to assess.)

This is also true of a Joburg. If you're going to get a reaction on the needle, it will come fast. No waiting. If you get a reaction you clear that reaction, not the pc's whole life. The moment the needle is nul, you go on to the next question. Of course, in a Joburg, the pc talks. He better!

All auditing actions except the CCHs are now done in Model Session.

And all auditing actions and questions are done effectively, neither frantically rushed nor slowly.

So it boils down to this. Weeks can be added to Joburgs and assessments if you think you have to wait for a needle response.

What are you waiting for? The whole action only requires a second.

Don't wait for the E-Meter to play Dixie. It was made in the Nawth.

LRH: rd
 Copyright © 1961
 by L. Ron Hubbard
 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HCO BULLETIN OF 12 JUNE 1961

Central Orgs
Franchise

THE RISING NEEDLE: SKIP IT!

Former ACC students will well remember the E-Meter drill in which, among other “reactions”, they were to produce a rising needle on their coach. The time has come to change nomenclature on this one! For practical auditing purposes—such as deciding if a Sec Check question has been cleared, or whether a particular level of the Pre-Hav Scale should be run—A RISING NEEDLE IS NOT CLASSIFIED AS A “REACTION”.

Of the 10 needle actions described in Ron's new book, *E-Meter Essentials*, let's call the following “reactions”, in as much as they are of value to an auditor in deciding what needs to be run on a case, or what needs further work:

ROCK SLAM
FALL
THETA BOP
STUCK
CHANGE OF NEEDLE CHARACTERISTIC

The following might be called, simply, needle actions, or motions—in that you don't use them in deciding to *do* something with a pc:

FREE NEEDLE
NO REACTION (NUL)
STAGE FOUR
RISE BODY
REACTION

About all a rising needle tells you is that the pc can't confront, therefore has exceedingly low reality, responsibility, and knowingness on whatever significance it's rising on. So, skip it! Treat a rising needle, for practical purposes like a Security Check or Assessment, like a nul needle. You needn't pursue this particular subject any further at this point in the case, because the pc's knowingness and responsibility on this subject is practically nil. There may very well be further material available on this particular subject *after* the pc has had some more auditing—but *not now*. So, let go of it. Skip it! So, it's putting the Tone Arm up, this rise. All right. That's why E-Meters are built with Tone Arms that rotate; sometimes they go up! Fine. You don't need to do a blessed *thing* about it, and shouldn't try. Just keep on with your check, assessment, or whatever it is you're doing. Let your auditing guides be the rock slam, fall, theta bop, chiefly, plus stick and change of pattern.

If it's a rise with sticks in it, you do find out what's putting the *stick* into it. If it were a rising needle with rock slam in it you'd investigate the *rock slam*. But the rise itself, or a needle that is simply rising, you ignore.

In this way you will save hours and hours of auditing time. Trying to kill a rise by finding out what it's rising on is attacking the case at its least approachable point—the point responsibility, reality, confrontingness and knowingness are at their lowest, the point when the pc (and the meter!) is least capable of helping you, or himself. Why try to scale a wall where it's 20 feet high when you can walk through the breaches in it? So gear him in instead where the needle is reacting with rock slam, falls, theta bop, or sticks, where he has some reality and responsibility, where he knows something about it, and can confront it a little. That way he'll move, and you'll both win.

LRH:im .rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 16 JUNE 1961

BPI
Franchise

CCHs AND ROUTINE 1

The criteria on Routine 1 is as follows:

All cases that have had no significant or rapid change over long periods of auditing shall be run on Routine 1, HCO Bulletin of June 5, 1961, regardless of graph, Meter behaviour or objections.

This applies to over half the Scientologists in the world.

So get over the idea the CCHs are for nuts. And get over diffidence in having them run or being run on them.

Routine 1, Routine 2 and Routine 3, HCO Bulletin of June 5, 1961, each one will make Releases. Routines 1, 2 and 3 are choices made for speed. One is faster than another for different pcs. Some pcs release faster on Routine 1 than 2 or 3.

Any case could be run on any one of these routines, from any level, and still make it. The question is "How fast?" One chooses the routine in the interest of greatest effectiveness in the least time.

Having attained Release, a person then goes to Routine 3 inevitably.

Time economy is our criteria. Not necessarily case level.

So keep your "pride" or be run on Routines 2 or 3 to Release at ten times the auditing time—or attain Release via Routine I, if it's for you, in one-tenth the time.

The D of P may refuse to further audit any pc who:

1. Refuses to be run on the process ordered, or:
2. Refuses to take a Joburg, or:
3. Refuses to abide by the regulations of HGCs regarding alcohol, eating, sleeping, etc.

I don't want any super-defensive valence getting in people's road in clearing. CCHs, the degradation of being audited on, compares to the little boy refusing food because it might make him live.

LRH:ph.cden
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

13—16 June 1961

- | | | |
|------------|-----------|---|
| ** 6106C13 | SHSBC-13 | Seminar—Q & A Period |
| ** 6106C14 | SHSBC-14 | Seminar—Withholds |
| ** 6106C15 | SHSBC-15X | Not Know |
| ** 6106C16 | SHSBC-16X | Confront and Havingness—Routine 1, 2, & 3 |

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 17 JUNE 1961

Central Orgs
Franchise Holders

PRIMARY SCALE AMENDED

Four additions have been made by me on the Primary Pre-Hav Scale on evidence of their absence being responsible for slow case gains, and as they occur more often than would be encountered in Secondary Scales.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jl.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PRE-HAVINGNESS SCALE

PRIMARY SCALE (Amended)

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 66. TR 10 | 33a. MAKE NOTHING OF |
| 65. FAITH | 33. FAILED LEAVE |
| 64. CAUSE | 32. LEAVE |
| 63a. PREVENT KNOWING | 31. WAIT |
| 63. NO EFFECT | 30. SURVIVE |
| 62. EFFECT | 29. FAILED TO ARRIVE |
| 61. OBSESSIVE CAN'T HAVE | 28. ARRIVE |
| 60a. MAKE SOMETHING OF | 27. FAILED IMPORTANCE |
| 60. CREATE | 26. IMPORTANCE |
| 59. THINK | 25. PROPITIATE |
| 58. INVERTED INTEREST
(PECULIAR INTEREST) | 24. ATTENTION |
| 57. DISPERSE | 23. SEPARATE |
| 56. INVERTED COMMUNICATION
(INTEND TO NOT COMMUNICATE) | 22. FAILED WITHHOLD |
| 55. INVERTED CONTROL | 21. WITHHOLD |
| 54. INVERTED HELP (BETRAY) | 20. MIS-EMOTIONAL |
| 53. COLLECT | 19. DESTROY |
| 52. SUBSTITUTE | 18. MOTION |
| 51. WITHDRAW | 17. FAILED OVERT
(FAILED ATTACK) |
| 50. DUPLICATE | 16. OVERTS (ATTACK) |
| 49. ENTER | 15. DISLIKE |
| 48. INHIBIT | 14. LIKE |
| 47. DISAGREE | 13. COMPETE |
| 46. ENFORCE | 12. FAILED HELP |
| 45. AGREE | 11. HELP |
| 44. DESIRE | 10. FAILED CONTROL |
| 43. KNOW | 9. CONTROL |
| 42. FAILED TO ENDURE | 8. EMOTIONAL |
| 41. ENDURE | 7. FAILED COMMUNICATION |
| 40. NO MOTION | 6. COMMUNICATION |
| 39. FAILED TO ABANDON | 5. FAILED INTEREST |
| 38. ABANDON | 4. INTEREST |
| 37. FAILED WASTE | 3. CONNECT |
| 36. WASTE | 2. FAILED HAVINGNESS |
| 35. FAILED TO PROTECT | 1. HAVINGNESS |
| 34. PROTECT | |

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 19 JUNE 1961

Central Orgs
HGCs
Tech Staff

SEC CHECK WHOLE TRACK
(HCO WW Sec Form 4)

For processing use only. Use only about midway on Routine 3 and from then on.

(These questions have been contributed by Jan and Dick Halpern.)

L. RON HUBBARD

Whole Track Sec Check

HCO WW Sec Form 4.

- Have you ever enslaved a population?
- Have you ever implanted anyone?
- Have you ever sacked a city?
- Have you ever sunk, or otherwise destroyed, a non-combatant vessel?
- Have you ever abused hostages, or prisoners?
- Have you ever ordered, or yourself committed, genocide?
- Have you ever annihilated a population?
- Have you ever poisoned food or drinking supplies?
- Have you ever strangled anyone?
- Have you ever deliberately spread disease?
- Have you ever degraded a religion?
- Have you ever raped a child of either sex?
- Have you ever warped an educational system?
- Have you ever deprived people of hope?
- Have you ever committed murder?
- Have you ever destroyed a culture?
- Have you ever forced anyone into an undesired beingness?
- Have you ever stolen a body from another being?
- Have you ever destroyed an economy?
- Is anybody seeking to discover your whereabouts?
- Have you ever violated a nation's neutrality?
- Have you ever broken a treaty?
- Have you ever blanketed bodies for the sensation kick?
- Have you ever upset an ecology?
- Have you persecuted others for their religious or political beliefs?
- Have you ever interfered with the free flow of trade?

Have you ever been a crook?
Have you ever obliterated a language?
Have you ever stamped out a religion?
Have you ever deliberately trained people in untruths for power, or profit?
Have you ever defiled religious places, persons, or objects?
Have you ever practised terrorism?
Have you ever done anything you would not like to think of yourself as having done?
Have you ever been a coward?
Have you ever trapped a thetan?
Have you ever prided yourself on your wickedness?
Have you ever destroyed artistic productions, or creations?
Have you burned literature?
Have you ever forbidden people to practise their own customs?
Have you ever perverted a people's customs?
Have you ever done anything which you hoped would be wiped out by the passage of time?
Do you deserve to be punished into eternity for something you've done?
If so, what is it?
Have you ever exposed infants?
Have you ever bred bodies for degrading purposes?
Is there anything you would have done differently if you had had more data?
Have you ever forced beings into unwanted bodies?
Have you deliberately prevented beings from exteriorizing?
Have you done anything to a person, group, or thing that wasn't deserved?
Have you ever deserted a just cause?
Have you ever debased a nation's currency?
Have you ever deliberately tortured someone?
Have you ever enslaved another being?
Have you ever gained, or maintained, a position by portraying yourself as victimized?
Have you ever undermined a people's trust?
Have you driven anyone insane?
Have you ever been a professional prostitute?
Have you ever been a criminal?
Have you ever trained people for criminal purposes?
Have you ever been a pervert?
Have you ever recruited anyone for an unworthy purpose?
Have you ever traded in others' bodies for profit or power?
Have you ever stolen a mock-up or facsimile?
Have you ever usurped a location?

Have you ever made things scarce so that you might profit unfairly?
Have you ever made a practice of creating emergencies?
Have you ever practised human sacrifice?
Have you ever assumed a beingness which was not rightfully yours?
Have you ever killed the wrong person?
Have you ever punished an innocent person?
Is anybody looking for you?
Have you ever systematically degraded an individual, or population, or mock-up?
Have you ever unlawfully, or unethically, deserted a post?
Have you betrayed someone, or something, which deserved your help?
Have you ever set a poor example?
Have you ever perverted the institutions of a culture for your own personal power or profit?
Have you ever denied yourself?
Have you ever betrayed yourself?
Did you come to Earth for evil purposes?
Have you ever acted contrary to your own principles?
Have you ever failed a friend?
Have you ever sought to render others dependent on you?
Have you ever abused those under your protection?
Have you ever destroyed farmland, crops, or breeding stock?
Have you ever despoiled a planet of its natural resources?
Are you in hiding?
Have you ever made a planet, or nation, radioactive?
Have you ever wrecked a climate?
Have you ever systematically set up mysteries?
Have you ever made nothing of yourself?
Have you made a profession of destruction?
Have you ever enturbulated an orderly environment?
Have you ever been a traitor?
Have you ever deliberately lowered another's knowingness, or ability?
Have you ever maimed, and crippled, other people's bodies?
Have you ever pretended to a power you did not possess?
Have you ever stolen ships, draft, vessels, or vehicles belonging to a government?
Have you ever disappeared?
Have you ever killed your own body?
Have you ever pretended to a knowingness you did not possess?
Have you ever caused a planet to disappear?
Have you ever felt the ends justified the means?

Have you ever given cause a bad name?
Have you ever discredited the creations of others?
Have you ever been off post at a time when you were desperately needed?
Have you ever convinced another that he has mocked up an unconfrontability?
Have you ever deliberately mocked up an unconfrontability?
Have you ever made a practice of confusing people?
Have you perverted historical truths for any reason?
Have you ever deliberately sent someone to the wrong place, or the wrong person?
Have you ever been a professional spy, or intelligence agent?
Have you made a practice of worrying people?
Have you consistently practised sex in some unnatural fashion?
Have you demonstrated that control is impossible?
Have you ever wrecked a vehicle, or vessel?
Have you ever pretended to be dead?
What question should be on this check for others?
Have you ever convinced another of the injustice of his cause?
Have you ever philosophised when you should have acted instead?
Have you ever claimed it harmed you to do something?
Have you ever deliberately disfigured another's body?
Have you ever torn out someone's tongue?
Have you ever blinded anyone?
Have you ever destroyed another's hearing?
Have you ever knocked someone's teeth out?
Have you ever punished another by cutting off some part of his body?
Have you ever been a parasite?
Is there anything you have sworn off being?
Is there anything you have sworn off doing?
Is there anything you have sworn off having?
Have you ever given a degraded, or debased, example of divinity?
Have you ever perverted a communication system?
Have you ever been a professional critic?
Have you ever held others in pawn for profit?
Have you ever presumed on the natural goodness of another?
Have you ever caused another to mistrust you?
Have you ever made a burden of yourself? Have you ever gone crazy?
Have you ever sought to persuade another of your insanity?
Have you ever deliberately mutilated bodies?

Have you ever deliberately mutilated objects?
Have you heightened sexual sensation by inflicting pain?
Have you ever caused something to appear at an unexpected time?
Have you ever caused something to appear in an unexpected place?
Have you ever maltreated a pregnant woman, or pregnant animal?
Have you ever corrupted a child?
Have you ever sought to convince others of their guilt?
Have you ever started a war?
Have you ever caused your own side to lose?
Have you ever deliberately distorted others' ideas?
Have you ever manipulated beings as though they were MEST?
Have you ever deserted, or betrayed, a great leader?
Have you ever sought to convince beings that they were MEST?
Have you ever tried to persuade others there were thoughts they mustn't think?
Have you ever sought to put another's thinkingness out of his control?
Have you ever permitted a subordinate of yours to be punished for your mistakes?
Have you ever tried to shift blame on to a superior of yours?
Have you ever smothered a baby?
Have you ever inflicted physical pain on an insane person for any reason?
Have you ever taken pride in and cultivated a wrongness?
Have you ever worshipped wrongness in others?
Have you ever sought to make others unwilling to produce?
Have you ever wiped out a family?
Have you ever rewarded another, or a group, for a wrongness?
Have you ever had sexual relations with an animal, or bird?
Have you ever participated in a sexual relationship between a doll body and a human body?
Have you ever destroyed a doll body?
Have you ever lost a doll body entrusted to you?
Have you ever punished another, or group, for a rightness?
Have you ever permitted another to be punished for your misdeed?
Have you ever perpetuated an injustice?
Have you ever been brutal to animals?
Have you ever denied others a means of existence?
Have you ever deserted your own children?
Have you ever refused to support your parents, or grandparents?
Have you ever denied others a redressment of grievances?
Have you ever caused another to distrust himself?
Have you ever caused another to identify himself with a form in order to enslave him?

Have you ever given anyone the third degree?
Have you ever validated the insanity of another being or group?
Have you ever tried to give sanity a bad name?
Have you ever warped, or distorted, bodies for sexual purposes?
Have you ever wanted to disown a deed of yours?
Do you deserve to have any friends?
Have you ever castrated anyone?
Have you ever wrongfully claimed another's deed as your own?
Have you ever robbed a dead body?
Have you ever made love to a dead body?
Do you deserve to be free?
Do you deserve to be enslaved?
Is there any question on this check I had better not ask you again?
Have you ever considered another didn't deserve to be sane?
Have you ever considered another didn't deserve to be free?
Have you ever considered another didn't deserve to be well?
Have you ever considered another didn't deserve to be alive?
Have you ever made MEST guilty of harming you?
Have you ever made another guilty of doing you permanent harm?
Have you ever forced another to compete?
Have you ever pretended to be unable to repair a form?
Have you ever refused to put back into order a disorder you created?
Have you ever shot, or stabbed, someone in the back?
Have you ever been disloyal?
Have you ever been treacherous?
Have you ever engaged in piracy?
Have you ever made an outrageous, or preposterous, will?
Have you ever thrown the ownership of property into doubt?
Have you ever demonstrated that communication is impossible?
Have you ever withheld useful data?
Have you ever created chaos?
Have you ever consistently made a practice of furnishing useless data?
Have you ever tried to make the physical universe less real?
Have you ever caused another to mistrust his judgement?
Have you ever convinced another he was guilty of a crime, or misdeed, which he had not in fact committed?
Have you ever sought to convince another that there was something wrong with him?
Have you ever practised medicine unethically?
Have you ever practised law, or jurisprudence, unethically?

Have you ever sought to convince another that everything was the same as everything else, so it didn't matter what he did?

Have you ever spread despair?

Have you ever kept effective solutions from working?

Have you ever sought to convince another that there was no difference between right and wrong?

Have you ever been a pimp?

Have you ever given families a bad name?

Have you ever produced a criminal?

Have you ever assisted an evildoer?

Have you ever driven a population into criminality?

Have you ever used criminality as a means of control of a population?

Have you ever made sanity appear to be psychotic?

Have you ever been a psychiatrist?

Have you ever depopulated an area?

Have you ever deprived another of a livelihood?

Have you ever given God a bad name?

Have you ever been a corrupt priest?

Have you ever given spirits an evil reputation?

Have you ever been an evil spirit?

Have you ever sought to convince others that things were evil?

Have you ever taught others that nothing can be done?

Have you ever tried to convince others that knowing is bad? That perceiving is bad? That sensation is bad?

Have you ever deliberately caused a sane person to be committed to a mental institution?

Have you ever performed unnecessary surgery on someone's body?

Have you ever tried to convince others that things are bad? That there are bad beingnesses? That it is bad to do things?

Have you ever mocked another's ability?

Have you ever mocked another's knowingness?

Have you ever mocked another's creativeness?

Have you ever applied a hot iron to another person's body?

Have you ever tortured another with electrical, or electronic, devices?

Have you ever attacked others for causing effects that you secretly knew were beneficial, or helpful?

Have you ever deliberately caused others to feel less responsible?

Have you ever beaten a child to death?

Have you ever starved anyone to death?

Have you ever left anyone to die of thirst?

Have you ever misestimated an effort?

Have you ever misjudged another?
Have you ever failed to save someone from drowning?
Have you ever knowingly sponsored a swindle?
Have you ever failed another?
Have you ever wasted time when you ought not to have?
Have you ever retreated from an area where you should have stayed, or advanced?
Have you ever wasted men? Women? Children? Objects? An ability? Animals?
Thoughts? Spaces? Energy?
Have you ever made nothing of a worthy person? Of a group? Of a universe? Of a
spint?
Have you failed in any way to live up to your own ideas of how you should be?
Have you ever broken someone's body on a wheel?
Have you ever stretched another's body on a rack?
Have you ever put a criminal in a position of trust?
Have you ever sold people on the idea that people are basically wicked?
Have you ever boiled someone's living body in oil?
Have you ever eaten a human body?
Have you ever eaten the body of a member of your own species?
Have you ever disfigured a beautiful thing? Have you ever exterminated a species?
Have you ever let your past triumphs discourage you about your future?
Have you ever flayed anyone alive?
Have you ever been a professional executioner?
Have you ever done a bad thing to win approval?
Have you ever been a dishonest policeman?
Have you ever been a brutal gaoler?
Have you ever been a corrupt judge?
Have you ever been a bad soldier?
Have you ever done a bad thing to save yourself?
Have you ever done a bad thing to save another?
Have you ever been an ungrateful child?
Have you ever been a wicked mother?
Have you ever been a bad father?
Have you ever convinced another that his goals were no good?
Have you ever been an abortionist?
Have you ever run a brothel?
Have you ever had a body with a venereal disease? If so, did you spread it?
Have you ever produced a bastard?
Have you ever convinced another that he shouldn't confront someone, or something?

Have you ever failed to send, or deliver, a vital message?
Have you committed rape?
Have you employed poison gas against life forms?
Have you ever put up a discreditable creation?
Have you ever taught that it was bad for people to have things?
Have you ever deliberately infected life forms with disease?
Have you ever made a body disappear?
Have you ever consistently made a practice of attacking people who helped you?
Have you ever penetrated an ethic?
Have you ever consistently made a practice of attacking those who helped others?
Have you ever abused, or tortured, life forms?
Have you ever inflicted an unwarranted punishment?
Have you ever enforced breeding?
Have you ever desecrated burial places?
Have you ever attacked helpless persons?
Have you ever denied anyone a desired beingness?
Have you ever caused another being to create against his own wishes or interests?
Have you ever zapped anyone?
Have you deliberately set property afire?
Have you ever created an effect for which there was no apparent cause?
Have you ever interiorized a being into a machine?
Have you ever forced a body to survive against its owner's wishes?
Have you ever arrested the development of a culture?
Is there any place you'd better not return to?
Is there anything the people of Earth had better not find out about you?
Is there any time you'd better not return to?
Have you done anything that had better not happen again?
Have you ever given creativeness a bad name?
Have you given biological bodies a bad name?
Have you given doll bodies a bad name?
Have you given robots a bad name?
What should others be warned about concerning you?
What don't you trust yourself with?
Is there anything you can't forgive yourself for?
Is there anything others should not forgive you for?
Have you ever caused equipment entrusted to your care to vanish?
Have you ever acted as a double agent?
Have you ever misappropriated equipment entrusted to your care?

Have you ever interrogated another under torture?
Have you ever caused anyone to be burned alive?
Have you ever misappropriated funds entrusted to your care?
Have you ever violated the sanctity of a herald?
Have you ever violated a flag of truce, or a period of truce?
Have you ever caused someone to be flogged to death?
Have you ever been a religious fanatic?
Have you ever assassinated a prominent person?
Have you ever blown anything up?
Have you ever violated a sanctuary?
Have you ever poisoned an atmosphere?
Have you ever set a booby trap?
Have you ever violated the established rules of warfare?
Have you ever made yourself out to be weaker than you in fact were?
Have you ever made yourself out to be stronger than you in fact were?
Have you ever promised help without intending to give it?
Have you ever abandoned your sick, or dead, to the enemy?
Have you ever failed to rescue your leader?

LRH:imj.rd
Copyright ©1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

19—22 June 1961

** 6106C19	SHSBC-15	Q & A Period—Auditing Slowdowns
** 6106C20	SHSBC-16	Sec Check Questions—Mutual Rudiments
** 6106C21	SHSBC-17	Seminar at Saint Hill (Auditing Speed)
** 6106C22	SHSBC-18	Running CCHs

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 23 JUNE 1961

Central Orgs
Tech Depts

RUNNING CCHs

(from a telex sent by LRH to Johannesburg)

CCHs being run terribly wrong.

Correct version follows: Run a CCH only so long as it produces change in the pc's general aspect.

If no change in aspect for twenty minutes go on to next CCH.

If CCH producing change do not go on but flatten that CCH.

Then when for twenty minutes it produces no change go on to next CCH.

Run CCHs One Two Three Four, One Two Three Four, One etc.

Use only right hand on One.

Any pc on Routine One is given Joburg Sec Check Form 3 hour for hour with CCHs or have a second auditor giving Joburg on Routine One to pc on same day.

CCHs not run in Model Session, not run on E-Meter.

It is code break clause thirteen to run a CCH that is producing no change or to not flatten in same or subsequent session a CCH that is producing change.

Some pcs get no reaction at first on any CCH; therefore run each one the twenty minute period CCH One Two Three Four, One etc, and with Joburg being given same time you will eventually win.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jl.cden
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[HCO B 13 July 1961, *Change Processing and CCHs*, which had a "Franchise" distribution, was a combination of the above HCO B and HCO B 29 May 1961, *Clarification of "Change Processing"*, page 320, with the last paragraph deleted.]

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

23—26 June 1961

** 6106C23	SHSBC-19	Q & A Period—CCHs—Auditing
** 6106C26	SHSBC-20	Dealing With Attacks on Scientology

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 27 JUNE 1961

Franchise Holders
Central Orgs
Tech Depts

ROUTINE ONE

It has been noted that "hour of Joburg" for "hour of CCHs" has been taken to mean you run the CCHs for an hour and then the Joburg Sec Check for an hour. This is very wrong.

If another auditor is giving the Joburg, it should be given in the same day. An auditor less skilled on CCHs could thus be employed for half the auditing day giving Joburgs.

But the CCHs must be run as they are supposed to be run. Run One, Two, Three, Four, One, each one to a temporary flat point (20 minutes of no Auditor-observed change of comm lag or demeanour [not pc's statements about change or somatics]), and when one is biting, you flatten that CCH as per the 20 minute test.

If one auditor is doing CCHs *and* Joburg Sec Check, whenever he has pc temporarily flat on a CCH, he can give a page of Joburg. Probably one-third of the auditing time is best for a Sec Check, rather than one for one in time with CCHs if one auditor is doing both.

A pc can go three days on CCHs without a Sec Check. At a time when a CCH that was unflat but is now temporarily flat, a Sec Check consisting of a couple of pages or more can be given (in any event about five hours worth for fifteen hours of CCHs for one auditor).

If you have two auditors on a case, one giving CCHs, one Sec Checks, this means 2 1/2 hours in the morning on CCHs, 2 1/2 hours in the afternoon on Sec Checks or vice versa. Some pcs getting Sec Checks in the morning and some pcs getting them in the afternoon would keep all auditors busy.

I hope this helps you to handle Routine One.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :imj .rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES
27—29 June 1961

** 6106C27	SHSBC-21	CCHs—Circuits
** 6106C28	SHSBC-22	Raw Meat—Trouble Shooting Cases
** 6106C29	SHSBC-23	Wrong Target—Sec Check

CenOCon

STUDENT SECURITY CHECK

(HCO WW Sec Form 5)

This is a Processing or a Security Check. As a Processing Check it is given in Model Session.

The following Security Check is the only student security check (in addition to the standard Joburg and HCO WW Sec Form 6) to be used in Academies and courses.

HCO WW SEC FORM 5

SCIENTOLOGY STUDENTS' SECURITY CHECK

(For Academies, ACCs, etc.)

The first few questions below are for a student who has registered, but has not yet started on course, and who has never had a course in Scientology or Dianetics. The whole battery is given to a student actually on course, or who has had a previous course in Scientology, or Dianetics.

Has anyone given, or loaned, you money to help cover your tuition, or expenses, while on this course?

If so: Have you promised them something in return for this?

If so: What exactly have you committed yourself to?

If so: Do you intend to make good this obligation?

Are you coming on this course in order to get away from someone, or something?

Do you have any goal for being on this course which, if achieved, would result in harm to another person, his possessions, or his reputation?

Are you here in order to get into anything?

Have you promised anyone auditing which you do not intend to give?

Have you read, or had read to you, the course Rules and Regulations? If so: Are there any which you do not intend to comply with?

Are you here to find out whether Scientology works?

Are you here to prove that Scientology can't help you?

Are you here to prove that you cannot help others with Scientology?

Is there anything, discreditable to you, going on back home which is liable to be found out by reason of your being on this course?

Are you neglecting any responsibilities of yours in order to take this course?

Is there anything important that you are setting aside until after the end of this course?

Do you already know all there is to know about Scientology?

Are you here for any other reason than to become an expert auditor?

Are you coming on this course with the intention of killing off your body?

Are you coming on this course with the intention of spinning, or going insane?

Is any goal that you have for this course harmful to any dynamic?

Are you presently taking tranquilizers, drugs, or medication, of any sort?

Is there anyone you are in communication with that regularly makes a practice of discrediting Scientology, its personnel, or its organizations, to you?

Is anyone counting on you to keep something secret while you are on course?

Are you presently suffering from some bodily, or mental, condition that others have failed to alleviate?

Are you secretly worried about some condition of your body, or your mind?

Are you upset by my questions?

Is there anything about this course, or the Academy, or Scientology, that you are making allowances for?

Is there anything about your conduct as a Scientology student that others should be making allowances for?

Have you done any drinking on class days?

Have you told any other students that your instructor's data is wrong?

Have you had sex with another student?

Are you trying to get another student to have sex with you?

Have you had sex with a staff member?

Are you trying to get a staff member to have sex with you?

Have you borrowed any organization property and not returned it?

Have you invalidated, or criticized, any auditors to their preclears?

Do you intend to practice Scientology in the field differently from how you have been taught it here?

Have you coughed, or distracted others, during a lecture?

Have you done any self-auditing?

Have you done any unauthorized auditing?

Have you received any unauthorized auditing?

Have you criticized your auditor to others?

Have you been thinking unkind, or critical, thoughts about your preclear? L. Ron Hubbard? Your instructors? Your auditor? Other students? Staff members?

Have you criticized this course, or the organization, verbally, or in writing, to non-Scientologists?

Have you criticized your instructors, or the D of T, to others?

Have you said, or done, anything to make field Scientologists think badly of the central organization, or its staff?

Is there anything **here that you feel so uncomfortable about that you are** thinking of leaving?

Have you received any medical, dental, or other treatment while on course without permission?

Have you tried to teach Scientology to HGC preclears who are not Scientologists?

Have you been late to any scheduled course periods?

Have you cheated on any course exams?

Have you passed off any other student's work as your own?

Have you tried to persuade any potential preclear to wait and be audited by you after the course rather than by the HGC?

Have you violated the Auditor's Code while auditing your preclear?

Have you done anything really stupid with your preclear?

Have you violated the Code of a Scientologist in any way?

Have you been absent from any course period without your instructor's knowledge or consent?

Are you in disagreement with any of the stable data of Scientology?

Have you been getting less sleep than usual?

Have you been eating less than usual?

Is there anything you are withholding from your auditor because he's "only a student"?

Have you taken tranquilizers, or drugs, of any sort?

Have you deliberately disobeyed your instructor's orders, or directions?

Have you unintentionally failed to follow your instructor's orders, or directions?

Do you have any overdue Infraction Theses?

Have you been assigned any Infraction Theses which you do not intend to do?

Have you tried to break up anyone's marriage?

Have you secretly violated any course rule, or regulation?

Have you tried to enturbulate the course, or any person connected with it?

Have you taken any other student's property?

Do you have any other student's property in your possession?

Have you taken any staff member's, or HGC pc's, property?

Do you have any staff member's, or HGC pc's, property in your possession?

Have you taken any organization property?

Have you broken, or damaged, anything belonging to the organization, or its staff?

Have you any organization property in your possession?

Have you passed any restricted data of Scientology to unauthorized persons?

Have you tried in any way to give Scientology a bad name?

Have you tried to give any Scientologist a bad name?

Are you a difficult, or unco-operative, student?

Do you have a grudge against any other student, or any staff member?

Have you tried to get any other student removed from this course?

Have you tried to make any staff member lose his job?

Have you told lies about anyone while on this course?

Have you done anything outside of course hours which you shouldn't have?

Have you been doing less than your best to become an expert auditor?

Are you doing anything which will prevent your becoming an expert Scientologist?

Have you been spending time, which should have been spent in studying Scientology, doing something else?

Are you making any Scientologist guilty of anything?

Have you been doing anything you believe is not right to obtain money for this course?

Have you done anything while on this course that you would hate to have known back home?

Have you been misapplying anything you have been taught in such a way as to make it appear that what you've been taught doesn't work?

Have you been doing anything solely because it is "the instructor's idea"?

Have you been doing anything solely because it is "L. Ron Hubbard's idea"?

Have you been putting into practice any method, or datum, that you don't see the reason for?

Have you done anything that would discredit Ron or Mary Sue Hubbard, or your instructors, by reason of their having trained you?

Is there anything that L. Ron Hubbard, or your instructors, should mistrust you for that you haven't told them about?

Is there something you've been wondering about concerning Scientology, or Scientologists, which you haven't asked your instructor about?

Are you withholding asking any question because you're afraid it will sound stupid?

Have you been making a practice of getting other students to answer your questions rather than the instructor? If so, what questions? Why?

Have you been keeping other students from doing their work?

Have you been such a problem to your instructors that you've been robbing other students of their fair share of the instructors' time?

Have you been writing letters home, or elsewhere, criticizing this course? The instructors? Your fellow students?

Do you regularly make a practice of gossiping about the affairs of staff, students, or preclears?

Have you tried out any processes that you've dreamed up yourself on staff, students, or preclears?

Have you been testing any squirrel processes on anyone?

Is there any process you are certain would resolve your case, or your pc's case, which is not being used?

Is there anyone to whom you make a regular practice of discrediting Scientology, its organizations, or its personnel?

Are you in communication with someone who is a much better Scientologist than your instructor?

Are you in communication with someone who understands more about Scientology than L. Ron Hubbard?

Have you ever, while on course, felt that you would not achieve your goals by reason of poor auditing, or poor instructing? If so, who exactly have you made guilty of this?

Have you prevented anyone, including instructors, from achieving goals concerning you, or others, in Scientology?

Have you thought so badly of the central organization for any reason that you would under no circumstances accept a job here on completion of this course?

Are you in fairly regular communication with anyone who has a lot of ARC breaks with L. Ron Hubbard, or the central organizations? If so, what is the nature and frequency of this communication?

Are you in fairly regular communication with any group that is interested in seeing Scientology fail, or its organizations discredited?

Is anyone hostile to Scientology assisting you financially on this course?

Have you run any unauthorized processes on anyone?

Have you permitted anyone to run unauthorized processes on you?

Is anyone here counting on you to keep a secret for him?

Have you any feeling of “injured innocence” at having been asked these questions?

Have you been going to some other person rather than your D of T or instructors to get the “real data” on Scientology?

Have you been critical of the data or quality of tapes?

Have you been critical of the data in or quality of texts on Dianetics and Scientology?

Have you ever been critical of Scientology terminology?

Have you ever written critical messages to persons in Scientology about how they ran things?

Have you ever written and then destroyed critical messages addressed to L. Ron Hubbard?

How do you feel about these questions?

LRH:imj.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 6 JULY 1961

Franchise

ROUTINE 1A

Here is the first refinement of the Routines.

It sometimes happens that certain auditors cannot get results with CCHs and it also happens that certain pcs have heavy constant problems that prevent SOP Goals assessment, the problems being *hidden standards* by which all auditing progress is judged.

It also happens that Problems as a subject is the only reason why cases fail to advance (as in rudiments). Therefore problems are probably why some people clear easily and others don't.

Considerations about the stable datum and the confusion also lead toward the auditing of problems as such. For a problem consists of two opposed stable data and therefore two confusions.

The definition of a problem is "Two or more postulates in opposition to each other".

Probably all pcs should be run on Routine One. The Change Scale was aimed at handling alter-is in doing auditing commands. Auditing Problems, you will find, cures alter-is-ness in a case.

The full rundown on the basic Routine 1A was given to the Sthil Briefing Course Students on July 3, 1961, and the tape of this date should be studied for full data on Routine 1A. Routine 1A can however be used without serious consequences and with great benefit without all its data; at least it will get better results than poorly run CCHs and will get results anyway. Try it.

STEPS

Routine 1A only has two steps—

1. Problems
2. Security Check HCO WW Form 3 or HCO WW processing forms.

The original command was "Recall a problem". This is the fundamental command. A somewhat better command, since it increases ability and does more than merely as-is track, and since it moves pc off the 1st dynamic, follows:

"What problem could you confront?"

"What problem don't you have to confront?"

"What problem should another confront?"

"What problem wouldn't another confront?"

"What problem would be confronted by others?"

"What problem wouldn't others confront?"

Note: The third question may be “What problem could another confront?” also, whichever checks out on meter.

SEC CHECK

This is followed by a Security Check. The Security Check *must* be an HCO WW Form Sec Check and not a local version ever. A Sec Check is done with a full command of the new book *E-Meter Essentials* now being mailed from HCO WW. A Security Check is done (and so are goals) only by INSTANT READ and never by LATENT READ. If the needle falls or reacts within a tenth of a second after the question is asked pursue it, for this is an Instant Read. If it doesn't fall or react for a second or more and then reacts, do NOT pursue it or do anything about it. This is a LATENT Read. Only use the E-Meter if the pc says “No” or disclaims having done it.

If the pc owns up to a question, don't refer to the meter. Don't even look at the meter when asking a Sec question the first time. If the pc then says he hasn't done it, look at the needle and without looking at the pc ask again. Pc still says “No” or its equivalent and you get an instant read, pursue it with more questions. Never pass Sec Check question that is getting an Instant Read. It's hot. Always pass them if they only give a latent read. It's cold or it's something else. Only use the meter after a pc denies it. Increase sensitivity high, asking question again, before leaving any question which a pc disclaims.

RATIO BETWEEN PROBLEM AND SEC CHECK

Run Problems and Sec Checks one for one in terms of time. But never on the same morning or same afternoon or same evening. Never in the same session. Sec Check mornings, run Problems afternoons. Or vice versa. Or on alternate days. Don't wait for Problems to flatten before you Sec Check. Problems are a long run. Two different auditors can work on one pc, one at one time of the day, the other auditor at another time of day. The pc may ARC Break if a Problems session is cut off to Sec Check. So Sec Checks are one session, Problems are another session. And spread them apart into different auditing periods.

VALUE OF ROUTINE 1A

Routine 1A should be run on every pc at one time or another when going to or having arrived near clear. It is best run first as it speeds the auditing later, removing PIPs and alteris of commands.. It does not go as far south as the CCHs but almost.

Routine 1A is extremely valuable on any case. It will give you many wins.

I believe at this time, though I have no broad data on it yet, that Routine 1A will speed up cases that are hanging fire or taking a long time to clear. Therefore use it.

LRH :jl.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

** 6107C03	SHSBC-26X	Routine 1A—Problems
** 6107C04	SHSBC-27X	Routine 1A—Problems and Solutions
** 6107C05	SHSBC-25	Q & A Period—Procedure in Auditing
** 6107C06	SHSBC-26	Routine 1 A—Problems
** 6107C11	SHSBC-27	Routine 1A—Problems and Solutions
** 6107C12	SHSBC-28	Q & A Period
** 6107C14	SHSBC-29	Checking Ruds and Withholds
** 6107C18	SHSBC-30	Can't Have—Create—Fundamentals of all Problems

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 JULY 1961
Issue II

CenOCon

PROCESSING SECURITY CHECK
(HCO WW Sec Form 6)

This is a Processing or a Security Check. As a Processing Check it is given in Model Session.

The following Security Check is the only one permitted on Staff Auditors or Field Auditors, in addition to HCO WW Sec Forms 3, 4 and 5.

No Security Check form may be edited or modified.

(Credit goes to Jan and Dick Halpern for preparing HCO WW Sec Forms 4, 5 and 6.)

HCO WW SEC FORM 6

HGC AUDITOR'S SEC CHECK

This check is suitable for anyone who has done a fair amount of auditing, and, also, for students in professional level courses in the later part of the course.

Have you ever told a preclear what his attitude toward someone or something ought to be?

Have you ever permitted a preclear to take control of the session?

Have you ever alter-ised orders from L. Ron Hubbard concerning your preclear?

Are you hiding anything from the Director of Processing? (Or whatever the appropriate terminal is.)

Have you ever failed to get a preclear to carry out an auditing command?

Have you ever deteriorated a preclear's case?

When running a Model Session, have you ever omitted, or skimped, Rudiments?

Have you ever lost your temper with a preclear?

Have you ever startled a preclear when he was on a comm lag?

Have you ever audited a preclear late at night, or in the small hours of the morning?

Have you ever, overtly or covertly, got it across to your preclear that he was wrong?

Have you ever alter-ised your instructions from the Director of Processing? (Or whatever the appropriate terminal is.)

Have you ever permitted a preclear to blow session? To blow an intensive?

Have you failed to find out whether your preclear was getting adequate food and rest?

Have you permitted a preclear to have secrets from you?

Have you ever been late for a scheduled auditing session?

Have you ever failed to show up at all for a scheduled auditing session?

Have your sessions frequently run overtime?

Have you ever blamed the pc for running overtime?

Have you frequently ended sessions early?

Have you ever blamed your preclear for his case's not advancing?

Have you ever blamed the D of P, or L. Ron Hubbard for your preclear's case not advancing?

Have you ever ignored, forgotten, or failed to put into practice L. Ron Hubbard's orders regarding your preclear?

Have you ever ignored, forgotten, or failed to put into practice orders from the D of P regarding your preclear?

Have you some sort of hidden standard as to what a preclear should be like?

Do you think that everybody really has the same troubles as you?

Is there any sort of preclear that you are certain you cannot help?

Is there any sort of preclear that you would far rather not help?

Has auditing a preclear ever had a bad effect on you? If so, whom did you make guilty?

Have you ever used the wrong process on a preclear?

When you have made a technical flub, did you hurry on without calling it to the preclear's notice?

Have you ever justified it to the preclear?

Have you ever shown up, sloppily dressed and badly groomed, to audit a preclear?

Have you had a lot of trouble confronting your preclears?

Have you ever Q-and-A'd with a preclear?

Have you ever failed to flatten a process when it was still biting?

Have you ever jammed a preclear into a one-way flow and left him stuck in it?

Do you really know Model Session cold?

Have you read, understood, and put into use the material in the latest technical bulletins?

Have you ever, while auditing a preclear, sat there worrying about your own problems, making future plans, mocking up pleasure moments, or self auditing?

Have you ever kept on running a process that wasn't moving the Tone Arm, or changing the preclear in any way?

Have you ever audited badly?

Have you ever failed to help a preclear?

Have you failed to notice when your preclear's case has changed, and tried to audit the person he was yesterday?

Have you ever gone on a machine when auditing?

When auditing Tone 40, have you failed to place an intention in the preclear's head on each command and acknowledgement to the best of your ability?

Have you ever, deliberately or carelessly, gone out of communication with your preclear?

Have you ever used a preclear as a guinea pig for some process?

Have you ever used an exercise or drill from some field other than Scientology while auditing a preclear?

Have you ever audited anyone solely because you couldn't stand him the way he was?

Do you regard auditing as punishment?

Have you ever done anything to a preclear which you would be unwilling to have an auditor do to you?

Have you ever felt that you must solve the preclear's problems?

Have you ever resented it when a preclear criticized you for something which you hadn't, in fact, done?

Have you ever argued with a preclear?

Have you ever taken your preclear's advice while auditing him?

Have you ever asked a preclear to instruct you in auditing while you were auditing that person?

Have you ever failed to get good results with a case?

Do you feel that auditing is too good for psychotics, or cripples, or criminals?

Do you feel you must be kind to preclears?

Have you ever been distressed because of a preclear's physical or emotional pain under auditing?

Is there any sort of preclear you are afraid you may harm?

Is there any sort of preclear you are afraid may harm you?

Have you ever accepted for auditing a preclear you were fairly sure you couldn't or wouldn't help?

Have you ever made sexual advances or had intercourse with a preclear of either sex during an auditing session, or during the course of an intensive?

Have you ever recommended the use of liquor, or drugs, to a preclear "to relax him", or for any other reason?

Have you ever stolen from a preclear?

Have you ever audited preclears while a staff member for yourself and kept quiet?

Have you ever stolen another auditor's preclear?

Have you ever stolen a preclear from a Central Org?

Have you ever sought to persuade a preclear that you were a better auditor than his auditor?

Have you ever passed a Central Org preclear to an outside auditor?

Is there any question about the way you audit which you would hate to have the D of P, or L. Ron Hubbard, ask you?

Is there any question about your preclears which you would hate to be asked?

Is there any question the D of P, or L. Ron Hubbard, should have asked you, and hasn't?

Have you nothing further to learn about auditing?

Have you ever found it hard to become interested in a preclear's case?

Have you ever been utterly baffled by a case?

When a preclear's case is not going right, are you certain there must be something wrong with the stable data of Scientology?

Have you failed to learn, understand, and regularly employ the stable data of Scientology?

Do you hope you won't be found out?

Have you ever avoided receiving auditing yourself?

Have you ever mistrusted your E-Meter?

Is there anything mysterious to you about an E-Meter?

Is there any technical question you are afraid to ask the D of P for fear it would make you look incompetent, or stupid?

Do you think you are an incompetent, or stupid, auditor?

Do you think you audit perfectly at all times?

Have you ever believed a preclear knew more about his own case than you did?

Have you ever made the D of P guilty of anything?

Have you ever justified your actions to a preclear?

Have you ever let a preclear control you?

Have you ever falsified an Auditor's Report in any way?

Have you ever given the D of P, or L. Ron Hubbard, a false impression about your preclear's case?

Have you ever failed to get an instruction concerning your preclear clarified, if you did not understand it?

Do you think selling auditing is really a swindle?

Have you ever felt that some item in the Auditor's Code didn't really apply to your auditing?

Have you ever done anything weird, or strange, with a preclear?

Have you ever been a squirrel?

Do you feel there is anything wrong with invading a preclear's privacy?

Do you feel there is anything wrong with having your own privacy invaded?

Have you ever redramatized anything on a preclear?

Have you ever avoided running a standard process on a preclear because you didn't or wouldn't like having it run on you?

Have you ever refused to run something on a preclear because you didn't like it?

Are you avoiding using any standard process because you are not sure of your technique?

Have you ever done a bad assessment?

Have you permitted yourself to get rusty, or unfamiliar, with any standard Scientology process?

Have you forgotten any parts of the Auditor's Code?

Have you ever had a preclear you felt you *had* to help?

Have you ever had a preclear you didn't want to help?

Do you deserve to get good results with cases?

Is there any viewpoint that is absolutely intolerable to you?

Have you ever had a preclear that you couldn't stand to be, even for an instant?

Is there any case you've audited that you still feel badly about?

Have you ever felt that there was something about an auditing room that you were not responsible for?

Have you ever felt that there was something about a preclear's behavior under auditing that you were not responsible for?

Have you ever pretended you could use an E-Meter when you couldn't?

Do you believe that any preclear can influence the E-Meter in any mysterious way?

Do you believe that the preclear can control his reactive bank?

Do you believe that the preclear really knows about and understands his reactive bank?

Do you believe you can control a preclear's reactive bank?

Have you ever made a practice of so much two-way communication with the preclear that you were spending very little auditing time in getting a process run?

Have you ever run a process without feeling that it was your process?

Have you ever decided that the D of P, or L. Ron Hubbard, was the cause of some effect which you produced on a preclear?

Do you dislike auditing?

Have you ever felt that auditing another was harmful to you in any way?

Have you ever felt sorry for yourself while auditing a preclear?

Have you ever felt sorry for a preclear?

Have you ever confused social chit-chat with auditing?

Have you ever left an auditing session without ending it properly for the preclear?

Have you ever felt bound by the Auditor's Code in your relationships with everyone, in and out of session, 24 hours a day?

Have you ever permitted a preclear to throw you into session outside of regularly scheduled session time?

Have you ever made a practice of evaluating for, or invalidating, a preclear of yours between sessions?

Have you ever deliberately encouraged a preclear to believe that you were clear, or OT, when you had not in fact reached this state?

Have you ever tried to force a preclear to believe he or she was clear?

Have you ever represented yourself to a preclear as being in bad shape?

Have you ever discussed your own case with a preclear you were auditing?

Have you ever blackmailed a preclear by threatening to discontinue his auditing?

Have you ever tried to get special favors from a preclear, beyond the agreed-upon payment or remuneration?

Have you ever promised a preclear something which you were not certain you could fulfill to the letter?

Have you ever promised a preclear something you knew you could not fulfill?

Are you weak in any of the TRs? If so, which? If so, have you failed to make arrangements to be coached up on them?

Is there anything you can get away with that other auditors shouldn't do?

Have you ever gotten into a games condition with a preclear?

Have you ever deliberately or carelessly given a preclear a command which was impossible for him to execute at that time?

Have you ever used poor judgement in auditing a preclear?

Have you ever felt that you were a liability to the Hubbard Guidance Center (or appropriate terminal) as an auditor?

Is there anything about auditing which you alone in all the world know and understand?

Are you in disagreement with any current practice or theory of Scientology as L. Ron Hubbard has communicated it?

Have you ever taken orders from a preclear as to what you should run on his case?

Have you ever yanked the preclear's attention off his case by uncalled-for statements or actions?

Have you ever stopped running a process because the preclear said it was flat?

Have you ever stopped running a process because the preclear was tired of it?

Have you ever stopped a session just to talk to a preclear to amuse yourself?

Have you ever stopped running a process because you couldn't stand the preclear's somatics?

Have you ever just stopped auditing a preclear without ending a session or anything?

Have you ever walked off from a preclear who was halfway through something?

Have you ever felt you had to have a special auditor in order to hide data gotten from preclears about withholds?

Have you ever felt you would be discredited if you received auditing?

Have you ever advised preclears not be audited?

Have you ever taken a commission for secretly passing a preclear to some auditor?

Have you ever invalidated the caliber of auditing or training in a Central Organization?

Have you ever sought to convince a preclear he would injure his case if he or she went to an HGC?

Have you ever taken money for auditing you did not deliver?

Have you ever taken money from a preclear and handed him over to some student to audit for you?

Have you ever committed sharp practices in auditing?

Have you ever pestered L. Ron Hubbard with questions already to be found in bulletins?

Have you ever sought to prove auditing would not work?

Have you ever done anything to slow down L. Ron Hubbard's research?

Have you ever wasted auditing time?

What do you wish you hadn't done?

What about your auditing activities are you trying to forget?

Have you any idea it doesn't matter whether you get results or not?

Are Scientologists' or Ron's goals really false?

Are you upset by this Security Check?

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:imj.jh
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 10 JULY 1961

Central Orgs
City Offices
Tech Depts
Franchise

METERING RUDIMENTS

The following question from HASI London, and my answer are of general interest:

“From Academy and HGC London.

Ron from Rosalie = 6/7 = 375L

Re Rudiments: Data you gave me was that falls are all one was concerned with in clearing rudiments.

I have heard all reactions should be taken into consideration—i.e. Falls, Rock Slams, Theta Bops, Sticks.

Mary Sue issued Bulletin of May 9th 1961—saying Falls, Rock Slams, Theta Bops, change of characteristic should be considered. Would you please clarify.

Best

ROS, D of T.”

“Ron from Selwyn = 6/7 = 376L

Rosalie's query goes for me too. Best SELWYN, D of P.”

“Ros from Ron Info Selwyn Info MSH

375L2 Regarding the remark that only falls are taken into consideration while doing rudiments. This is misleading. The word 'FALL' is often used mistakenly or colloquially for 'CHANGE OF NEEDLE PATTERN' because the latter is so clumsy in phrasing. Any instant change of reaction in needle pattern is indicative of charge and so in any metering whether rudiments, assessment, sec checking, one explores and pursues all reactions of the needle which change the pattern of what the needle *was* just doing a moment before.

On rudiments 'CHANGE OF PATTERN', detectable when and only when the sensitivity knob is set for a third of a Dial Drop of the needle, one and one half inches, on the can squeeze test, is explored and cleared. The sensitivity knob is not advanced to see if the reaction is entirely handled when the needle reaction vanishes at one third of a Dial Drop sensitivity setting. Unless this sensitivity setting is also observed in addition to change of needle pattern the auditor will take forever to clean rudiments when it is not necessary. Rudiments exist to run enough to get the pc into session, not to audit the case by rudiments. It will be found that when any charge on PTPs, ARC Breaks, or Withholds or Room is dissipated by rudiments so that it does not produce a fall detectable with the sensitivity set for one third of a Dial Drop or any other change of pattern, the pc will be able to go into session.

As a further note when running Routine One A it is not necessary when doing the problems part of it as a main process to handle in rudiments present time problems.

When doing the Security Check part of Routine One A, PTPs can be handled to some extent. Also one does not try to get all Withholds off in running Routine One A beyond clearing them for a sensitivity knob setting of one third of a Dial Drop as these are being handled by the Security Check.

I hope this clarifies your question and related matters.

Best

RON.”

LRH:imj.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 10 AUGUST 1961

Franchise

INFORMATION ON CLEARS

The following digest of HCO Information Letters gives some interesting information about the Clears which have been made recently in South Africa:

HCO INFORMATION LETTER OF 14 JULY 1961

CLEARS IN SOUTH AFRICA

(From telexes received at Saint Hill from the HGA Course in Johannesburg)

RON FROM JEAN 218JB 13/7/61 2.40PM

RON WE HAVE GOTTEN TWO CLEARS. ONE JOAN JOHNS ONE PETER PAPADAKOS CLEARED ON ROUTINES ONE TWO THREE BOTH CASES BLOWN CLEAR ON GOALS ASSESSMENT NOTHING FURTHER MOVES TA THOROUGHLY CLEAR CHECKED ON COMPLETE GOALS AND TERMINAL LISTS AND PRE-HAV SCALE AND DYNAMICS CHRONIC EMOTIONAL LEVELS ON BOTH CASES ASSESSED AND PROCESSED OUT ON 5 WAY BRACKET.

BEST,
JEAN.

RON FROM PAUL 219 JB 13/7/61 4.20PM

RON AND ANOTHER JOE VAN STADEN. I TOLE YOU AN I TOLE YOU.....WHERE ARE THE BRACELETS?

BEST,
PAUL.

HCO INFORMATION LETTER OF 25 JULY 1961

HGC CLEAR

(From telexes received from Johannesburg)

RON FROM PETER 231JB 20/7/61 2.15PM

RON HAL ROLAND CHECKED OUT CLEAR FROM HGC CONFIRMED D OF P AREA SEC AND MYSELF. NO DOUBT WHATSOEVER. AUDITOR EDITH SPENDER RECENTLY OFF HPA DID MAGNIFICENTLY EXACT JOB. INTENSIVE OF 125 HOURS ROUTINES 2 AND 3 PREVIOUS AUDITING 30 HOURS.

PETER GREENE.

RON FROM HAL ROLAND 232JB 20/7/61 2.20PM

RON
THANKS.
HAL ROLAND.

LT=
SIEN TOLOGY JOHANNESBURG TELEX JX299 =
231JB2 CONGRATULATIONS ON ROLAND TO SPENDER AND HGC STAFF.
BEST=
RON+

HCO INFORMATION LETTER OF 4 AUGUST 1961

AN HGC CLEAR

This dispatch received from Peter Greene, Assoc Sec in Johannesburg, concerns the making of a clear in the HGC there:

I was thrilled to-day to send you the news about Hal Roland. He has been sitting close for a week ever since he flattened 12 levels of Pre-Hav on Routine 2.

We weren't able to use an HGA graduate for Routine 3, as Jean and Arnold wanted them to stay on Course for another week to stabilise the clears and give the others the best chance to make it too—which was very reasonable.

Several of the auditors in HGC, are now I believe, up to scratch. Leon Bosworth runs good control and Steve Roos, his deputy, no longer flounders since his last intensive. I had several auditors checked on Bulletins—by Jean Kennedy, and notably Rita Metz and Edith Spender were straight on their data, so since we had the chance to make a clear, we took it. A special listening post was set up in a room on HASI premises and Leon was able to keep tabs on the sessions. Hal passed a clear check yesterday in HGC, but when I further checked him in Wally's presence something further was found to still be bugging him.

Well that boy really meant to get clear. He went home that night and returned for his last session with 3 foolscap pages of terminals, on the Pre-Hav level that was still reacting. A 2-hours session to-day completely knocked it out. I have never seen such an unmistakable clear needle. Apart from that his manner, demeanour, etc, was almost enough in itself. I *have* done what you said. Concentrate on clearing and releasing and get the technical real. Release certificates are regularly being issued for HGC now—the last 3 HPA graduates checked out release, and Edith Spender has only been off the HPA a few weeks. Our technical still has bugs in it—but I believe will compare favourably with any HASI in the world.

Everyone was delighted with 3 clears from HGA Course but felt the only clears we had knowledge of were all off courses. It is a terrific boost to have an HGC Clear. Staff attitudes immediately changed with the realisation not merely that it *could* be done, but that it has been done. It seems easier to do it again.

HCO INFORMATION LETTER OF 9 AUGUST 1961

A POST-CLEAR AUDITING SESSION

The following report received from Arnold Gochin, instructor on the HGA Course in Johannesburg, will be of interest:

I have given Jean about 6 hours of auditing to flatten out a previously uncontacted engram (present life operation) which turned on a symptom which the doctor told her was an acute appendicitis. He ordered her to report for an appendectomy twelve days ago. The auditing cleared this completely. This letter to you is to give you some data on the E-Meter reading of people who are 75 hours past a clear check and thus near theta clear.

- (a) The havingness processes didn't work and asking her to confront the floor or something in the room repaired it after 2 commands.
- (b) Every confront command answered brings the tone arm down between 3 and 4 1/2 tones, and every "might not confront" brings it back to 4-5 on the meter, or up 3 or 4 tones.
- (c) Midway through flattening the incident the TA didn't go down lower than 2 1/2, on drops, and just before it flattened (1 hour or so) it went down switch on position when drops occurred.
- (d) Rises brought the TA to about 4 only just before the incident flattened. Before this it used to go up to 6.5 plus.
- (e) The needle doesn't float much but moves from one side to another, as though it is going somewhere.
- (f) One might say the tone arm floats with a fastish motion.
- (g) Can squeeze gives very big drop of course.
- (h) After the incident had been flattened as to all terminal and Pre-Hav levels, dynamics, etc, there was a large regular (inch and half) theta bop. After sufficient questioning I satisfied myself that Jean's answer that it was a *feeling of freedom* explained adequately this movement.
- (i) She keeps the needle still while rudiments are done. Sensitivity 0 of course.
- (j) In order to find out which of the terminals in the incident or the most objects is important, it is necessary to select between drops of 2 or 3 on the tone arm. It takes very sharp observation indeed—and the auditor must really be in PT.
- (k) End of session reads were the clear read.
- (l) It is totally obvious when the body is left and entered. This is manifested by 2" theta bops, which turn into a drop when the body is entered.

Two of our clears on course are beginning to show little signs of the excited tone arm, and your development of the new meter is eagerly awaited. It would seem that the meter must be set for a minimum of 1000 ohms and an equivalent of 10 on the tone arm.

LRH :jl. rd
 Copyright © 1961
 by L. Ron Hubbard
 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES
 19 July—4 August 1961

** 6107C19	SHSBC-31	Q & A Period: Auditor Effect on Meter
** 6107C20	SHSBC-32	Games Conditions
** 6108C03	SHSBC-33	Creation and Goals
** 6108C04	SHSBC-34	Methodology of Auditing—Not Doingness and Occlusion

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 23 AUGUST 1961

CenOCon

NEW CLEARING BREAKTHROUGH!

The failures of auditors to get assessments done rapidly, the failure of pcs to get their goals and terminals found, and other important factors of clearing are resolved and covered in full in my lectures of:

August 8—9—10—15—16—17—18—22—23: Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

No special courses on clearing should be started before the instructors have heard and understand these tapes. HGCs are, in particular, alerted to these tapes.

These lectures, each about II/2 hours long, summate findings on clearing gained this summer at Saint Hill and resolve the clearing problems being met in HGCs, and lay out clearing for future continental courses to avoid the errors of the Australian and D.C. courses, where long assessment reduced student results.

These tapes are available from Washington, D.C. (if you've paid for your tapes to date, we add commercially).

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jl.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES
8—23 August 1961

** 6108C08	SHSBC-35	Forgettingness
** 6108C09	SHSBC-36	Q & A—Goals Search
** 6108C10	SHSBC-37	Q & A—Goals Assessment, Behavior of Pc
** 6108C11	SHSBC-38	Basics of Auditing—Matter of Factness
** 6108C15	SHSBC-39	Q & A—Anatomy and Assessment of Goals
** 6108C16	SHSBC-40	Cyclic Aspect of Goals
** 6108C17	SHSBC-41	Rudiments—Valences
** 6108C18	SHSBC-42	Control of Attention
** 6108C22	SHSBC-43	PTPs—Unknownnesses
** 6108C23	SHSBC-44	Basics of Auditing

Franchise

VALENCES KEY TO CLEARING

If you aren't running in the direction of Valences, you aren't clearing.

That is the lesson proved by the recent DC course and by this summer's gathered knowledge.

All summer, indeed spring *and* summer, I have been working to speed up clearing.

And I have finally cut away a great deal of extraneous data.

It boils down to this:

Goals made by a person take the person away from areas he or she doesn't want to be in and therefore does not as-is. Goals are an escape. One must have them. But when one uses them to be where he or she can't stand to be, then goals are an escape.

The basic escape is into *another* being. Thus one acquires beingnesses to escape.

Therefore Routine 3, as it exists, is the fundamental road to clear.

When you are running anything else except Routine 3, you are not going toward release of valences. Unless you alter a valence, you can do little for a case.

All processes then should be addressed to finding valences.

The fastest road is to find a goal that is a lasting one and then find the valence that matches up with that goal and then run the valence out. This alone changes and improves the pc.

All other processes not addressed to separating valences are addressed to a valence and try to make the *valence* better. One cannot improve a valence. One must improve the *pc* not the valence.

Routine 3, used with good technical skill, is the road to clear. There are faster ways to get goals, faster ways to get valences.

But the fundamental is, get the goal, get the valence *off* For that valence is the way the pc used to prevent experience of an environment he never as-ised.

Not know, forget, unknown, used in security questions and in assessing are the key to the speed-up. But more of that later.

I want *lots* of clears, not an isolated few.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jml.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 24 AUGUST 1961

CenOCon

HGC ALLOWED PROCESSES

Until further notice the HGC allowed processes shall be:

Routine 1

Routine 1A

Routine 3.

Routine 1A is preferred on all pcs and should be begun as early as possible and flattened fully before a Routine 3 Assessment is attempted.

Routine 3 has failed only where rudiments are flagrantly out during assessment or in running.

Routine 1A inhibits out rudiments and ARC breaks. It flattens in from 25 to 100 hours. It speeds goals assessment to as little as 2 1/2 hours if 1A is flattened.

Routine 1A consists of any version of problems and all HCO WW Form Security Checks.

Not know, unknown version of Problems Processes and Security Checks are allowed.

It is policy that no preclear on staff or in the HGC be assessed for goals or run on goals or run further on goals until Routine 1A is flat in all versions.

This guarantees clearing if auditors are also technically expert and flatten all processes begun by them.

Saint Hill Tapes of recent date and other materials cover and will continue to cover this subject.

This is *policy*. It must be followed.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jl.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES
24—30 August 1961

** 6108C24	SHSBC-45	Rudiments
** 6108C29	SHSBC-46	Basics of Auditing
** 6108C30	SHSBC-47	Auditing Quality

Franchise

ADVANCES IN TECHNOLOGY

It became obvious earlier this year that clearing was now entirely dependent upon auditing *quality*.

Clearing is not dependent on state of case. We have cleared people since February who had very poor cases to begin—in fact some were almost famous for no gain before this year.

Clearing is not for only a certain case type. The people cleared had widely varied case types.

The common denominator of all clearing was good auditing, exactly according to the principles of auditing. The less the auditor departed from these, the more rapid was the clearing.

The following data was that data which was known and used by auditors who accomplished clearing:

- TRs 0—4
- Model Session
- E-Meter Essentials
- Rudiments
- CCHs
- Assessment
- Security Checking
- Routine 1
- Routine 1A
- Routine 2
- Routine 3
- Pre-Hav Scale

If an auditor knew these he or she could clear people.

It is lack of knowledge of these elements that prevents clearing.

Therefore since last spring my attention has gone to auditing quality and how to improve it. As an example, the most clears exist in the area where I spent the most time. My time in that area was mainly devoted to improving auditing skill. As of this moment, the best auditors in the world exist in South Africa, and the most clearing being done is in South Africa.

Next in rank is Australia, spear-headed by Peter Williams who was trained in South Africa

To do this for all continents, I started Saint Hill training rather than Saint Hill clearing. Organizations sending people to Saint Hill, or auditors coming to Saint Hill, can obtain this necessary grooming. And thus continental clear.

But I am not trying to force this, I am letting areas wake up to it on their own. Thus a sense of accomplishment is preserved.

Major advances have occurred, of course, in processing and processes since spring. Many of these are quite startling. Our advance in the theory of Scientology has been more rapid since January AD 11 than in any other time except perhaps 1950. The bugs are being taken out of processing to increase speed of advance, not to reach more cases.

These advances are summed up in Saint Hill tapes. I give three hour and a half lectures to the students each week and these contain the best current record of bettered technology. These tapes go to Central Organizations for use on HGCs and in Special Courses. Made at Saint Hill with a Neumann Microphone and now on an Ampex 601 Professional recorder, the tapes are flown to Washington DC and copied there, 1 for 1 speed on a battery of Ampex 600s on 1 mil Mylar tape. These copies are then flown to Central Organizations. This is working very smoothly now, thanks to the staff members concerned.

What is discovered by myself is known to Central Orgs within two weeks for use in HGCs and Courses. This is no substitute for hand grooming at Saint Hill but it is a major data record forwarded at high speed with high quality. This is data at the rate of 27,000 words a week! Or 108,000 words a month! A small river in itself since that is close to a Modern Science of Mental Health per month! The data is sorted and re-sorted in the lectures and, rather than new data, it is mainly an amplification and clarification that keeps the unknowns out.

In the past 15 days (tapes of the last half of August) some startling breakthroughs have occurred.

A brand-new speed-up for Security Checking; Why auditors won't let pcs into session; Why pcs don't gain; Why pcs ARC break; Why many old-time teams are achieving no gains; How to run a session with full gains; Why Routine 3 assessment was taking forever instead of ten hours; How to do a fully accurate assessment in ten hours.

All these and a great many more breakthroughs are on the Saint Hill tapes of the last half of August of this year.

Essential data also finds release in these HCO Bulletins in a briefer form.

But all this data depends on the essentials listed above.

Before a person can become a clearing auditor he or she must know, cold, cold, cold, the items on the first list in this bulletin. Without these known, data never gets applied to the pc.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jl. rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

31 August—6 September 1961

- | | | |
|------------|----------|------------------------|
| ** 6108C31 | SHSBC-48 | What is Auditing? |
| ** 6109C05 | SHSBC-49 | Principles of Auditing |
| ** 6109C06 | SHSBC-50 | Subjective Reality |

Franchise

NEW FACTS OF LIFE

Security Checks

Our Security Checking has become absorbed into processing and is an integral part of processing, producing very spectacular gains when well done.

There is a new "not know" way of giving a Security Check. These are some data about it:

On your Not Know Version of Security Checking or on any "Security Check" being used for processing, do *not* use "this lifetime" or limit the check to this lifetime in any way.

All the directions given on how to do a Security Check on the HCO WW Form 3 are for *Security* Security Checking, not for *processing* Security Check use. Omit these directions when you are using a Security Check for processing.

Do not use a repetitive command when Security Checking. Vary the question and *find out*. Use versions of "not know" "forget" "forgotten" "shouldn't be known about" etc.

Example: (Auditor has reached the rape question on the form. He or she does not read the question yet.)

Auditor: What shouldn't be known about rape?

PC: Answers.

Auditor: Good. What should be forgotten about rape?

PC: Answers.

Auditor: All right. (Reads question from form.)

PC: Answers.

Auditor: What are you looking at?

PC: This picture that came up about this rape.

Auditor: Is it still there?

PC: Yes.

Auditor (as picture seems stuck or sticky): What is unknown about that picture? (Goes on asking such questions, does not permit PC to wander off from *that* one picture *so long as Meter needle is reacting* on questions about unknowingness in that picture.)

PC: (Runs incident.) (Usual time required 10 minutes more or less. Time is not measured, however, as PC runs on it so long as *needle* reacts.)

Auditor (needle no longer reacting on picture): All right now. Is there anything else about rape you'd like to tell me?

PC: Answers.

Auditor: (Looking at meter now reads question from form and notes needle reactions.)

The point here is that one flattens all pictures contacted with "unknown" etc questions and flattens all needle action on the Security Check question.

Do not leave a Sec Check question until

1. All needle action is gone from the question itself with sensitivity at 16, and
2. All needle action is gone from every incident contacted and run.

Note: This is a new way and a very effective one to run engrams, the most important development on engrams since 1950.

Auditors who have not yet mastered the above or who have themselves never been “on the time track” or who have never seen a picture in which they were in valence, or who have “no reality on past lives” (have never seen an engram in 3D) should only use the standard Sec Check procedure of just reading the question and getting the needle action off the question itself.

ARC Break Prevention

An ARC Breaky PC has only these things wrong, provided an even vaguely correct auditing job is done:

1. Rudiments are out, particularly withholds.
2. Routine 1A (problems) is unflat.
3. An intolerance of unknowingness which makes PC edgy about what the auditor is doing.
4. An intolerance of motion.
5. A great scarcity of auditing.
6. Has given auditor an order on his case which auditor then obeyed.

An Observation of Terrible Truth

If you do just once what the PC tells you to do, the PC is put on auto auditing (self auditing), the basic *Original Thesis* laws of Auditing are violated, the PC's bank collapses and PC will then ARC break.

You may as well face it, auditors. If you let the PC be fully responsible for the session, there is no session and no progress and ARC breaks will ensue.

Almost all ARC breaks are preceded by the PC giving the auditor an auditing order or suggestion about rudiments, what to run, etc.

Example:

PC: You didn't ask about withholds in the rudiments.
Auditor: OK, are you withholding anything?
PC: (ARC breaks, chews out auditor.)

Example:

Auditor: I'm going to run you on women now.
PC: It should be men.
Auditor: Well, all right, Men, then.
PC: Yow, yow, yap! (ARC breaks now or later.)

Why?

PC has just lost an auditor, bank falls in on him.

How to get good and even with a PC: Follow any slightest instruction the PC makes about the session.

That'll fix the PC.

Look it over. It's a terrible truth.

This is the real meaning of Q and A.

LRH:jl.cden
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

** 6109C07 SHSBC-51 Reality in Auditing
** 6109C12 SHSBC-52 Clearing Breakthrough

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 12 SEPTEMBER 1961

All HGCs
All Academies

CURRICULUM FOR CLEARING COURSES

(Note: LA and Melbourne are to begin Special Clearing Courses at the end of this month. This gives data to be stressed.)

(This data may be used in HGCs.)

In the last DC and Melbourne courses, goals assessments were reported to be taking so long that very few goals were found in Melbourne and none in the DC course.

This condition also existed elsewhere and on my *very* careful research, in *all* cases where goals assessment exceeded 150 goals, the actual goal was to be found in the first 150 goals given by the pc. *Out rudiments* had buried it. As soon as rudiments were put in, the goal reappeared, the terminal was found and all went off routinely.

On *all* long, arduous runs on the goals terminal rudiments were out, a chronic PTP or heavy withhold had stopped clearing.

Plainly, auditors are in a games condition on goals and prevent the pc from having one or attaining one. This and unreality on track is the probable source of all long or bad auditing.

The general remedy for this is to flatten Routine IA on all auditors, flatten the games condition process where the auditor won't let the pc win and get every auditor to have a reality on own track.

Several cases have been found stalled on "treatment", the pc being wildly allergic to any and all "treatment" and thus taking forever to run.

All bad auditing is done by auditors who have no reality on the track, and the then-ness of pictures. These are seeking to escape and thus pull the pc into escaping, whereas clearing lies in confronting. Auditors whose pictures flick in and out and who never linger are "out of valence" on the track or are otherwise seeking to escape. The remedy is to make such, as pcs, run pictures with *unknown* when found, not escape from them. Several lectures cover this.

Q and A with the pc is entirely taking what the pc suggests or taking orders from the pc. One order taken from the pc by the auditor and bang, ARC breaks. This is the source of ARC breaks.

All this and more is covered in the Saint Hill lectures of the last half of August and early September.

The exact lectures are being listed and examinations prepared for them. This list and the examinations will be sent for these two courses.

It is suggested that the students get at least two of these lectures per day.

To make your students into auditors, skip the TRs in these advanced courses, relegating TRs to the Academy and Saint Hill. Instead, start the course cases as follows:

Find if the pc has ever been "in himself" or herself in a picture. Unbury and run that picture with *Unknown* with this command:

“What was unknown about that incident?” Keep the pc *in* the incident.

If the pc has never had a picture 3D in his own valence, run either or both of the following:

“What was unknown?” and another process,
“What unknown should you escape from?” “What unknown should you attack?”
“What unknown should another escape from?” “What unknown should another attack?”

These last two processes also handle problems, treatment and the other factors mentioned above and class as 1A processes.

Omit Routine 2 out of all instruction.

Rewrite your Pre-Hav Primary Scale to include all emotions from “serenity” to “hide”. Include on the scale in the place of “No Motion”, PROBLEMS. Include also UNKNOWN, FORGET, NOT KNOW. Add also DISLOCATE. Omit anything that is a brother to “No Motion”. Include DENY.

Get assessment going only when 1A is flat. 1A can be considered flat when Escape-Attack on Unknown produces no TA motion after this or other 1A processes have been run.

Get ordinary security checking going at once on HCO WW Sec Form 6. When students do this well, shift to the Not Know version of Security Checking on Form 3. Do the last two pages of Form 3 before the rest.

In all auditing done on course (or in HGCs) get daily cross-checks on rudiments. Let a student (or in HGCs another auditor) check (but not run) the rudiments on every pc and point out to the pc's auditor those that are OUT.

Let students sec check each other evenings, independent of days auditing, but make sure they know how it is done. Don't let them assess evenings. Do all assessment in class auditing time.

Stamp ruthlessly on Q and A (auditor doing whatever the pc says).

Arrange two 2 1/2 hour auditing periods a day.

Instructors check out any goal and any terminal found before letting it be run.

A course completion depends on a student:

1. Doing a good Not Know version of Security Checking.
2. Finding the goal and terminal of a pc.
3. Doing a proper Pre-Hav Assessment.
4. Having a Form 3 and a Form 6 Sec Check completed on self.
5. Passing a perfect exam on the book *E-Meter Essentials* plus Instant and Latent Read.
6. Getting a decent graph change on his pc or clearing.

Any student clearing his pc on either course will instantly be awarded a D.Scen. Clear status must be checked out by HCO.

Routine 1 A consists of flattening problems (or unknowns) on the TA and completing a Not Know Sec Check, HCO WW Form 3.

Routine 3 consists of finding the goals and terminals of the pcs and doing any available Sec Checks.

These two routines are the only routines to be used or taught on Special Courses at this time.

The processes to be used to clear rudiments are as follows (supposing the difficulty has been finally stated by pc):

ROOM: TR 10 or pc's havingness process, run only until question about room produces no needle reaction.

AUDITOR: What would you be willing to be? What would you rather not be? (Run TA motion out.)

PT PROBLEM: (When pc has stated it and who) What is unknown about that problem with ? (Run until needle no longer reacts on terminal, check any other PTP and run it as necessary.)

WITHHOLDS: To whom wasn't that known? To whom shouldn't that be known? (Run until needle no longer reacts.)

ARC BREAK: What didn't an auditor do? When? What weren't you able to tell an auditor? When?

Alter Model Session Script to include the above.

Limit two-way comm to asking what, where, when questions.

SUMMARY

Spend no course time trying to make auditors. Criticise blunders. But give *no* long lectures of any kind to the class. Just tell them what to do individually, exactly as above, and see that it gets done on an *individual* basis.

In instructing, confront each student, one at a time. Don't worry about general confronts of the class, not even a seminar period.

Tell the student to do so and so as above with his pc. Show him or her how to do it. Skip all extraordinary solutions. Just use the above. Get a maximum of solid auditing done.

Spread your teams as far apart as possible.

Dispense with check sheet examination except on Saint Hill tapes.

Make auditors by making them audit. If they goof, assume they have no reality on the track and get the student to confront his bank as above. Subjective reality alone can make an auditor. Routines IA and 3 alone can make clears.

All auditor goofs stem from unreality. Reality is found

a. By auditing and b. By familiarity with own bank and track.

If an auditor on your course has already received HPA/HCA and any further training and still has no hang of it, you won't educate them to victory. They just don't have reality on the mind yet. See that they get it subjectively. And so teach them to make clears.

LRH:jl.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

Franchise

NEW RUDIMENTS COMMANDS

Keeping rudiments in looms to great importance with the realization that endless goals assessments occur only when rudiments are out. If rudiments are *in*, the goal invariably occurs in the first 100 goals the pc gives.

If rudiments are out the goal, terminal or assessment level vanish when found or won't appear at all.

Therefore, even better rudiments processes are necessary. Over the past month or so I have worked out and tested these for your use.

These rudiments processes supersede all earlier rudiments processes. They do not alter basic Model Session. They do alter all rudiments *commands* used in Model Session as noted:

Rudiments on the:

ROOM: TR 10 or pc's havingness process. (Run only until question about room produces no needle reaction.)

AUDITOR: What would you be willing to be? What would you rather not be? (Run needle action out only.)

PT PROBLEM: (When pc has stated it and who) What is unknown about that problem with.....? (Run until needle no longer reacts on terminal, check any other PTP and run it as necessary.)

WITHHOLDS: To whom wasn't that known? To whom shouldn't that be known? (Run until needle no longer reacts.)

ARC BREAK: What didn't an auditor do? When? What weren't you able to tell an auditor? When? (Run needle action out only.)

Alter Model Session Script to include the above.

Limit two-way comm to asking what, where, when questions.

LRH:jl.cden
Copyright Q1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

- | | | |
|------------|----------|--|
| ** 6109C13 | SHSBC-53 | Sec Check and Withholds |
| ** 6109C14 | SHSBC-54 | Goals and Terminals Assessment |
| ** 6109C19 | SHSBC-55 | Q & A Period—Prehav, Sec Checks, ARC Break Process, Sec Check and Withholds |
| ** 6109C20 | SHSBC-56 | Seminar at SH. Q & A Period—What is Knowable to Pc (when an E-Meter will react), Attention, Motion, Still Pictures |

Franchise

SECURITY CHECK CHILDREN
HCO WW Security Form 8

The following is a processing check for use on children.

Be sure the child can understand the question. Rephrase it so he or she can understand it. The first question is the most potent.

Children's Security Check
Ages 6—12

- What has somebody told you not to tell?
- Have you ever decided you did not like some member of your family?
- Have you ever taken something belonging to somebody else and never given it back?
- Have you ever pretended to be sick (ill)?
- Have you ever made yourself sick (ill), or hurt yourself to make somebody sorry?
- Have you ever wanted something very much, but never told anybody about it?
- Have you ever gotten yourself dirty on purpose?
- Have you ever refused to eat just to worry someone?
- Have you ever remembered something about yourself and not told anybody, because you thought they wouldn't believe you, or be angry at you?
- Have you ever refused to obey an order from someone you should obey?
- Have you ever told another child something that wasn't true, just to frighten or upset him?
- Have you ever bullied a smaller child?
- Have you ever deliberately got another child, or a grown-up, into trouble?
- Have you ever pestered older children, or grown people, who were trying to work?
- Have you ever been mean, or cruel, to an animal, bird or fish?
- Have you ever forgotten to give food or water to a pet entrusted to your care?
- Have you ever broken something belonging to someone else?
- Have you ever deliberately spoiled clothing of yours because you didn't like it?
- Do you have a secret?
- Have you ever noticed something wrong with your body that you were afraid to tell anybody about?
- Have you ever done anything you were very much ashamed of?
- Is there anything about you your parents could not understand, even if you told them?
- Have you ever failed to finish your schoolwork on time?
- Have you ever flunked an examination at school?
- Have you ever deliberately given a teacher trouble?
- Have you ever tried to make others dislike some teacher?
- Have you ever tried to make another child unpopular?
- Have you ever broken, damaged, or taken, any school property?
- Have you ever lied to a teacher?
- Have you ever been late to school, or late to a class?

Have you ever stayed away from school, when you could have gone?
 Have you ever cheated by copying someone else's work, taking notes into an examination, or looking up answers in a book when you weren't supposed to?
 Have you ever spoiled things for somebody?
 Who have you made guilty?
 Have you ever done something you shouldn't when you were supposed to be in bed or asleep?
 Have you ever told others bad stories about someone?
 Have you ever tried to make others believe that your parents, or teachers, were cruel to you?
 Have you ever offered as an excuse for something you have done wrong that you are only a child, or that you haven't grown up yet?
 Have you ever felt that your parents and home were too good for you?
 Have you ever felt that your parents and home weren't good enough for you?
 Is there anything you should tell your parents, and never have?
 Have you ever done something to your body that you shouldn't have?
 Have you ever done anything to someone else's body that you shouldn't have?
 Have you ever told anyone that you did something, when you hadn't really done it?
 Have you ever told anyone that you hadn't done something which you really had done?
 Have you ever ganged up on another child and made fun of him because he was different from the rest of you?
 Have you ever made fun of another because of the way he looked?
 Have you ever decided never to talk to someone again?
 Have you ever made your parents or teachers work harder than they should?
 Have you ever decided that you were too bright, or too smart for the other kids?
 Have you ever annoyed an adult by something you did or said?
 Have you ever hurt a child?
 Have you ever made a child cry?
 Have you ever made a child sulk?
 Have you ever kept another child from having something that really belonged to him?
 Have you ever found anything and failed to return it to its owner?
 Have you ever told stories about someone behind their back?
 Have you ever lied to escape blame?
 Have you ever not told the whole truth about something so as to protect someone?
 Have you ever felt ashamed of your parents?
 Have you ever felt ashamed of your friends?
 Have you ever disappointed your parents?
 Have you ever run away when you should have stayed?
 Have you ever felt sure your parents wouldn't understand something that had happened in school, so you didn't tell them?
 Have you ever not told teachers something about your family because they wouldn't understand it?
 Have you ever failed to keep another child's secret?
 Have you ever felt it was just no use talking to someone?
 Have you ever hurt someone you didn't mean to?
 Have you ever been sloppy about your clothes or possessions?

Have you ever cried when you shouldn't have?
 Have you ever been a coward?
 Have you ever made too much fuss over a little hurt?
 Have you ever tried to make your parents believe you were doing better in school than you were?
 Have you ever told on anyone?
 Have you ever teased younger children?
 Have you ever made a mess and not helped to clean it up?
 Have you ever broken or damaged something and never told anybody it was you
 Have you ever let someone else get punished for something you did?
 Have you ever cried till you got your own way?
 Have you ever decided "Someday, when I'm grown up, I'll get even"? If so, with whom?
 Have you ever picked on someone smaller than yourself?
 Have you ever upset anyone by throwing a temper tantrum?
 Have you ever hurt anyone by telling them you didn't love them any more?
 Have you ever made out that you were more badly damaged than you were in order to make someone stop picking on you?
 Have you ever pretended to like someone that you didn't like in order to satisfy your parents?
 Have you ever done anything wrong according to your own religion?
 Have you ever not understood why someone was angry with you?
 Have you ever pretended not to understand what you had done wrong?
 Have you ever pretended not to understand what someone wanted you to do?
 Have you ever been in places where your parents didn't want you to go?
 Have you ever spied on anyone?
 Have you ever made friends with people your parents didn't approve of?
 Have you ever thought someone was crazy?
 Have you ever broken up a friendship?
 Have you ever let your team, or school, or club down?
 Have you ever tried to keep someone from making friends with another child?
 Have you ever pretended not to hear your parents or teacher?
 Have you ever made a fuss about doing something that your parents or teacher wanted you to do?
 Have you ever done something to someone that you'd hate to have done to you?

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jl.cden
 Copyright © 1961
 by L. Ron Hubbard
 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

** 6109C21	SHSBC-57	Smoothness of Auditing
** 6109C26	SHSBC-58	Teaching the Field—Sec Checks
** 6109C27	SHSBC-59	Q & A Period; States of Beingness

Franchise

HCO WW SECURITY FORMS

7A and 7B

(Employment Sec Checks)

(Reissued from HCO Policy Letters of September 13 and September 18, 1961)

These two Security Checks have been devised specifically for employment—i.e. to check applicants for employment, or personnel already employed. Each Sec Check should take no more than twenty minutes, and is completely effective if expertly done.

HCO WW SECURITY FORM 7A

(For Staff Applicants)

Person's Name _____ Date _____

The following Security Check is for Security use. All other Security Checks have passed into processing use and so can no longer be used for Security, taking too much time, and the auditor seeking to clear every question.

DIRECTIONS

Use a standard organization approved or manufactured E-Meter such as the British Mark IV.

Make certain, by can squeeze, that the instrument is plugged in and adjusted.

Use the meter strictly in accordance with the manual *E-Meter Essentials*.

Read only *instant reactions*. Do not use latent reactions of the needle. If the needle reacts within a 1/5th or 1/10th of a second after the question is asked, it is an *instant read*. This is valid. If it reacts 1/2 to 1 second after the question, this is invalid. Explore only *instant* reads on any check. Ignore all latent reads.

It should take only 10 to 20 minutes to give this check. If it takes longer you are doing something wrong.

All you do is put the applicant on the meter and read the questions to him with sensitivity set high (1 dial or more drop for can squeeze).

Keep the needle near centre of dial. Don't adjust it while asking a question. Don't ask a question if it is uncentred.

If you get no reaction go on to next question.

If you get a reaction, *compartment* the question, (reading it word by word and phrase by phrase) and see if any one word or any one phrase falls rather than the question as a whole. Clear each word or phrase that reads on the needle. Then read the whole question. If it is the whole question that reacts, it is a flunk.

Don't clear flunks. Just go on to next question.

The person being checked does not have to answer anything verbally.

The person giving the check does not have to find out or get off any withhold as this is not a processing check.

A needle reaction must be clearly established to be a reaction to the question before it can be a flunk.

The tone arm action is ignored.

Rising needle is ignored.

The Auditor's Code is ignored.

Processing is ignored.

You'll find that the main trouble with giving this check is that it is so easy to give that people try to complicate it.

ANY question still reacting after it has been cleared word for word or phrase by phrase FLUNKS the Applicant. That's it. One question that reacts and the person cannot be hired. It is not permitted to hire the person for anything or for any reason or for any purpose until the person is wholly cleared. You must not goof on this. Don't hire people who cannot pass this check.

If a person is guilty of any part of this check, the person *will* react on that exact question, providing the question is put to the person directly (not his shadow).

There are no nul questions to be given the applicant.

The following statement is read to the applicant:

“This is a Security Check I am giving you. These are E-Meter electrodes. This is a very modern instrument developed after ten years of research. It can and does detect guilt very easily. If you pass this check you will be trusted. If you fail to pass this check, you cannot be employed here without extensive processing with Scientology.

“You do not have to speak or answer if you do not want to. It makes no difference.

“Here is the first question. “

1. If anyone found out about something you've done in this lifetime, could you be blackmailed about it?
2. Are you a pervert?
3. Have you ever stolen from an employer?
4. Have you ever falsified records to obtain money by fraud?
5. Have you ever tried to get a fellow worker in trouble by telling lies about him or her?
6. Do you hate all employers?
7. Are you or have you ever been a Communist?
8. If you were employed here would you try to damage this organization?
9. On your last job did you consistently complain about being overworked and underpaid?
10. Have you ever worked in an organization just to spy on it for others?
11. Have you even taken money for passing on confidential information?
12. Have you ever consciously driven customers away from your employer?
13. Do you privately think we are a fraud or a racket?
14. Have you ever secretly bought anything yourself and sold it to your employer at a profit?
15. Have you ever taken a bribe or a secret commission to give someone an employer's business?
16. Is there something about your past jobs you are hoping desperately we don't find out?

17. Do you hate work of any kind?
18. Do you have a criminal record?
19. Are you wanted anywhere by the police?
20. Do you intend to quit soon after starting work here?

The interrogator can smooth out any ARC breaks caused.

If the needle gave consistent or unmistakable instant response on any of the above, the applicant may not be employed at this time.

The applicant, feeling falsely accused, should be informed he has the right to be security checked by another person with the same form.

Passed _____ Security Checker _____
 Failed _____ Date _____

L. RON HUBBARD

HCO WW SECURITY FORM 7B
(For persons now employed)

Give this check in exactly the same way as HCO WW Security Form 7A.

Failure to pass one or more questions on this check results in suspension until processing has been given.

The security checker does not attempt to clear or process any of the following questions if they produce *instant* needle reaction. Clearing questions is an auditor's job and is done in an auditing session, not while receiving this check.

If a question produces instant needle response, clear it word by word and phrase by phrase until all words and phrases are as nul as they can be made. Then test for reaction to the whole question. If it reacts then it is a flunk.

The whole test is always completed.

It should take 10 to 20 minutes at the most.

Read the following to the staff member.

“There is nothing personal about this check. It is for your protection as well as others. If you pass it you have no worries. If you flunk it you will be suspended immediately until processed on your own arrangements. If you feel you have been falsely flunked, if you are flunked, you can demand that another skilled person give you the same check over again. But you may only be checked by two people.

“Here is the check. You do not have to answer anything if you don't care to.”

1. Have you ever committed any criminal act for which you could be blackmailed now?
2. Do you or your close family currently have any connection with organizations violently opposed to L. Ron Hubbard?
3. Have you ever personally accepted a commission, percentage, bribe or “gift” for giving any firm or person this organization's business?
4. Have you ever stolen anything here?

5. Have you ever falsified an expense account here? 6. Have you ever falsely accounted for petty cash?
7. Have you ever maliciously gossiped about your fellow staff members or your superiors?
8. Are you here purposely to upset or damage Scientology or Scientology Organizations?
9. Have you ever cautioned anyone about following L. Ron Hubbard's directions or data or told them not to?
10. Have you ever maliciously criticized Scientology, its organizations, data or people to persons outside this organization?
11. Have you ever used people you met here to secretly further your personal gain outside of the organization?
12. Do you feel Scientology is a fraud or racket?
13. Do you complain about how overworked and underpaid you are?
14. Do you ever privately laugh at the antics of your superiors?
15. Have you ever slowed things down just because your superiors wanted them speeded up?
16. Do you think it really doesn't matter whether you do a good job or not?
17. Do you intend to quit just as soon as you've achieved your own ends?
18. Do you illegally have anything in your personal possession that really belongs to us?
19. Do you get satisfaction out of not doing your job?
20. Have you consistently covered up the blunders and mistakes of other staff members so they won't be found out?

Passed _____ Security Checker _____

Failed _____ Date _____

Findings and Decision: _____

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jl.rd
 Copyright © 1961
 by L. Ron Hubbard
 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURE
 28 September 1961

** 6109C28 SHSBC-60 Grades of Auditors

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 29 SEPTEMBER 1961

All HCO Secs
All Assn Secs

HGC ALLOWED PROCESSES

(Cancels all previous HCO Bulletins and Policy Letters on
HGC Allowed Processes)

HGCs must begin clearing.

All Academies must get auditors trained up so their skill is adequate to clear.

In an HGC, all auditing is done by staff auditors of course. But if individual staff auditors cannot handle the skills of clearing, no clearing will get done.

Therefore a program of increasing skills of staff auditors must be undertaken, not just in training but in gradient skills they are permitted to use on pcs. A staff auditor must only use skills he can command and with which he can win.

Saint Hill Special Briefing Course Tape of September 26, 1961 is a part of this Policy Letter. It enjoins that auditors increase and use their skills as follows:

CLASS ONE: Relatively unskilled. HCA/HPA graduate, field auditor called in part or full time or current staff auditor or HGC or Academy personnel or executive. This auditor is asked what process he has had success with on pcs. What process he has confidence in. Whatever it is, as long as it's Scientology, a Class One Auditor is not permitted to use any other process on HGC pcs, regardless of their "case requirements". This is mandatory.

CLASS TWO: Any auditor auditing on staff who has finally passed a *perfect* score on HCO quizzes on

1. E-Meter Essentials
2. Model Session
3. Security Checking HCO Bulletins
4. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course Tape of September 26, 1961.

(These quizzes must embrace the most minute details of these items.)

This auditor is thereafter permitted only to use Security Checks on HGC pcs, either standard checks or checks combined with specially devised checks.

CLASS THREE: Any staff auditor who has graduated up through Class Two skills and who is having excellent results with Class Two skills and who thereafter has been specially trained directly by a person who has attended and passed the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course and who has also passed a *perfect* examination by HCO on

1. All HCO Bulletins relating to Routine 3.
2. All Saint Hill Tapes on Routine 3.
3. Who has a good grasp of the technical side of auditing and can run a smooth session.

This Class Three Auditor may use Routine 3 on HGC pcs but may only utilize goals and terminals and levels that have been checked out and verified by a person graduated from the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. He may not run engrams on HGC pcs.

4. Who can find rudiments when out and get them in.

CLASS FOUR: Any Class Three Auditor who has achieved excellent results with Routine 3 and who has had his or her goal and terminal found and is a release and who has had engrams run on his or her own goals terminal chain and who has excellent subjective reality on engrams. This auditor may run Routine 3 and engrams on HGC pcs.

In an HGC as of receipt of this HCO Policy Letter there are no other classes of auditors and no special permissions may be granted contrary to this policy letter.

All HCO Area Secretaries are enjoined to make this program stick, get this HCO Policy Letter immediately hat checked on all Central Org technical staff and all executives including the Association Secretary. A copy of this HCO Policy Letter, carrying a list of all those who have passed a check on it and all who can't or won't, should be airmailed back to me.

This is the first positive and effective step toward getting broad clearing done in HGCs. This is a very important step. It will be with us a long while. For even when we are routinely clearing, every new staff auditor will go up this ladder.

Rapidity in getting this into effect will bring the HGC that much closer to clearing.

It is not permitted that HGC pcs are security checked or run on Routine 3 or engrams until the auditor doing so has been awarded the class that permits him to do so.

If HCO Area Secs or Assn Secs find anything else more important than getting this done, pause a bit and ask why.

For only broad general clearing in HGCs and training in Academies toward clearing skills will resolve any and all of a Central Org's problems.

(Note: Pcs who are being run contrary to this Policy Letter on its receipt and who would be upset by a sudden change may be continued on whatever the auditor was running on receipt.)

LRH :jl.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

[This HCO PL is added to by HCO PL 29 November 1961, *Class of Auditors*, page 439.]

** 6110C03 SHSBC-61 The Prior Confusion
** 6110C04 SHSBC-62 Moral Codes: What is a Withhold?

Franchise

CLEAN HANDS MAKE A HAPPY LIFE

For the first time in the soggy stream that's history to the human race, it's possible that happiness exists.

This goal, repeated many times and sought so heavily, has been ungraspable as sun motes, unattainable as a loved one's sigh.

What makes Mankind, basically good beings all, such strangers far to happiness?

The rich man geysers out his wealth. The poor man peers in every crack. But wealth buys nought and crevices are bare. The child hopes he will realize it when grown and, grown, wishes he were happy as a child.

We grasp it but like gossamer, it's nought. We marry a most perfect girl or man and then throughout our lives weep to make the other make us glad.

Often sought, but seldom found, there are no riches, gems or palaces as valued as mere happiness.

But listen! Here is happiness, just at our finger tips, awaiting only magic words "Start Session" to begin its quest.

But like we walk through rain toward a banquet ball, our happiness in processing is gained by passing through the phantom shadows of our "sins".

What has made all Man a pauper in his happiness?

Transgressions against the mores of his race, his group, his family!

We care but little what these mores were or are. It was transgression did the trick.

We agree to fixed moralities and then, unthinking, we transgress, or with "good cause" offend, and there we are, the first dull bars of misery draw stealthily behind us.

And as we wander on, transgressing more, agreeing to new mores and then transgressing those, we come into that sunless place, the prison of our tears and sighs and might-have-beens, unhappiness.

Mutual action is the key to all our overt acts. Agreement to what ought to be and then a shattering of the truth works all the spell that's needed for a recipe of misery.

There must be pain. So we agreed. For pain restrains and warns, shuts off, forbids. But goodness now must then consist of bringing in no pain.

Mutual motion is agreed. And then we disagree and part and so are tied no more—tied not save back there in our minds, with scars of broken faith. The faith we broke, and said it had to be.

We all agree to feel the sun and then protest it burns. We all agree to kiss and love and then are startled that such pain can follow in that wake.

Mutual motion is all right—until we act in cruelty to the rest.

Tied by agreements and co-actions, we dare be cruel to that to which the hard steel clasps of promises have bound us.

And so in being cruel to part of self—extended self as in a couple or a group—we then find pain in self with great surprise.

The overt act sequence is simple now to grasp. The scope is limited. But it began when we first had a cruel impulse to others bound to us by mores or co-acts.

Why does one suffer pain in his own arm when he or she has struck another's limb?

Because the cruel impulse has been a break of bond with others where pledge once lived.

The only overt act that can bring pain to self is that cruel act which then transgresses things to which we had agreed.

Share action with a group or person in your life, agree to mutually survive by some specific code and then be cruel to them and so transgress and you'll have pain.

All Mankind lives and each man strives by codes of conduct mutually agreed. Perhaps these codes are good, perhaps they're bad, it's only evident they're codes; Mores bind the race.

Co-action then occurs. Thought and motion in accord. A oneness then of purpose and survival so results.

But now against that code there is transgression. And so because the code was held, whatever code it was, and Man sought comfort in Man's company, he held back his deed and so entered then the bourne in which no being laughs or has a freedom in his heart.

So down the curtains come across the brightness of the day and dull-faced clouds enmist all pleasant circumstance. For one has evilly transgressed and may not speak of it for fear *all* happiness will die.

And so we shut ourselves from off the light and enter grey-faced gloom. And seal within our deepest vault the reasons why we dare not face our friends.

And afterwards we go on making others guilty with the rest, when like some scrawny scarecrow of a priest whose tattered filthy robes are rough with sacrificial blood, we point the way to hell for those who kill.

And deep within us secret gnawings ache. And then at last we cannot even cry.

The road to hell—Man's very good at painting ugly signs that point its course and way.

The road to heaven—Man's often sent but never yet arrived—more like he found the “other place”.

But now a road that's wide has opened up—in Scientology.

The meter and the process check, when done by auditors with skill, can open up transgression's rush and loose a cascade out until hell's spent.

And day will once more have a drop of dew upon the morning rose.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :jl.vmm.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 6 OCTOBER 1961

Central Orgs
HCOs City Offices

TRAINING OF STAFF AUDITORS

The following despatches to the Assn Sec London and HCO Area London, are of general interest:

HCO LONDON
HCO STHIL EGSTD

JOHN FROM RON INFO HCO
OCT 3 2242

In order to care for your special condition wherein the newcomers cannot run old processes then temporarily modify the Pol Ltr as follows:

Class such auditors as "Class Two Under Training". Let them go right ahead and continue with security checking only. HCO should get very ambitious about making these auditors pass all the necessary Bulletin tape exams on Class Two, and then confirm their status when they have passed.

Make available a tape recorder with headphones and let auditors standing in for exams listen to tapes and have HCO give them exams on these tapes.

On the two auditors that have very little reality on auditing, this would stem of course from their never having gotten any benefit from auditing or having any subjective reality on it. Therefore they would be rather dangerous to let near a PC. Suggest you turn them loose on each other with Sec Checking and make them complete a thorough Form Three and other checks on each other.

You are going to get your wildest changes on cases at this time by doing excellent Sec Checking.

There is a current rundown down here which is part of Class Two, which is Sec Checking against a chronic somatic. The tape of Oct 3 goes into it very thoroughly. It gets rid of hidden standards and chronic somatics and has gotten to, under and into every pokey case we have around there. This is assessing for the prior confusion to the condition, and then Sec Checking the PC on personnel found in that assessed area. It is easy to do and hell to teach but when an auditor gets a reality on it—Wow here we go.

I would be very happy to see a lot of wins coming out of Sec Checking only. This requires model session meter rudiments and TRs, and knowing never to leave a question as long as there are withholds on it. (Surest way in the world to blow a PC out of the HGC is to leave a question with charge still on it.)

I'm real keen to see you hit the easy trail now that it's taped so well. I have every confidence that if you work like mad in the HGC to make every auditor a top grade Security Checker and run nothing but Security Checks (Standard Form and those you specially prepare for a particular PC) you will be getting quite startling case gains. This data includes assessing for the prior confusion and doing special Sec Checks on it as per tape here Oct 3.

With just this you would be curing people left and right.

When you got that jolly well anchored in the hurricane and all staked down we can then start educating auditors for Routine Three complete. But that's away—a few months perhaps—up the line.

I feel that if we just settle down on this one programme and saw wood we'll get a lot of wins and a lot of happy PCs and the bugs out of procurement and case gains. Then we can move on.

How about it??

Best,

RON

JOAN FROM RON 3R2

I am counting on you to exam staff routinely on the various HCOBs and tapes relating to:

Model Session
E-Meter Essentials
New Rudiments
How to Security Check

I think we would err in spreading our attention too far on what we expect them to get down pat. If the TRs are obviously way out, blame the Academy and return the auditor to there on a weekend basis.

Don't classify any auditor as Class Two until he or she never stutters an instant on any Exam question on the above items.

The tape of Oct 3 was tailored up to be of assistance in explaining the data about prior confusion that gets rid of somatics. This is part of Class Two.

Security Checking includes the ability to locate the area of prior confusion. As this clears up most of the things a PC is worried about you are in for a lot of wins.

The people you get in the HGC have Psychosomatics, lots of PTPs of long duration and hidden standards. It is now very easy to relieve these things at the level of Class Two by Sec Checking areas before the PC noticed the somatic.

I think auditors can easily learn these things and I know you will get very appreciative PCs as a result.

I want you to bear down hard on Examination. The way you examine is very brief. You bring in the auditor or having studied the auditor comes in. You have a complete Check Sheet for the auditors, all he or she is supposed to know about this, Bulletin by Bulletin, Tape by Tape. You have a prepared Exam. It is very intensive and minute. You keep asking questions from it until the student misses. The first time the student misses is a flunk and that is the end of the Exam. This saves you lots of time and it brings the student up to reading the Bulletin or hearing the tape time after time, and they get really familiar with the Exam data. A seventy percent pass is no good. We only want one hundred percent passes.

Well that's it.

Best,

RON

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jl.bh
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 9 OCTOBER 1961

Franchise
Central Orgs
Tech Depts

RUDIMENTS, CHANGE IN

In *End Rudiments* only of Model Session, delete “Are you withholding anything?”

Substitute before ARC breaks in End Rudiments the following:

“Have you told me any half truths or untruths in this session or have you said anything just to make an impression on me?”

This is to be used in End Rudiments only in all types of sessions.

Be sure you give End Rudiments in general enough time to do. You should start ending any session one half hour before end of session time. That is to say, end the process of the session and begin on End Rudiments one half hour before end of session time.

Fill in any extra time left over by running the havingness process of the PC or TR 10 as the last stage of End Rudiments.

This new End Rudiments step does not alter Beginning Rudiments. “Are you withholding anything?” remains in Beginning Rudiments.

This new end step has been developed to overcome the bad effects on the PC caused by his lying to the Auditor, trying to get others in trouble by giving false withholds, and trying to make an impression on the Auditor by half truths, etc.

It will be found that a certain proportion of “withholds” are in fact lies. If the Auditor accepts these, the PC's case is damaged and session is hard to maintain on a PC who is consistently allowed to get away with this. This end rudiment step helps restrain the impulse and cleans off the ill effects of lying to the Auditor or making bids for sympathy with half truths.

Clean all instant needle reactions which occur by reason of this question. Do not leave it until it is free from instant reaction.

LRH:md.cden
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES
10—17 October 1961

** 6110C10	SHSBC-64	Problems Intensive
** 6110C11	SHSBC-65	Problems Intensive Assessment
** 6110C12	SHSBC-66	Problems
** 6110C17	SHSBC-67	Problems Intensive Procedures

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 10 OCTOBER 1961

Sthil

PROBLEMS INTENSIVE FOR STAFF CLEARING

Who Does Assessment

The auditor assigned to audit the preclear does the assessment.

When is Assessment Done

This assessment is done at the beginning of the first intensive the preclear has. The last questions may be added to and done again at a later time.

Is this part of the Preclear's auditing time

Yes, it is. The questions asked are to a degree auditing because the auditor is asking the preclear to look and to recall.

Purpose of Preclear Assessment Sheet

The purpose of this form is to establish auditor control over the preclear, to better acquaint the auditor with his preclear, to provide essential information required and to locate hidden standards and PTPs of long duration.

To Whom is the Preclear Assessment Sheet Routed

This Sheet is routed to the Technical Sec as soon as possible, at the first session break if the auditor can do so. It must be routed at least by the end of the auditing day. After the Technical Sec reviews the Sheet, it is returned to the auditor for keeping in his folder on the preclear.

Neatness of Preclear Assessment Sheet

If you cannot write plainly and neatly, print all the data required. Information is wanted, not mysterious cryptographics.

PRECLEAR ASSESSMENT SHEET

Name of Pc _____ Age of Pc _____ TA Position at Start of
Assessment _____

Auditor _____ Tech Sec's Initials _____

A. Family:

1. Is mother living? _____ E-Meter reaction _____

2. Date of death _____ E-Meter reaction _____

3. Pc's statement of relationship with mother _____

_____ E-Meter reaction _____

4. Is father living? _____ E-Meter reaction _____

5. Date of death _____ E-Meter reaction _____

6. Pc's statement of relationship with father _____

_____ E-Meter reaction _____

7. List brothers, sisters, and other relatives of the Pc, date of death of any and E-Meter reaction.

<i>Relation</i>	<i>Date of Death</i>	<i>E-Meter reaction</i>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

B. Marital Status.

1. Married _____ Single _____ No. of times divorced _____

2. Pc's statement of relationship with spouse _____

_____ E-Meter reaction _____

3. List any marital difficulties Pc presently has _____

_____ E-Meter reaction _____

4. If divorced, list reasons for divorce and Pc's emotional feeling about divorce

_____ E-Meter reaction _____

5. List children, date of death of any child and E-Meter reaction.

<i>Children</i>	<i>Date of Death</i>	<i>E-Meter reaction</i>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

C. Educational Level:

State the level of schooling Pc has had, University education, or prof training.

_____ E-Meter reaction _____

D. *Professional Life:*

State main jobs Pc has held.

<i>Job</i>	<i>E-Meter reaction</i>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

E. *Accidents:*

List any serious accidents Pc has had, the date of such, any permanent physical damage and E-Meter reaction.

<i>Accident</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Physical Damage</i>	<i>E-Meter reaction</i>
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

F. *Illnesses:*

List any serious illness (excepting usual childhood diseases, colds, etc) giving date of such, any permanent physical damage and E-Meter reaction.

<i>Illness</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Physical Damage</i>	<i>E-Meter reaction</i>
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

G. *Operations:*

List any operation, the date of each and E-Meter reaction.

<i>Operation</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>E-Meter reaction</i>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

H. *Present Physical Condition:*

List any bad physical condition Pc presently has and E-Meter reaction to such.

Physical Condition

E-Meter reaction

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

I. Mental Treatment:

List any psychiatric, psychoanalytic, hypnotic, mystical or occult exercises, or other mental treatment which Pc has had, the date of the treatment and E-Meter reaction.

Treatment

Date

E-Meter reaction

_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

J. Compulsions, Repressions and Fears.

List any compulsions (things Pc feels compelled to do), repressions (things Pc must prevent himself from doing) and any fears of Pc.

Compulsions, etc

E-Meter reaction

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

K. Criminal Record.

List any crime committed by Pc, prison sentence, if any, and E-Meter reaction.

Crime

Sentence

E-Meter reaction

_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

L. Interests and Hobbies:

List any Interests and Hobbies of Pc.

Interests and Hobbies

E-Meter reaction

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

M. Previous Scientology Processing:

- List auditors, hours and E-Meter reaction to any processing done other than in the HGC or Academy.

<i>Auditor</i>	<i>Hours</i>	<i>E-Meter Reaction</i>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

2. List briefly processes run _____

3. List goals attained from such processing _____

4. List goals not attained from such processing _____

N. Present Processing Goals.

List all present goals of Pc and E-Meter reaction to each.

<i>Goal</i>	<i>E-Meter reaction</i>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

O. LIFE TURNING POINTS:

List each major change the pc has experienced in life.

1. _____
_____ date _____

Meter _____

2. _____
_____ date _____

Meter _____

3. _____
_____ date _____

Meter _____

4. _____
_____ date _____

Meter _____

5. _____

_____ date _____
Meter _____
6. _____

_____ date _____
Meter _____
7. _____

_____ date _____
Meter _____
8. _____

_____ date _____
Meter _____
9. When did pc newly join any religious group _____

10. When did pc start going to Church again _____

11. When did pc subscribe to a fad _____

12. When did pc begin dieting _____

13. When did pc leave a job _____

14. When did pc have to take a rest _____

15. When is the time the pc noticed a body difficulty _____

16. When did the pc decide to go away _____

17. Whom did the pc decide to leave and when _____

18. When did pc decide to start being educated in some new line _____

19. When did pc's physical body change characteristics _____

20. When did pc collapse _____

21. When did pc start a new life _____

22. When did pc stop going to parties _____

23. Who has pc never seen again _____

24. What does pc now consider his or her major life change _____

DO SECTION P (FOLLOWING) SEVERAL TIMES.

P. PROCESSING SECTION.

1. Most needle action on above O Section was on number_____. (If necessary read them all off and assess for most reaction—not by elimination.)
Note Occurrence Assessed_____

2. Ask pc “What problem existed immediately before_____ (that occurrence)”.
3. Write down problem pc gives_____

4. Run “What was unknown about that problem with_____ (descriptive word)” until all tone arm action is off (20 minute test).
5. Locate confusion before that change (as per number above).
6. List persons present in the confusion_____

7. Assess persons.
Most needle reaction on_____
8. Run Processing Check of withholds from that person.
9. Assess persons above and any new ones. (Add to above list.) Persons now reacting_____

- Run Processing Check on that person.
10. Assess persons above and any new ones. (Add to above list.)
11. Person now reacting_____

12. Run Processing Check on that person.
13. Return to O. Assess and do all of P again.

HCO BULLETIN OF 12 OCTOBER 1961

Academie

STUDENT PRACTICE CHECK

The following practice Security Check may be used by Academy Students learning E-Meter use. It was developed by Dir PE Durban hopefully for use on Co-Audit. But it is doubtful if Co-Audit would win with such. A general repetitive process would be better. I have changed it to an Academy Practice Check.

- “Do you feel you are making a fool of yourself by being at the Academy?”
- “Is someone watching how you get on to ‘judge’ Scientology?”
- “Have you made any derogatory remarks concerning Scientology?”
- “Do you think Scientology might be a racket?”
- “Is there something you’re afraid you might have to face if you continue training?”
- “Are you here for another purpose than you say?”
- “Have your friends advised you against taking a course?”
- “Have you had any criticisms of the Course Instructor?”
- “Have you had any criticisms of the Director of Training?”
- “Have you made any criticisms of the way the organization is run?”
- “Have you any criticisms of the way the course is run?”
- “Have you seen any Scientology staff members who you’d hate to be like?”
- “Do you know of anyone who seems to have got worse since they took up Scientology?”
- “Have you got worse since you discovered something about yourself?”
- “Do you think your Tests were wrongly evaluated?”
- “Do you think Scientology is a violation of your religion?”
- “Do you think there is something wrong with making people more able?”
- “Is there something you wouldn’t dare mention here?”
- “Is there something you’re afraid you won’t do properly?”
- “Are you afraid of dealing with the mind?”
- “Have you ever been to a psychiatrist/faith healer/numerologist?”
- “Are you planning to tell people that Scientology is no good?”
- “Do you dislike anybody on the course?”
- “Are you shocked by anything that has happened since coming to the Academy?”
- “Did you find it difficult to pay for the course?”
- “Do you intend to pay for the course in full?”
- “Are you waiting for Scientology to do something for you?”
- “Are you looking for an excuse to say Scientology doesn’t work?”
- “Are you missing or neglecting doing something by coming on to the course?”
- “Is there something you should be handling that you are expecting the course to help you to do?”
- “Are you beyond help?”
- “Do you deserve to be helped?”
- “Do you think that the state of Clear is fictitious?”
- “Have you ever been late for class?”
- “Have you ever made an excuse to miss a class?”
- “Have you ever suspected a Scientologist of anything?”
- “Have you ever advised anyone against Scientology?”
- “Does the idea of being more responsible frighten you?”

L RON HUBBARD

LRH:md.cden
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HCO BULLETIN OF 17 OCTOBER 1961

HGCs

PROBLEMS INTENSIVES

Two important additions should be made to HCO Bulletin of November 18, 1960, the Preclear Assessment Sheet.

These are Sections O and P, which are attached to this Bulletin.

Section O lists all the turning points, or changes, in the preclear's life. It forms an additional section to the actual preclear assessment, which is unchanged in every other respect.

Section P is the Processing Section. Using the data obtained from Section O, a Class Two auditor can run a complete Problems Intensive, following the procedure outlined in Section P. Section P is done in Model Session.

Full details of how to run a Problems Intensive are given in the Saint Hill tapes of 10th, 11th and 12th October, which will be sent to you soon. Meanwhile, study Sections O and P carefully. And mimeo out supplies of Sections O and P for use by staff auditors. (Do not however mimeo more than enough for your immediate needs, as these sections may be changed in form or detail.)

A Problems Intensive is very simple. The procedure is outlined very clearly in Sections O and P.

Turning points are simply self-determined changes in the pc's life. When did he start doing something new or stop doing something, get married, get divorced, take up a new activity—any change or turning point in the pc's life. These are listed briefly, and when—an approximate date will do. Typical entries would be: "Went to Canada, 1930", "Took up slimming, 1936", "Went to sea, 1924", etc.

Each change, or turning point, was preceded by a period of confusion, or a PROBLEM. The Processing Section P consists of finding what problem existed immediately before the change. Run off the unknowns in the problem. Locate the confusion. Find the persons present in the confusion. Assess the persons for most reaction, take the one with most reaction and run a Processing Check on that person to get the withholds the pc had from that person.

This procedure is repeated again and again. Assess the changes. Find the one which reacts most (not by elimination). Run Section P on that change, find all the persons present in the prior confusion, get the withholds.

Basic stable datum: The change, or turning point, in the preclear's life is always the solution to the problem, or confusion, which immediately preceded it. It is the prior confusion which is the auditor's target. By sorting out these confusions and the personnel buried in them, a Class II auditor can do a fine job on any preclear, and prepare the ground for clearing the pc on SOP Goals.

This programme for Class II auditors should be grooved in as soon as the data and tape material are thoroughly understood.

LRH:md.cden
Copyright ©1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

[Sections O and P mentioned above are part of HCO PL 10 October 1961, *Problems Intensive for Staff Clearing*, page 392. HCO B 18 November 1960, *Preclear Assessment Sheet*, referred to above is cancelled by BTB 10 December 1974, Issue III, *Cancellation of Bulletins-1960*, which says, "See BTB 24 April 69R, *Preclear Assessment Sheet*." Similar data to the 18 November issue is contained in HCO PL 10 October 1961.]

HCO BULLETIN OF 19 OCTOBER 1961

Franchise

SECURITY QUESTIONS MUST BE NULLED

The main danger of security checking is not probing a person's past but failing to do so thoroughly.

When you leave a security check question "live" and go on to the next one, you set up a nasty situation that will have repercussions. The person may not immediately react. But the least that will happen is that he will be more difficult to audit in the future, and will go out of session more easily. More violently, a pc who has had a security check question left unflat may leave the session and do himself or Scientology considerable mischief.

About the most unkind thing you could do to a person would be to leave a security check question unflat and go on to the next one. Or to fail to nul the needle on withholds in the rudiments and go on with the session.

One girl, being audited, was left unflat on a security check question. The auditor blithely went on to the next question. The girl went out after session, and told everyone she knew the most vicious lies she could create about the immoral conduct of Scientologists. She wrote a stack of letters to people she knew out of town, telling gruesome tales of sexual orgies. An alert Scientologist heard the rumours, rapidly traced them back, got hold of the girl, sat her down and checked auditing and found the unflat security check question. The Withhold? Sexual misdemeanors. Once that was pulled, the girl hastily raced about correcting all her previous efforts to discredit.

A man had been a stalled case for about a year. He was violent to audit. The special question was finally asked, "What security check question was left unflat on you?" It was found and nulled. After that his case progressed again.

The mechanisms of this are many. The reactions of the pc are many. The summation of it is, when a security check question is left unflat on a pc and thereafter ignored, the consequences are numerous.

THE REMEDY

The prevention of security check being left unflat is easily accomplished:

1. Know *E-Meter Essentials*.
2. Know the E-Meter.
3. Work only with an approved E-Meter.
4. Know the various bulletins on security checking.
5. Get off your own withholds so that you won't avoid those in others.
6. Repeat questions in various ways until absolutely sure there is no further needle reaction on a question with sensitivity 16.

LRH: md.cden
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

** 6110C18 SHSBC-68 Valences—Circuits
** 6110C19 SHSBC-69 Q & A Period—Flows

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 23 OCTOBER 1961

HGCs

HGC PREPROCESSING SECURITY CHECK

(for pcs beginning intensives)

HCO WW Sec Form 8

Pc's Name _____ Date _____

This check is to be given by HGC Admin on interviewing applicant. It is a pre-processing Security Check. Follow directions exactly. If any question still produces instant read after clearing any midway reads, report this fact to the D of P before permitting pc to proceed with other testing or auditing. Write down on a dispatch paper the questions that produced instant reads and give them to the auditor prior to the pc's first session (excepting only questions 1, 6, 9, 13, 14, 16 or 17 which must be referred to D of P first. If pc is still accepted after this, give these questions to the auditor as well as any others producing instant read).

DIRECTIONS

Use a standard organization approved or manufactured E-Meter such as the British Mark IV.

Make certain, by can squeeze, that the instrument is plugged in and adjusted.

Use the meter strictly in accordance with the manual *E-Meter Essentials*.

Read only *instant reactions*. Do not use latent reactions of the needle. If the needle reacts within a 1/5th or 1/10th of a second after the question is asked, it is an *instant read*. This is valid. If it reacts 1/2 to 1 second after the question, this is invalid. Explore only *instant* reads on any check. Ignore all latent reads.

It should take only 10 or 20 minutes to give this check. If it takes longer you are doing something wrong.

All you do is put the applicant on the meter and read the questions to him with sensitivity set high (1 dial or more drop for can squeeze).

Keep the needle near center of dial. Don't adjust it while asking a question. Don't ask a question if it is uncentered.

If you get no reaction go on to next question.

If you get a reaction, *compartment* the question (reading it word by word and phrase by phrase), and see if any one word or any one phrase falls rather than the question as a whole. Clear each word or phrase that reads on the needle. Then read the whole question. If it is the whole question that reacts, it is a flunk.

Don't clear flunks. (Note: Do not inform pc it is a flunk. This is not an employment security check.) Just go on to next question.

The person being checked does not have to answer anything verbally.

The person giving the check does not have to find out or get off any withhold as this is not a processing check.

A needle reaction must be clearly established to be a reaction to the question before it can be a flunk.

The Tone Arm action is ignored.

Rising needle is ignored.

The Auditor's Code is ignored.

Processing is ignored.

You'll find the main trouble with giving this check is that it is so easy to give that people will try to complicate it.

If a person is guilty of or has charge on any part of this check, the person *will* react on that exact question, providing the question is put to the person directly (not his shadow).

There are no nul questions to be given to the pc applicant.

The following statement is read to the pc applicant:

"This is a Pre-Processing Check I am giving you. These are E-Meter electrodes. This is a very modern instrument developed after ten years of research. You do not have to speak or answer if you do not want to. It makes no difference.

"Here is the first question:

1. Have you ever had electric shock treatment?
2. Are you a pervert?
3. Do you knowingly intend to cause disorder here?
4. Are you here knowingly to prove Scientology doesn't work?
5. Are you under a doctor's care?
6. Are you suffering from any secret illness?
7. Have you ever been placed in the care of a psychiatrist?
8. Have you ever been classified as legally insane?
9. Are you planning harmful acts to yourself or others?
10. Are you guilty of any major crime in this lifetime?
11. Have you been sent here knowingly to injure Scientology?
12. Are you or have you ever been a Communist?
13. Are you addicted to drugs?
14. Have you falsified the statement of personal history given to the Consultant?
15. Are you wanted in this country by the police?
16. Are you closely affiliated to any person or organization violently opposed to L. Ron Hubbard or Scientology?
17. Are you supposed to go insane?"

The interrogator should now smooth out any ARC breaks caused, by asking and clearing: "Has anything I have done here upset you?"

Note: If the pc applicant is accepted, write down *all* the questions that didn't clear after clearing midway reads, give them to the auditor (or if two auditors or more, the security check auditor) and instruct him to place those *exact* questions in the security check form at or very near the beginning of the sec check. The pc applicant is not to be informed of any special action on this. These questions are to be cleared, then, as part of the processing check in the same way as other sec check (processing) questions.

If any question continues to react, in accordance with instructions given in "Directions" above, refer this to the D of P for his decision. In the event D of P cannot make a decision easily (due to any doubt as to whether policy would be violated on the acceptance of the pc), he is to refer the matter to the Organization Secretary and HCO Area Sec. If policy would be violated by the acceptance of a pc and the D of P *still* wants to have the pc audited, he must advise L. Ron Hubbard at once. The D of P should be well advised as to policy however, and only refer cases where there is more likelihood of doing good than doing harm by having the pc audited at the HGC. Similarly the HGC Admin, on asking the sec check questions, should not make a practice of referring matters to the D of P, but *only* when the *questions* mentioned above are in fact still reacting. It will be found that this will apply to a minority of applicants.

HGC Admin sign here on completion of interrogation: _____

Auditor sign here on receipt of any reacting questions: _____

D of P sign here: Pc has been accepted: _____

Pc has not been accepted: _____

Reason if not accepted: _____

Note: Send completed form to Saint Hill with first week's auditor's reports. If pc applicant was not accepted, file in HGC unless required by L. Ron Hubbard.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :iet.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

24—26 October 1961

- | | | |
|------------|----------|-----------------------------------|
| ** 6110C24 | SHSBC-70 | Clearing |
| ** 6110C25 | SHSBC-71 | Importance of Goals Terminals |
| ** 6110C26 | SHSBC-72 | Security Checking Auditing Errors |

Franchise

SAFE AUDITING TABLE

I have just isolated the reason why a pc sometimes gets a solidifying bank on Step 6 and at other times.

The reason is that no terminal, except as below, may be run that is not the pc's goal's terminal.

A central valence or terminal is built in to demand total attention from the pc. When attention is given another terminal, too much, in life or auditing, the bank reacts to prevent that attention.

This is why some pcs gain weight. A terminal not the goals terminal has been run too long or concentrated upon too hard.

Therefore I have composed a table of safe processes.

SAFE PROCESSES

1. *Security (Processing) Checking*. As long as O/Ws (times when pc's attention was fixed on terminals other than goals terminal) are pulled off by Meter properly per standard or composed Sec Checks. Sec Checking a single terminal is less safe than Sec Checking in general which is totally safe unless a question on which pc has withholds is left unflat.
2. *The word "you"* as a terminal may be run so long as it does not eventually stick any flows.
3. *Areas of Prior Confusion* (prior to a stuck point or problem) may be run and will free the stuck point that occurs later in time. The run should be done on the Prior Confusion by Sec Checking the period earlier than the stuck point or problem. The questions are by deed rather than by terminal.
4. *Concepts* including *Rising Scale Processing* are perfectly safe as they include no terminals.
5. *ARC Straight Wire, ARC Break Straight Wire* and *Something you wouldn't mind forgetting?* are all completely safe as long as pc is cycled back up to present time at process period end.
6. *CCHs*.
7. *Touch Assists* and all Familiarization Processes.
8. *Havingness and Confront Processes* (The 36 Commands).
9. *Rudiments Processes* if briefly used.
10. Routine 3, finding pc's goal and terminal and pre-hav runs and other processes on the goal and terminal, if found and done by an expert. Otherwise process is dangerous as incorrect goal and terminal might be used. By expert is meant a course completion with honours at Saint Hill. The wrong goal and wrong terminal run in any fashion disturbs the bank without release. (No goal or terminal found on any student before that student came to Saint Hill has so far proved correct.)
11. Sec Checking a goals terminal. Running O/W or repetitive commands on a goals terminal is perfectly safe.
12. Running engrams on the goals terminal chain is perfectly safe if well done.

Other processes may on a good percentage of pcs produce a heavy bank reaction and not discharge but only worsen the bank. The bank generally fades down in from three to ten days, and responds well thereafter to the above.

LRH:imj.msp.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 1 NOVEMBER 1961

HCO Secs
Assoc Secs
D Of Ts

HCO WW SECURITY FORM 5A

(For all HPA/HCA and above students
before acceptance on courses)

Give this check in exactly the same way as HCO WW SECURITY FORM 7A.

Failure to pass one or more questions on this check results in non-acceptance of this student on course until processing has been given.

The security checker does not attempt to clear or process any of the following questions if they produce *instant* needle reaction. Clearing questions is an auditor's job and is done in an auditing session, not while receiving this check.

If a question produces instant needle response, clear it word by word and phrase by phrase until all phrases and words are as null as they can be made. Then test for reaction to the whole question. If it reacts it is a flunk.

The whole test is always completed. It should take 10 to 20 minutes at the most.

Read the following to the student applicant:

“There is nothing personal about this check. It is for your protection as well as others’. If you pass it you have no worries. If you flunk it you will not be accepted on this course until you have been processed on your own arrangements. Here is the check. You do not have to answer anything if you do not care to.”

1. Have you ever committed any criminal act for which you could be blackmailed now?
2. Do you or your close family currently have any connection with organizations violently opposed to L. Ron Hubbard?
3. Are you here purposely to upset or damage Scientology or Scientology Organizations?
4. Have you ever cautioned anyone about following L. Ron Hubbard's directions or data or told them not to?
5. Have you ever maliciously criticized Scientology, its organizations, data or people to people outside these organizations?
6. Do you intend to use people you meet here to secretly further your personal gain outside this course?
7. Do you feel Scientology is a fraud or racket?

8. Do you think it really doesn't matter whether you do a good job or not?
9. Do you intend to quit this course just as soon as you have achieved your own ends?
10. Are you or have you been a Communist?
11. Are you wanted by the Police?
12. Have you come here with the intention of having sex?
13. Have you come on this course to create trouble, directly or indirectly, to Scientology?
14. Has some group opposed to Scientology, as it is presently practiced, sent you on this course?
15. Do you intend to use any information gained on this course for any devious purpose?
16. Have you come here to prove to yourself or others that Scientology does not work?
17. Are you presently under medication or treatment?

Passed

Security Checker

Failed

Date

Findings and Decisions: _____

LRH:esc.jh
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

Franchise

THE PRIOR CONFUSION

A recent discovery I have made may well do away with the need to directly run problems, particularly on people who find them hard to confront.

The mechanism is this:

All problems are preceded by a Prior Confusion.

The handling consists of locating the problem, then locating the Prior Confusion and then Sec Checking that Prior Confusion.

The preclear tends to edge forward in time to the problem continuously and to 'bounce' out of the Prior Confusion once located. The remedy is to locate the O/Ws in the Prior Confusion and keep the preclear out of the moment of the Problem.

All somatics, circuits, problems and difficulties including ARC breaks are all preceded by a Prior Confusion. Therefore it is possible (but not always feasible at the moment) to eradicate somatics by Sec Checking the Area of Confusion which occurred just before the pc noticed the somatic for the first time.

This is part of a Class II Auditor's skills.

A problem could be regarded as a mechanism by which to locate hidden Areas of Confusion in a pc's life.

All Hidden Standards are the result of a Prior Confusion.

The mechanism is extremely valuable. All rudiments could be run by finding the rudiment out, getting the difficulty expressed, locating the Prior Confusion and then finding the pc's O/Ws in that Area of Confusion.

A Problems Intensive based on this mechanism is under design and I will release it for Class II use when I am satisfied the form is complete.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:vbn.cden
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Franchise

RUDIMENTS AND CLEARING

The following report from Saint Hill Special Course Instructor, Herbie Parkhouse, former Association Secretary, London, is illuminative in the extreme.

“Dear Ron,

“Here is a long note on my recent experiences on clearing, beginning with Problems Intensive Assessment.

“I took over my pc after quite a bit of auditing from Reg Sharpe, Instructor, who had found the Goal and Terminal, and a fellow student.

“On commencing the Sections A-N of the Assessment Sheet I found the pc willing to give me the data asked for with an ever mounting interest, but with an inclination to fight control. This inclination grew stronger on the O Section especially on asking for self-determined changes rather than victim changes. However we completed Section O and went on to P where the problem dropped out OK and I ran the single command. This went fine but very soon the needle and Tone Arm tightened, and pc became ARC breaky. Upon instruction from yourself I changed the process to a 4 bracket command. This eased things considerably and further progress was made with Track opening up, but not much Tone Arm Action.

“Then you discovered the data re Terminals and on Monday you told me to go for clear on his Goal Terminal with a 10 way, bracket incorporating Groups. This shook me but in we went. First session Rudiments took 20 minutes which was longer than ever before. The process ran OK, but not much Tone Arm change. Pc in session very well, somatics, grief and heavy yawning and lots and lots of cognitions. Good Session. You remarked, ‘Keep Rudiments in’ and I innocently wondered why you bothered to mention it! Huh!

“Next session I commenced Session feeling terrific, and certain I could clear him as per your instructions, until I checked Rudiments, which incidentally on the cross check by another auditor were all OK. I took 48 minutes to clear the Rudiments on the meter, over hill and down dale, through ARC breaks, complaints and attempts to make me feel guilty. At the end of all this I didn’t have a pc very much in session, so I ran 6 commands of the main process and ended Session, for I figured that by ending Session I could get two more cracks at what the heck was going on. In the End Rudiments I took 33 minutes, most of which was on withholds—thanks for the new W/H Question—and did I get a surprise. It turned out that if my pc was to go clear he would have to ‘level’ with certain people and change his way of life, which he wasn’t willing to do, so he worked it out that if he worried me we would spend so much time on the Rudiments that we would never get to the main process and thus he would not go clear and have to do things he was unwilling to do.

“The Beginning Rudiments for the next session took the whole of 5 mins. In the process the Tone Arm moved, track opened up and out popped Robots, 2 ft high, green in colour with pineapple hand grenade type heads, and some somatics. End Rudiments also took 5 minutes.

“Next day Rudiments were out again. Withhold on the subject of clearing and its seeming obligations once again reared its head, but not to the same degree as before.

Track is opening up at quite a high rate. Tone Arm is moving up to 1 1/2 Tone Arm divisions. Cognitions all over the place. Tomorrow I think we'll flatten it.

“You have said many times, ‘Watch the rudiments’—I have, but I have never respected them as much as I do now.

“The problem my pc was putting in the way of clearing was very small to me, but big to him. I never would have guessed it could have held us up in a million years.

“Thanks for Rudiments.”

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:imj.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

St Hill
Students

ROUTINE 3A

I have found a way to undercut the speed of a goals terminal run.

This consists of a discovery of a new piece of the puzzle—*The Modifier*.

By use of the Modifier the basic terminal of a goals chain may be isolated without running off the *upper terminal*.

Routine 3 consists of finding a goal, finding a terminal and running it on the Pre-Hav Scale, combined with sec checking. Then one finds a new terminal for the goal, etc, etc.

ROUTINE 3A consists of:

1. Having pc write a goals list.
2. Adding various types of goals to the list (Secret, etc).
3. Assessing the list and locating the goal by elimination.
(The above steps are unchanged from Routine 3.)
4. Compiling a list of MODIFIERS by asking the pc what would make the goal impossible to attain, what would keep it from happening, what would be its consequences if attained, etc.
5. Assessing Modifier list by elimination. (Assess Modifiers without repeating goal.)
6. Combining goal and Modifier as the question for terminal (who or what would [goal & modifier]) and compiling a terminals list.
(Otherwise same as Routine 3)
7. Assessing terminals list by elimination to obtain *the* terminal.
(Same as Routine 3)
8. Assessing Pre-Hav Scale for level.
(Same as Routine 3)
9. Forming multi-bracket commands and running or using a packaged command.
(Same as Routine 3)

Routine 3A is also combined with ordinary sec checks as well as a Dynamic sec check gained from a Dynamic Assessment.

Havingness and Confront are also found and used during auditing of terminal on levels.

The resulting terminal will be found to be more fundamental than the Routine 3 type terminal and should run much faster.

I developed this by deducing that if a goal is held in suspense in time, it must have another side to it like a problem.

A problem is postulate-counter-postulate.

To stay fixed, a goal must have a counter-postulate.

Both goal and Modifier must be contained in one basic terminal, otherwise the postulates would not be out of reach of the pc.

This terminal may be far more real to the pc and the whole package may blow more rapidly.

In those cases where a goal has been found, do Routine 3A Steps 4 through 9.

Get Modifier and terminal checked out when found.

So far the Modifier list has been very short, the pc getting it on the first question in some cases and half a dozen in others. Ten would seem a fair number.

Definition: A Modifier is that consideration which opposes the attainment of a goal and tends to suspend it in time.

In practice all Modifiers so far found have Dianetic type deniers in them which put them semantically out of sight.

Example: Goal: To be a Willow Wand. Modifier: So as never to be reached.

Accordingly, the pc also never reaches the Modifier in his thinking but dramatizes it.

Goal + Modifier for terminal use would be "Who or what would be a willow wand so as never to be reached". Terminal assessed from list: "A bending reed".

In those cases that have gone Clear, the Modifier ran out, almost unnoticed. In those cases that haven't gone Clear, the pc is still dramatizing the Modifier while running the goal and cleaning off one terminal from a chain.

I suppose we may find in some cases that we have the Modifier but not the goal. In such a case the question would have to be (in Step 4 above) "What goal would make one eventually decide to be that way". I do not know positively of any such cases as yet, I am only providing for the possibility. Where the person's "goal" seems to be a defeat, I would suspect it was the Modifier with the goal before it not yet found.

Nothing in this means that all terminals are wrong. Some may be found to be the same terminal as before. Others will be found to be more basic. A few will seem not to compare.

All cases now running on a goals terminal as per Routine 3 should be reassessed at once as per Routine 3A to save time in auditing.

LRH:esc.rd
copyright ©1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

** 6111C07 SHSBC-76 Routine 3A
** 6111C08 SHSBC-77 Checking Case Reports

Franchise

**THE PROBLEMS INTENSIVE
USE OF THE PRIOR CONFUSION**

All sticks on the time track stick because of a Prior Confusion.

The most stuck point on the track is a Problem.

A Problem is caused by a balanced postulate-counter-postulate. Neither postulate has dominance. The problem, therefore, hangs in time and floats in time. Force vs force, endeavour vs endeavour, all these are the anatomy of a problem.

One cannot have a problem without overts and withholds against the people involved in it, for one cannot be so individuated as to not influence others unless one has O/Ws on those others.

All somatics, aberrations, circuits and problems are postulate-counter-postulate situations.

All these items occur only where one has O/Ws on others.

By finding and Sec Checking the Area of Prior Confusion to any problem, somatic, circuit or hidden standard, one can alleviate or blow that problem or condition.

THE PROBLEMS INTENSIVE

To give a Problems Intensive, the auditor first fills in the Preclear Assessment Form on the pc.

1. Complete Change List

The auditor then asks the pc for all the *self-determined* changes the pc has made this life. These are written with date first, followed by two or three descriptive words. This list is a long column on the page, or two columns on the page.

It is important that no other-determined changes in his or her life are recorded as these are occurrences and assess because of engram content as in operations.

The pc must have made up his or her mind to change, to move, to diet, to seek adventure, to take up Thackeray, to go to Church, etc, etc.

When the E-Meter no longer reacts to the question "Was there another time you decided to change your life?", when no needle action remains, consider list complete.

2. Assess Change List

Now Assess this list. It can be assessed by biggest needle reaction or, better, by elimination.

One change will react consistently. If none remain, find out about any more changes.

You will wind up with a charged, self-determined change.

Write it down.

3. Obtain Problem

Ask the pc for the problem that preceded this change.

If you have the right change, the Problem will *leap* into view. If you have the wrong change, the pc will appear to be in present time trying to figure out what problem there *might have been*.

This last indicates he is not stuck in the problem, therefore it isn't it. If pc obviously can't find any problem in the area, even when coaxed, do a better assessment.

When you have the problem, write it down.

4. Date the Problem

By using any dating system on the E-Meter, find the date *in this lifetime* when this problem arose. This gets the pc into a time perspective with regard to the problem.

If the pc insists on going back track, play along with it. Do following steps anyway on back track. But do not encourage it. A Problems Intensive concerns this lifetime.

5. Find Prior Confusion

Discuss the problem with the pc. Find out what people or type of person it concerns.

Locate on the Meter the Confusion which occurred minutes, days, weeks before this problem.

Find out the names of the people concerned in this confusion.

Write down these names.

Now ask searchingly with Meter for any missing persons.

When satisfied you have the persons (and sometimes things) involved, end your list.

NOTE: At this point one could assess the list for the most heavily charged person but the step is not vital nor, in the light of terminal phenomena, since only a goals terminal can be safely run, is this really safe.

6. Compose Sec Check

Composing a generalized Sec Check based on the type of confusion, and using the date of the confusion in every question, make ready to Sec Check the Area.

7. Sec Check Confused Area

Get off all the pc's overts and withholds in the Area of Confusion.

8. Test for Problem

Test on E-Meter for the Problem found above. If it is still reacting on Meter, Sec Check further. Do this until problem seems quietened down.

9. Assess for New Change

Return to Change List and any new self-determined changes pc now recalls.

Assess List.

Continue on with steps as above.

A Problems Intensive can key out present time problems of long duration, chronic somatics, circuits and hidden standards.

It is one of the skills of a Class II Auditor.

Excellent graph changes have been obtained by giving a Problems Intensive.

LRH:esc.cden
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L RON HUBBARD

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURE
9 November 1961

** 6111C09 SHSBC-78 Effective Auditing

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO INFORMATION LETTER OF 14 NOVEMBER 1961

Saint Hill Students
Graduates, Sthil Spcl Brfg Cs
All Trained Auditors to R.3 Level

ROUTINE 3D

This is the first routine to make Dynamic Clears. Earlier Clears were cleared on only one or two dynamics. Such selectivity also resulted in clearing procedures not working all the way to clear on a large number of cases.

On receipt of this preview of Routine 3D transfer any case you are assessing or running over to this routine at once. Do not bother to end off unflat processes from Routine 3 or Routine 3A. On all persons already cleared go back through this routine completely with them. You may use the first valid checked out goal located on the person to start in all cases. Beyond that use no other material. Naturally those persons who have been audited on a goals terminal or who have had considerable auditing or who have been cleared will go much faster because of that.

You will find that it will be more rapid to do this procedure in full on any person than to complete any existing activity.

There are several new words in this routine. They are obvious in meaning.

After I discovered Modifiers I immediately went on to ease the difficulty auditors were having in finding them. And I found many additional shortcuts to clearing in general.

The skills necessary to use Routine 3D are the same as those needed to run Routine 3 with the addition that there is more assessing. Rapidity and extreme accuracy of assessment are mandatory in using Routine 3D. *The selection of a wrong goal, terminal, modifier, opposition or counter-postulate and forcing it off on the preclear and running it can do considerable damage to a case.* Any such damage can be remedied by going back over the whole thing and finding the correct item. If a wrong one has been found and used the Pre-Hav Scale will show an increasing number of levels active on each successive assessment. I would prefer that only auditors trained and graduated at Saint Hill use Routine 3D. It is very fast but it demands deadly accuracy.

On the first test assessment in full after the goal had been more or less spotted but not checked, a full first assessment on all parts of Routine 3D required five and a half hours including getting rudiments in, keeping them in and final assessment on the Pre-Hav Scale. This will not be found to be how much time it will averagely take. But is remarked to show that speed of assessment has nothing to do with accuracy of assessment.

The hardest part of Routine 3D is finding the first goal. After that the parts of Routine 3D are so plotted as to make easy completion.

The theory back of Routine 3D is that a goal has the anatomy of a problem and is not only postulate counter-postulate but also terminal counter-terminal.

NO MATTER WHAT HAS BEEN PREVIOUSLY FOUND ON THE PRECLEAR OR CLEAR AFTER THE FIRST GOAL (without Modifier) USE ONLY THE ITEMS TURNED UP BY ROUTINE 3D AS FAR MORE RAPID AND SHORTCUT THAN ANY DATA FOUND ON THE CASE PREVIOUSLY. DO NOT LOCATE THE ITEMS IN ANY DIFFERENT ORDER THAN THAT GIVEN ON THE FOLLOWING STEP

LIST. DO NOT FILL IN THE STEP LIST WITH DATA FROM EARLIER ASSESSMENTS. USE ONLY 3D DISCOVERED DATA.

EACH TIME AN ITEM IS FOUND IT WILL BE DISCOVERED TO HAVE THE SAME NEEDLE PATTERN AS THE LAST ITEM. ALL PARTS FOUND WILL HAVE THE SAME NEEDLE PATTERN THROUGHOUT. THIS IS FOR CHECKING BY THE AUDITOR ONLY. IF SOME PART HAS A DIFFERENT NEEDLE PATTERN THAN THE ORIGINAL GOAL IT IS WRONG.

ALL PARTS OF ROUTINE 3D SHOULD BE CHECKED OUT BEFORE BEING RUN.

ROUTINE 3D

USE SEPARATE SHEETS OF PAPER. NUMBER EACH SHEET SO USED WITH THE SECTION NUMBER OF THE FOLLOWING. WHEN THE ITEM BEING ASSESSED HAS BEEN PROVED OUT WRITE IT ON THIS SHEET. DO NOT DESTROY ANY OF YOUR EXCESS SHEETS BUT STAPLE THEM TO THIS SHEET WHEN COMPLETE. ALL ASSESSMENTS LISTS AND RESULTS FOR ANY ONE PC MUST BE CAREFULLY PRESERVED TO PROVIDE FOR RECHECK IF ANYTHING GOES WRONG.

PC'S NAME _____ DATE _____

AUDITOR _____ LOCATION _____

1. GOALS ASSESSMENT. (Make sure that any goal found and used is something the pc has really wanted to do, not a difficulty or something that came in a dream.)
 - a. Write or have pc write a complete list of goals.
 - b. Add to the list by meter any secret or additional goals the pc may have. Add to list any time pc adds another goal during assessment.
 - c. Get rudiments in well before and during assessment.
 - d. Assess goals list by elimination.

PC'S GOAL _____

Checked out by _____

2. OPPOSITION ASSESSMENT.
 - a. Ask pc "Who or what would oppose that goal?" and carefully list every reply.
 - b. Add to list by meter any additional opposition terminals.
 - c. Get rudiments in well before and during assessment.
 - d. Assess opposition list by assessment by elimination.

OPPOSITION TERMINAL _____

Checked out by _____

3. OPPOSITION GOAL.
 - a. Ask pc "What would be a _____ (Opposition Terminal above) _____'s goals that would be in opposition to (pc's goal) _____?" You want to know what ideas the opposition would have that would directly counter the pc's goal. This must be in the form of a sort of goal. It is not the basic goal of the opposition terminal, but the goal that opposes the pc's goal.
 - b. Add to list by meter.
 - c. Get rudiments in well before and during assessment.
 - d. Assess Opposition Goals List by elimination.

OPPOSITION GOAL _____

Checked out by _____

4. MODIFIER. (In this you want to know what phrases are missing at the beginning or ending of the pc's goal. These will be found to be bouncers, denyers, down bouncers, call backs, etc, in old Dianetic terminology. Pc can skid all over track while giving these.)
 - a. Ask pc "If your goal consistently failed what ideas would you add to it?" Make full list.
 - b. Add to list by meter.
 - c. Get rudiments in well before and during assessment.
 - d. Assess by elimination. NOTE: Several of these phrases may modify the pc's goal. This is the only part of a goal's assessment that does not reduce to just one. These remaining phrases will have to be added up and stacked in various ways to make sense with the pc's goal and to give a smooth meter check out.

PC'S GOAL MODIFIER _____

Checked out by _____

5. GOALS TERMINAL FOR PC'S GOAL + MODIFIER. (Sec 1 + Sec 4 Abv.)

PC'S GOAL TERMINAL + MODIFIER _____

- a. Ask pc "Who or what would (pc's g +m)_____?" and list every goals terminal the pc gives you.
- b. Complete g.t. list using meter.
- c. Get rudiments in well before and during assessment.
- d. Assess list by elimination.

PC'S GOAL TERMINAL (Term for g + m) _____

6. PRE-HAV LEVEL.
 - a. Using goals terminal, reversing the flow every question by asking "Would (goals terminal)_____you?" for one level and "Would you_____ (goals terminal)?" for the next, assess by elimination (without repeater technique and repeating only levels which fell on subsequent coverage of scale) and obtain the one level that still reacts.

FIRST LEVEL _____

SEVENTH LEVEL _____

SECOND LEVEL _____

EIGHTH LEVEL _____

THIRD LEVEL _____

NINTH LEVEL _____

FOURTH LEVEL _____

TENTH LEVEL _____

FIFTH LEVEL _____

ELEVENTH LEVEL _____

SIXTH LEVEL _____

TWELFTH LEVEL _____

FURTHER LEVELS:

7. COMPOSE COMMAND.
 - a. Using goals terminal and opposition terminal compose command:

COMMANDS _____

-
-
-
- b. Clear commands with pc to make sure they make sense to him. (It is not whether he finds them easy but whether they can be answered by him despite duress caused.)

CLEARED COMMANDS

- c. Run command against TONE ARM, using only a TEN MINUTE test on an eighth of a TA Division.
 - d. When commands flat as in c, reassess on Pre-Hav as in 6 above. Compose new commands as in 7 on a separate sheet.
8. GOALS TEST.
- a. When the goals terminal is flat from having been run on levels of the Pre-Hav Scale and out the bottom, recheck all sections above from I to 5 inclusive for any reads on the needle.
 - b. If a new goals terminal can be found on the goals list or newly added to the goals terminal list, use it in Section 6, noting it at the end of Section 5 above that you have done so.
 - c. When no goals terminal can be found that reacts, form up pc's goal and opposition terminal and run one against the other. When flat, make new form.

VOCABULARY

GOAL—Something the pc wanted to be, to do or to have, whether the pc abandoned it, failed in it or not, just as in Routine 3.

MODIFIER—The unseen modification the pc has placed before or after his goal to insist upon winning or threaten with if he does not win, or to keep the goal in a games condition unknown even to himself. The Modifier is difficult to directly reach as it is full of bouncers, deniers, down bouncers, call backs, etc (see Dianetics). When the opposing factors are relieved by assessment the Modifier is more easily exposed. Described in Routine 3A. One never asks for the Modifer when doing step.

OPPOSITION TERMINAL—The person, group or object that has consistently opposed pc's goal, making it a terminal counter-terminal situation of long duration.

OPPOSITION GOAL—The idea that is interlocked against the pc's goal, making it a postulate counter-postulate situation of long duration. It is not actually the goal of the Opposition Terminal as the Opposition Terminal would see it, but only what the pc believes it was as it affects him.

GOAL PLUS MODIFIER—The visible goal is added to the heretofore invisible modifier. This is the G + M, being the true whole track desire of the pc plus the threat to self or others if that desire is not accomplished.

GOALS TERMINAL—That valence into which pc has interiorized and which carries the goal, modifier and aberration which the pc attributes to self. This is the most

important single item and is the “pc’s terminal”. It is this for which we are searching and which was the whole target of Routine 3 and which is the primary target of Routine 3D. This “is” the pc as he exists at the moment of the start of processing.

PRE-HAV LEVEL—That dominant doingness or thinkingness at the moment of the goals terminal, as taken from the Primary Pre-Hav Scale.

CAUTIONS

No part given above is valid if it has been forced off on the pc by suggestions by the auditor. One *never* suggests any goal, terminal, opposition goal, opposition terminal, modifier or Pre-Hav level to the pc. To do so is to prevent the pc going clear. Helpfulness stems from doing excellent TRs, Model Session and Meter Handling. In Sec Checking one suggests. In assessing one *never* suggests. *Many* case failures can be traced to the auditor “knowing” better than the pc or the meter on these matters. An auditor can *suppose* all he pleases so long as he doesn’t suggest it to the pc. It would be kinder to shoot the pc than to disobey this rule.

The pc’s *goal* must be the pc’s goal, see above definition. It must not be a difficulty. To invalidate something the pc has given you as a goal (or other part) is to break down the whole activity of 3D. Out Rudiments alone make pc’s goal, etc, hard to find. The fastest way to drive them out is by invalidation or non-acceptance. A pc will accept the result of an assessment if correct. The pc will not accept, though appear to accept, the auditor’s suggestion or even suggestion for assessment.

If the pc gives a *difficulty* (as different than a goal, a difficulty being a get-rid-of desire, a goal being an actual desire) the auditor may not reject it as a “goal” but, putting it down as a “processing goal” (not to be assessed), the auditor can make up a get-rid-of list as a Processing Goals List and write all get-rid-of goals on it as Goals which will be reached in processing. He can even explain this to pc. He then appears to accept this goal, writes it down on something, acknowledges it and goes on. But the auditor can explain that he is listing for assessment “things to be attained in life and livingness”. This keeps the pc from feeling invalidated.

Beware of get-rid-of type goals (get rid of my fear of height) because they will assess out, being a whole problem—pc vs height, pc vs bank. But the goal could be missed. So use “Processing Goal” for “Get-rid-ofs”, and “Life and Livingness Goals” for what you will assess and in the body of which list the pc’s goal is going to be found.

Modifiers are sometimes given as goals. This only happens with an incomplete goals list. Of course, the Modifier will assess out. Usually this happens when the goal is discreditable. When this happens the auditor flubbed in getting all the meter needle actions off the questions about secret, withheld or discreditable goals. Example: “Goal” assessed was “not to be found out”. This is, of course, a Modifier just by inspection. When an effort was made to find “the thing that would Modify that goal”, the actual goal came up which was “To tell lies”. The G + M was “To tell lies and not to be found out”. The goal, being discreditable in the pc’s eyes (even though every pro playwright would have it), was missed by an inexpert auditor when the secret-withheld goals were being asked for. Surely it showed on the meter during the goals listing but was missed.

Modifiers threaten, give consequences, modify. They are not something the pc ever wanted to be, to do or to have.

Do R 3D by definition and accuracy and you’ll obtain accurate results.

When a pc gets the idea he or she can “beat the meter” all listing and assessing can go to pieces. Rudiments are hard to keep in, ARC breaks are frequent.

The primary sources of ARC breaks are, of course, all under the heading of “no auditing”. Auditing is considered scarce and valuable by the pc—valuable to the point of not being able to have it at all. Bad auditing, slipshod auditing and even no auditing at all, come under this heading.

When the meter is seen to apparently flub, always by reason of poor auditing, the pc sees (down deep where he lives as a thetan) a betrayal of himself and a win for his valence. The pc hates this.

Just miss a withhold and see the eventual fireworks.

The pc who feels guilty will try to beat the meter. If he or she does, then it’s an invalidation of auditing and disappointment causes chop and upset. The pc then proceeds to express the ARC break in invalidation of the auditor and, sometimes, the meter.

If a pc can force off a goal or the rest on the auditor by twitching a finger on the cans or convulsing each time a goal or whatever is mentioned and the auditor then “buys” it in assessment, the whole case runs thereafter like a 1918 tank. It doesn’t.

It’s a sloppy auditor who gets into this trouble but, such are the powers of persuasion of a valence, even a good auditor sometimes “buys” a goal, terminal, etc, the pc “sells” him or her by a convulsion every time or a shift of a finger. Study body reaction patterns as per *E-Meter Essentials* until they can be detected and make a convulsing pc sit ramrod still when being checked out. About 5% of all pcs seem to try to “sell” with body convulsion. It’s uniformly dangerous to “buy” a result accompanied by a convulsion. Even if it’s right, the pc can still be made to sit still, you know. “It makes me double over” may be true, “It makes my hand twitch” may be a fact, but don’t buy it until it’s assessed and checked without the convulsion.

It’s good practice to find out periodically on a pc if any withholds have been missed. And it’s good practice to do the lot of rudiments and assessment at highest sensitivity if you can. If not, do it at least at a dial drop.

And when the pc ARC breaks a lot or seeks to invalidate the auditor, clear up two definite points:

1. Does the pc think auditing will happen? Not if auditing works, but just if the pc can believe that the auditor will work his very hardest at it.
2. Has anything invalidated metering to the pc?

You want only Instant Reads that occur right after you finish question. You do not want latent reads that occur $1/2$ to one second after you end. You want the instant read on what you’re looking for, not the natural read on the goal or already known item or items. Don’t sit staring at a meter waiting for it to finally read. Get on with the job.

When you obtain an item, a secondary method of checking before getting it checked out, is to find if the item drops the same as the other items already found. If a goal rock slams, then finally, all other items in turn will rock slam. If a goal theta bops, then all other items of 3D will theta bop.

This is not used in selecting items. It is used to double check after they’re found. If one is of a different needle reaction than the rest, it is probably wrong.

PROCEDURE OF ASSESSMENT

In assessing:

Get Rudiments in at highest sensitivity.

With sensitivity at 16, complete list by making sure that pc is nul on your asking for more terminals or items. Say "Who or what would _____" and get items until needle is nul.

Get Rudiments in at highest sensitivity.

Assess list by elimination with meter set for a 1 dial drop, on can squeeze. Read an item only 3 times.

Acknowledge pc as though pc spoke, which pc didn't. (Pcs are silent during assessment unless they have cognitions or wish to add to list.) Cover list often. Be rapid, accurate, sure. Tell pc if item is still in or is out. Go on to next. Read it three times. If it's still reacting on needle, leave it in by putting $\frac{1}{2}$ of a cross beside it. If it didn't react, complete the X. Always acknowledge. Always tell pc if item was in or out. Barrel right along. The more chat, the more chance of out Rudiments.

Get Rudiments in any time it looks like they're out.

If whole list nuls, add new ones to it by meter. Get Rudiments in. Check *whole* list again even the "out" ones.

When adding to list use secret, discreditable, unworthy in questions about new items as well as just asking for them.

If a list is still nul and even though all Rudiments are in and you are very sure they are and there are no more items by meter, go back to the beginning of the 3D form and check it out. The whole thing may have blown. Start again at any point where you get a consecutive read and do it all again. Example: Goal still in. Opp Term still in. OK, do an Opposition Goal list again. Anytime the goal is gone, get Rudiments in, check goal out. If it's still gone do a new goals assessment and continue.

Toward the end of clearing, this happens frequently that subsequent lists blow the goal and all. Eventually, not even a goal will stay in.

When looking for new goals *always* use the original list all over again and as added to from time to time. Always nul meter at sensitivity 16 on question asking for new goals.

SECURITY CHECKS

A pc should be security checked throughout being run on Routine 3D, by another auditor or frequently a session on a Security Check form only. Use standard forms.

Also do a Dynamic Assessment on pc and dream up a Security Check for that dynamic found or use eventual Dynamic Sec Check forms 11 to 18 inclusive when they have been created and issued.

Sec Checks should be given more time earlier on case than later. Whole track type checking will eventually become necessary.

COMMANDS

Command patterns for R 3D have not been completely worked out in formula at this writing.

RUDIMENTS

Slow or unsuccessful assessments occur because of:

1. Unskilled auditing.
2. Out Rudiments.

Before we learned it was Out Rudiments that hid goals and terminals, it was taking 3 months to find a goal! As it usually took me an hour or two, this long time for assessment exceeded my reality. I eventually pinned it down. It was Out Rudiments. As soon as I found that, I had auditors locating goals within 2 weeks of 2 1/2 hour per day sessions and sometimes both goal and terminal in that time.

R 3D is easier to do as it removes invalidation to a large extent even while assessing. But Rules 1 and 2 above are extremely important.

First in assessment is Accuracy.

Second in assessment is Speed.

Don't waste time in assessing but take all you need in getting Rudiments in and Sec Checking. That's saved time.

SUMMARY

Here is Routine 3D.

It takes a skilled auditor to use it. Be one. And make Clears!

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:esc.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

14—16 November 1961

- | | | |
|-------------|----------|----------------------|
| ** 6111C14 | SHSBC-79 | Routine 3D |
| ** 6111C15 | SHSBC-80 | Routine 3D Continued |
| ** 6 111C16 | SHSBC-81 | Points in Assessing |

Franchise

SEC CHECKING

Generalities Won't Do

The most efficient way to upset a pc is to leave a Sec Check question unflat. This is remedied by occasionally asking, "Has any Sec Check question been missed on you?" and getting what was missed flattened.

The best way to "miss" a Sec Check question is to let the pc indulge in generalities or "I thought"

A Sec Check question should be nulled at Sensitivity 16 as a final check.

A withhold given as "Oh, I got mad at them lots of times" should be pulled down to when and where and the first time "you got mad" and finally, "What did you do to them just before that?" Then you'll really get a nul.

The pc who withholds somebody else's withholds and gives them as answers is a card. But he isn't helped when the auditor lets him do it.

Situation: You ask the pc for a withhold about Joe. The pc who says, "I heard that Joe. . ." should be asked right there, "What have you done to Joe? You. Just you." And it turns out he stole Joe's last blonde. But if the auditor had let this pc go on and on about how the pc had heard how Joe was this or that, the session would have gone on and on and the Tone Arm up and up,

We have pcs who use "withholds" to spread all manner of lies. We ask this pc, "Have you ever done anything to the Org?" The pc says, "Well, I'm withholding that I heard . . ." or the pc says, "Well, I thought some bitter thoughts about the Org." Or the pc says, "I was critical of the Org when . . ." and we don't sail in and get **WHAT THE PC DID**, we can comfortably stretch a 5 minute item to a session or two.

If the pc "heard" and the pc "thought" and the pc "said" in answer to a Sec Check question, the pc's reactive bank is really saying, "I've got a crashing big withhold and if I can keep on fooling around by giving critical thoughts, rumours, and what others did, you'll never get it." And if he gets away with it, the auditor has missed a withhold question.

We only want to know what the pc did, when he did it, what was the first time he did it and what he did just before that, and we'll nail it every time.

The Irresponsible PC

If you want to get withholds off an "irresponsible pc" you sometimes can't ask what the pc did or withheld and get a meter reaction.

This problem has bugged us for some time. I finally got very bright and realized that no matter whether the pc thought it was a crime or not, he or she *will* answer up on "don't know" versions as follows:

Situation: "What have you done to your husband?" Pc's answer, "Nothing bad." E-Meter reaction, nul. Now we know this pc, through our noticing she is critical of her husband, has overts on him. But she can take no responsibility for her own acts.

But she *can* take responsibility for his *not knowing*. She is making certain of that.

So we ask, “What have you done that your husband doesn’t know about?”

And it takes an hour for her to spill it all, the quantity is so great. For the question releases the floodgates. The Meter bangs around.

And with these withholds off, her responsibility comes up and she *can* take responsibility on the items.

This applies to any zone or area or terminal of Sec Checking.

Situation: We are getting a lot of “I thought”, “I heard”, “They said”, “They did” in answer to a question. We take the terminal or terminals involved and put them in this blank.

“What have you done that ----- (doesn’t) (don’t) know about?”

And we can get the major overts that lay under the blanket of “How bad everyone is but me”.

This prevents you missing a Sec Check question. It’s a bad crime to do so. This will shorten the labour involved in getting every question flat.

Every session of Sec Checking you should ask the pc in the end rudiments, “Have I missed a Sec Check question on you?” In addition to “Are you withholding anything” and “half truths etc”.

And if your pc is very withholdy you can insert this “Have I missed a Sec Check question on you?” every few questions while doing a Sec Check.

Always clear up what was missed.

A pc can be very upset by reason of a missed Sec Check question. Keep them going up, not down.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :esc.cden
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Students

20 November 1961

ROUTINE 3D COMMANDS

I hasten to give you advanced information on Routine 3D Commands and use.

Do not be discouraged on 3D. The routine behaves in a most disconcerting way after Steps 1 to 5 are completed.

The preclear should experience an enormous case gain just by reason of assessment. However, the Tone Arm may, by assessment end, be reading higher than usual or the needle stickier than usual. Don't let this worry you as long as you're sure Ruds are in. You have, by assessment, brought into view the Goal Problem Mass.

If the pc has never had any mental masses before, he will have them now.

THE GOAL PROBLEM MASS

The goal has been baulked for eons by opposing forces. The goal pointed one way, the opposing forces point exactly opposite and against it.

If you took two fire hoses and pointed them at each other, their streams would not reach each other's nozzles, but would splatter against one another in mid air. If this splatter were to hang there, it would be a ball of messed up water.

Call Hose A the force the pc has used to execute his goal. Call Hose B the force other dynamics have used to oppose that goal. Where these two forces have perpetually met, a mental mass is created.

This is the picture of any *problem*—force opposing force with resultant mass.

Where the pc's goal meets constant opposition, you have in the reactive mind, the resultant mass caused by the two forces—goal=force of getting it done, opposition= force opposing it getting done.

This is the Goal Problem Mass. When contacted it raises the Tone Arm and sticks the needle.

In Routine 3 you did not run head on into this mass. You pushed around, more or less hit or miss, and may have keyed it out (on which you would have made a first dynamic clear) or you may have run into it and not keyed it out or erased it (at which time the case would have bungled along until it did key out).

In Routine 3D, the Goal Problem Mass is thrown into view in the assessment itself.

The running of the case keeps banging away at the Goal Problem Mass.

In Routine 3D, the Goal Problem Mass is erased, not keyed out.

METER BEHAVIOUR ON COMMANDS

In assessment, the relief afforded the case by discovery of the items of the Goal Problem Mass tends to keep the Tone Arm more or less down most of the time, even though assessment heads the pc more and more at the mass.

You may not be aware of this until you start to run your first Pre-Hav level. And then you may not get more than two or three commands in before the Tone Arm rises and sticks.

In any event, finish the bracket. By that time you will be sure the arm is stuck. The needle may still twitch in the pattern of the 3D Items. Ignore it. Except for that the needle too will look stuck.

Reassess the G + M terminal on the Pre-Hav Scale (never assess an opposition terminal) and form another bracket.

Once more stick the arm. It may go more or less commands than the earlier level. In any event the arm will shortly stick, the needle freeze and only the twitch characteristic of the level or the goal will be seen.

Reassess the G + M terminal on the Pre-Hav Scale. Once more form a bracket. Once more run it. And once more stick the Tone Arm and needle as above.

Continue to do this level by level. You will find pc's Tone Arm goes high and sticks. This is the Goals Problem Mass doing this. It is one of the bogs of the reactive bank. However, on subsequent runs you will notice that the pc's needle loosens faster after a level is finished and that the TA comes down quicker and lower after the level is flattened (even though the level appeared to stick it very hard indeed).

Eventually the G + M terminal is flat and levels if found produce neither a TA stick nor Tone Arm action.

Using the goal again, assess for a new 2, 3, 4 and 5 for that goal and try to run the result on the Pre-Hav Scale.

It is important to complete any 3D assessment started.

Get all 3D items. If you can find opposition terminals that react, you can find all subsequent items even if they are reacting minutely, for a Goals Problem Mass exists.

Assess on the Pre-Hav and run any item found just as above, no matter how minute the reactions are, level by level.

When you can no longer find even minutely active opposition terminals for the goal, with meter sensitivity at 16, assess for a new goal and repeat the whole procedure as above.

Do not be fooled into thinking that as there is a tiny reaction on a goal it can be left. *Any* reaction left *must* be run into a complete 3D, all steps.

The by-word in 3D is *once started, complete it all on all items.*

Also, there is no other process known that runs on the Auxiliary Pre-Have 3D Scale (HCO Bulletin of 23 Nov '61 or as amended) that will free a Goals Problem Mass.

TIPS ON ASSESSMENT

The task of assessment is to get the rudiments in, keep them in and make sure the pc is *in session* before assessing anything (or later, running anything).

Out rudiments stem from:

1. Withholds.
2. Present Time Problems.
3. Invalidation of Items.
4. Slow Assessment.
5. Distrust of Auditor.

All in that order of importance.

An ARC breaky pc is best handled by flattening Routine 1A (or as amended) complete with Sec Checks, before a 3D is attempted. This handles (1) Withholds and (2) Present Time Problems. It also handles to some extent (5) Distrust of Auditor.

In actuality the items, 3, 4 & 5 are dependent upon the auditor doing a fast, expert job of listing and assessing by elimination.

In assessing, the less chat with the pc the better. You want the lists. In goals and other items you want the discreditable ones by meter. In goals listing you want the withheld, anti-social, secret goals by meter. In others you want the “unseemly” or “discreditable” items by meter.

Once you’ve got a complete list by meter, that’s the list. You don’t add to it every time you cover it. You add, of course, things the pc asks you to add when he asks you, but always at the bottom of the list.

You always *add* to lists, using the oldest known list. You don’t make brand-new lists, discarding the old.

If rudiments out have killed all reads (the whole list nuls) you cover the *whole* list again, every item, when you’ve got the rudiments in again. Because a list nuls does not mean the wanted item isn’t on it. It means the rudiments were out. Get them in by Sec Checks and various means and do all items on the list newly as though never before nulled.

You can copy lists. You never discard them.

Keep present time or present life names off opposition terminals lists. They foul up the reading.

When you assess, do so briskly, saying the item three times, acknowledging the pc, saying if it’s in or out, marking it and going on to the next. You should be able to do 400 items per hour, new or old. It takes about 8 seconds to cover an item.

During nulling a pc should be made to sit back, relax and be silent. He can originate new additions. If he does, add them to list end, ack and go rapidly on. Don’t ask pc what he’s thinking about or looking at during assessment. An attitude of relaxed irresponsibility should be cultivated in the pc during nulling.

The target of the auditor is the pc’s Reactive Mind.

Once a list is made and complete by Meter, the auditor has the meter, himself and the reactive bank of the pc. That’s all he or she works with. Don’t ask any help from the pc. Never ask him for the answer. That makes him “help” and wrecks the nulling. The pc who has been brought by inexpertness to “help” is put on a self-audit of anxiety and the whole operation goes to pieces.

In “bleeding the meter” for more items on a list, beware of mistaking a reaction denoting ARC Break for more items present. Check by eliminating out all ARC Breaks.

Remember that when a pc has an ARC Break he is out of auditor control and an ARC Break question does not always react because the “rudiments are out”. To be sure you have to vary the ARC Break question. To be *very* sure, run a few ARC Break process commands varied to “Have you been unable to tell me something” and see if these react on the meter.

When a heavy ARC Break is present, the meter can remain inactive until the ARC Break is out. An ARC Break is the only rudiment that can be undetectable on the meter, as then the pc is totally undetectable *to the auditor* who is auditing him or her. Hence, nul rudiments, nul lists.

Best detection method for an ARC Break is to talk with the pc in a friendly way for a moment. Friendliness is greeted by friendliness, easy and unfeigned = no ARC Break. Friendliness greeted by no answer = ARC Break.

Pc not setting goals for session denotes heavy ARC Break. It will be heavy enough to nul the whole meter.

This is the only real frailty of an E-Meter. But it’s *humanly* detectable. Other 3D items are *not* humanly or spiritually detectable by *any* means other than a *good* meter. Telepathy and intuition used to locate 3D items are disastrous! Use the meter!

In end rudiments, for all sessions of assessment, or that had any session or level to be found, always add “Have you done anything to influence the E-Meter?” And clean it. Pcs, even Scientologists, try to *throw* assessments and *sell* items.

If you buy what the pc *thinks* it is, you’re sunk. So’s the pc. If you purchase *sells* done by finger flicks, etc, the pc is sunk indeed. 100 hours of wasted auditing has been traced to this on one pc.

25% of pcs will do “selling” by efforts to influence the meter, and wreck a 3D assessment in an effort to “help”.

Short session restive pcs. 2 sessions in 2 hours gives you 4 cracks at rudiments!

If you’re going to run 1A or Sec Checks or Problems Intensives on a pc, do it before you start Routine 3D. Only Sec Check when a 3D is in progress and *before you* start running levels.

A Sec Check question that always works when ordinary questions fail is “What have you done that _____ doesn’t know about?” And use various known proper names involved with the pc. This runs on *any* pc. Don’t abuse it. It’s the last shot in the locker.

TIPS ON RUNNING LEVELS

The Auxiliary Pre-Have Scale (HCO Bulletin 23 Nov ‘61 or as amended) is the correct 3D list of levels.

This is assessed by reading each item only once to the pc and reversing flows, terminal to pc, pc to terminal. Several levels can be called off on one flow without mentioning the terminal except on the first level of that flow.

Cover the whole list, one read each level. Use a symbol on each level that reacted. Go back up the list on only those levels that did react, reading levels only once each

time. Come back down, reading only those that reacted the second read, etc, until only one level is left.

Let the pc have his own Aux Scale in his folder. Note the level symbols and date on it each time it's used. Use different symbols each time you use it.

The Model Command (and the only one used for 3D) is:

WHAT HOW WHY (whichever makes the most sense for the level)

YOU-----> LEVEL-----> TERMINAL

TERMINAL-----> LEVEL-----> YOU

TERMINAL-----> LEVEL-----> OPPOSITION TERMINAL

OPPOSITION TERMINAL-----> LEVEL-----> TERMINAL

TERMINAL-----> LEVEL-----> SELF

Always use MIGHT in Commands.

Example: Pc's Terminal—Waterbuck.
Opposition Terminal—Tiger.
Level—Interest.

Commands:

How might you interest a Waterbuck?

How might a Waterbuck interest you?

How might a Waterbuck interest a Tiger?

How might a Tiger interest a Waterbuck?

How might a Waterbuck interest self?

In running 3D commands be as careful to get your rudiments in as if you were assessing.

RULES OF USING THE PROCESS

1. If an auditor can't assess accurately and quickly the obvious auditing error is that he or she can't read an E-Meter fully. Bad or slow assessments are best countered by (a) Getting the auditor the know-how to read a Meter and stop covering up his or her ignorance and (b) Getting the auditor through 3D on his or her own case.
2. The pc's goal and the opposition goal, taken together, look like a problem to anybody. The pc's terminal and the opposition terminal taken together look like a conflict.
3. *Never* suggest a 3D item to a pc or lead him by suggestion into one. Let the meter, listing and assessment find it. An auditor who suggests is covering up an inability to read a meter with confidence or is dramatizing.
4. *Always* complete a full 3D on anything you start, even when the needle is floating too free to be read. This applies to clears, half clears, new people, late in clearing and always. Complete a 3D in all sections. Always complete all 3D actions on any item that has been started on 3D, particularly past goals from Routine 3.
5. Don't take clearing for granted. Only when you, the auditor, have assessed and run out everything you can think of and have been unable to find any further way to halt a floating needle, should you state you've cleared someone and only then when you have watched the Life and Livingness activity of the case for three months after the end of auditing.

6. Until an auditor can do a perfect Class II auditing job, he or she should not attempt a 3D. All the skills needed in 3D are to be found in Class II activities—Sec Checking, rudiments, a Problems Intensive. When an auditor can do these *flawlessly*, it's time to permit him or her to run 3D. Yank a certificate if you find an unqualified auditor using Routine 3D. He'll kill somebody.
7. Always get a 3D item (sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) (except Pre-Hav levels) checked by another skilled auditor.
8. The moment you find the Pre-Hav Scale getting more items alive on any one assessment than it did on the previous assessment, scrap the run. Go back and complete everything from section 1 forward. There's an error of magnitude. Example: In assessing Interest, 10 other levels were alive. Next assessment, Withdraw, finds 38 levels alive. Wrong 3D Assessment or pc self-auditing on other terminals at home. If not latter, scrap the run.

ADMINISTRATION AND RECORDS

In doing 3D keep a pc's papers all in one folder. Don't be sloppy about it.

Keep the goals lists, Sec Checks, all 3D lists, a 3D form for the pc (filled in) and a Pre-Hav Scale for this pc only and auditor's reports and check sheets all together.

To lose a pc's records, not to make a proper clean copy of the goals list all in the pc's own words, to fail to keep the pc's 3D form or forms filled in to date, failure to keep all added assessment sheets, can result in a case ball-up of magnitude. You need these things.

The pc's own Pre-Hav and Have Scales must be marked in so anyone can tell if more levels came alive on subsequent runs.

One can't straighten out a pc's 3D run case without records. We have to do it on elsewhere assessed pcs all the time. (We have yet to find a correct assessment on Routine 3 here at Stihl where the pc was assessed elsewhere.)

Further, in filling out auditor's reports, use correct terminology. Don't call the Opposition Goal "The goal" or the Opposition Terminal "The terminal". Shorthand it if you wish, but so it can be understood. Opp goal, Opp term, Pc's Goal, Mod, G + M, are all valid symbols. Call an Opp goal a "goal" and a case reviewer can't figure out what you were doing.

Keep good records. It will save the cases of a lot of pcs even if they're mis-run. And you yourself will need them to run 3D.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:esc.rd
 Copyright © 1961
 by L. Ron Hubbard
 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES 21—22 November 1961

- | | | |
|------------|----------|---------------------|
| ** 6111C21 | SHSBC-82 | Running 3D |
| ** 6111C22 | SHSBC-83 | Reading the E-Meter |

Franchise

METER READING

A survey of auditing has brought up the datum that the gross auditing error in failure to obtain results from Security Checking and Problems Intensives lies wholly in the inability to read an E-Meter.

You may some day get a huge reality on the fact that, in supervising auditing, all failures are gross auditing errors, not fluke case differences.

Auditors one is supervising often demand “an extraordinary solution” because such and such a case isn’t moving. The unwise supervisor will actually furnish “extraordinary solution” after “extraordinary solution” “to handle this different case”. It may be John Jones who “cannot think of any changes in his life” or it may be Mary Smith who “just doesn’t respond to Security Checking”. And the supervisor burns the midnight oil and gives the auditor some new involved solution. Then as often as not, the auditor comes back the day after and says, “That didn’t work either.” And the supervisor goes a quarter around the bend and again burns the midnight oil If this seems familiar to you as a supervisor, know you *should* have asked, “*What* didn’t work?” Usually the auditor can’t even recall the solution—it was never used. Or it was applied in some strange fashion.

For *today*, the reasons for failure all lie under the heading “Gross Auditing Error”.

Such an error would be, the auditor never arrived for the session, the E-Meter was broken throughout, the pc hadn’t eaten or slept for three days, the din from construction next door made it impossible to give commands or hear answers. The auditor didn’t run any known process. That is the order of magnitude of a “GROSS AUDITING ERROR”. It is never, the pc was unhappy, the pc has difficulty remembering, etc. In supervising auditing, *always* look for the gross auditing error and *never* give out with an extra-ordinary solution.

Well, taking my own advice, when I saw some tricky elements in new clearing processes taking far too much time, I didn’t look for “different” pcs, I looked for the gross auditing error. And found it.

The auditors who were having trouble couldn’t read an E-Meter.

Impossible as that may seem, it proved to be true. I put Mary Sue on this at once and Herbie Parkhouse carried through. The errors found in E-Meter reading where there had been trouble, were so huge as to have been missed on any casual inspection.

The errors went like this:

1. The auditor believed the E-Meter could not be read while the needle was swinging around. The auditor was waiting until it stopped every time before asking a question.
2. The auditor believed the needle had to be exactly at “set” on the dial before it could be read.
3. The auditor did not know a rising needle could be read by stopping the rise with a question or making the needle twitch.

4. The auditor had not done the body reaction drills in *E-Meter Essentials* and was reading only body reactions and ignoring all others.
5. The auditor thought an E-Meter could not be read if it showed breathing or heart beat.
6. The auditor always looked at the pc for a few seconds after asking the question, then looked at the meter, and so missed all but latent (non-significant) reads.
7. The auditor sat staring at the meter for twenty seconds after the reading had registered.
8. The auditor thought E-Meters could be fooled so easily, it was more reliable to make up his own mind about what the pc's item or guilt was.
9. An auditor thought that if the needle rose on a rudiment question, the rudiment was out.

These and many, many more panned out to be:

IF A SECURITY CHECK OR PROBLEMS INTENSIVE WAS PRODUCING NO RESULTS, IT WAS BECAUSE THE AUDITOR COULD NOT READ AN E-METER.

That's the gross auditing error.

In this bulletin, I am not trying to give you any methods to remedy this. I am just calling it widely to everyone's attention.

The fact is big enough to merit study by itself.

And to get cases started by no other mechanism than learning to really read an E-Meter or by teaching people to read it.

This one point remedied could change the entire future of Scientology, an organization or an auditor.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: esc.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURE
23 November 1961

** 6111C23 SHSBC-84 Auxiliary Pre-Have: 3D Scale

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 23 NOVEMBER 1961

R 3D list
sthil Students

AUXILIARY PRE-HAVE 3D SCALE

For immediate assessment use on running 3D terminals. Do NOT use early scales for 3D assessment.

If you run out of levels, use secondary scales or Hartrampf's Vocabularies.

Do not abandon search for a level if the TA is high.

Always run a level to a stuck TA and needle. Never overrun a stuck TA by more than 20 minutes.

Do not leave a level that still shows TA action and needle movement. Do not consider the twitching of the otherwise motionless needle, when 3D items or the level is mentioned, a still moving needle.

Later in runs after many levels flat, when TA will no longer stick (or move) on levels, still look for a new level that will produce TA motion.

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 65. FAITH IN | 30. SURVIVE |
| 64. CAUSE | 27. FAILED IN IMPORTANCE TO |
| 63a. PREVENT KNOWING | 26. IMPORTANT TO |
| 63. NO EFFECT ON | 25. PROPITIATE |
| 62. EFFECT | 24. ATTENTION FOR |
| 61. OBSESSIVELY CAN'T HAVE | 23. SEPARATE FROM |
| 60a. MAKE SOMETHING OF | 22. FAILED TO WITHHOLD FROM |
| 60. CREATE | 21. WITHHOLD FROM |
| 59. THINK ABOUT | 19. DESTROY |
| 58. PECULIAR INTEREST IN | 18. MOTION OF |
| 57. DISPERSE | 17. FAILED TO ATTACK |
| 56. INTEND TO NOT COMMUNICATE | 16. ATTACK |
| 55. BADLY CONTROL | 15. DISLIKE |
| 54. BETRAY | 14. LIKE |
| 53. COLLECT FOR | 13. COMPETE WITH |
| 52. SUBSTITUTE FOR | 12. FAILED TO HELP |
| 51. WITHDRAW FROM | 11. HELP |
| 50. DUPLICATE | 10. FAILED TO CONTROL |
| 49. ENTER | 9. CONTROL |
| 48. INHIBIT | 7. FAILED TO COMMUNICATE |
| 47. DISAGREE WITH | 6. COMMUNICATE |
| 46. ENFORCE UPON | 5. FAILED TO INTEREST |
| 45. AGREE WITH | 4. INTEREST |
| 44. DESIRE | 3. CONNECT WITH |
| 43. KNOW | 1. HAVE |
| 42. FAILED TO ENDURE | FAIL |
| 41. ENDURE | REASON WITH |
| 38. ABANDON | CHALLENGE |
| 36. WASTE | POSTULATE |
| 35. FAILED TO PROTECT | MAKE BEAUTIFUL |
| 34. PROTECT | TORTURE |
| 33a. MAKE NOTHING OF | |

MAKE UGLY
PANIC
TERRORIZE
HORRIFY
MAKE SUCCUMB
FEEL AFFINITY FOR
NO AFFINITY FOR
START
TRY TO STOP
CHANGE
TRY NOT TO CHANGE
CALM
WIN
UNDERMINE
LOSE
CIVILIZE
DISTRUST
IMAGINE
SHOW CONTEMPT FOR
MAKE TRUE
BELIEVE
NOT BELIEVE
OWN ALL
DENY
OWN NOTHING
MAKE RESPONSIBLE
NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR
MAKE RIGHT
MAKE WRONG
TRY TO STAY WITH
ESCAPE FROM
THROW OUT OF CONTROL
ACCEPT
REJECT
DRIVE CRAZY
UNBALANCE
DEGRADE
TRY TO MAKE GUILTY
BRUTALIZE
EXHIBIT
BURY
PAIN
WOUND
MAKE APATHETIC
MOURN FOR
PLEAD WITH

IDOLIZE
LIFT
DROP
PUSH
PULL
RAISE
LOWER
CLOSE WITH
EXPOSE
SCORN
PUNISH
CRUSH
MAKE EAGER
MAKE RESPONSIVE
MAKE CONTENT
SCANDALIZE
BE INDIFFERENT
LOVE
SPURN
NEGLECT
SUPPLICATE
EVADE
IDENTIFY
ASSOCIATE WITH
IMPRESS
GET NO RESPONSE FROM
KILL
REVIVE
RESIST
CONTRIBUTE TO
CONTACT
DEPRIVE
MOVE
HUMBLE
RUIN
ENNOBLE
CONFUSE
DISABLE
EDUCATE
SICKEN
SHUN
SLANDER
INJURE
BE WITH
TAKE AWAY FROM
PART FROM

CONTINUE
CRITICIZE
PITY
AVOID
PRESERVE
LOSE
FIND
USE
DEFY
ADJUST
THREATEN
MAKE SERIOUS
HURT
MAKE IRRESOLUTE
DOUBT
CONSIDER
REMEMBER
OCCLUDE
RECEIVE
MAKE UNCONSCIOUS
DIFFERENTIATE
IDENTIFY
DISASSOCIATE FROM
EAT
SEXUALLY SATISFY
SEXUALLY AROUSE
SEXUALLY REPRESS
CREATE A MYSTERY FOR
TROUBLE
WORRY
FOOL
GET INTO
GET OUT OF
APPROACH
FORCE
ENERGIZE
FREE
DREAM ABOUT
ASSOCIATE WITH
SATIATE (SATISFY)
LOOK AT
CONVINCE
LIE TO
FIXATE
ENTHRALL

ENTRANCE
FEEL
TOUCH
SMELL
PERCEIVE
HEAR
SPEAK TO
ENJOY
HOLD OFF
ATTRACT
DEFEND
HARASS
NAG
HEAL
DISTRUST
DESPISE
PROBLEM ABOUT
DISLOCATE
DENY
UNKNOWN
FORGET
NOT KNOW
HIDE
NEED
APPROVE
OWN
SHAME
BLAME
REGRET
FAIL
MAKE AMENDS
GRIEVE
SYMPATHIZE WITH
FEAR
RESENT
FEEL NO SYMPATHY FOR
ANGER
ANTAGONIZE
BORE
CONSERVE
ENTHUSE
EXHILARATE
TRUST
MAKE SERENE

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:esc.bh
Copyright Q 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Special Briefing Course

27 November 1961

ROUTINE 3D COMMAND SHEET

(Use No Other Commands for Routine 3D)

Preclear _____ Date _____

Auditor _____

LEVEL _____ TERMINAL _____ OPP TERM _____

1. TELL ME A PROBLEM YOU MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH AN (term)_____.
2. HOW MIGHT (phlev)_____ HAVE BEEN A SOLUTION TO THAT PROBLEM?
3. TELL ME A PROBLEM (term)_____ MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH YOU.
4. HOW MIGHT (phlev)_____ HAVE BEEN A SOLUTION TO THAT PROBLEM?
5. TELL ME A PROBLEM AN (term)_____ MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH AN (opp term)_____.
6. HOW MIGHT (phlev)_____ HAVE BEEN A SOLUTION TO THAT PROBLEM?
7. TELL ME A PROBLEM AN (opp term)_____ MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH AN (term)_____.
8. HOW MIGHT (phlev)_____ HAVE BEEN A SOLUTION TO THAT PROBLEM?
9. TELL ME A PROBLEM AN (opp term)_____ MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH YOU.
10. HOW MIGHT (phlev)_____ HAVE BEEN A SOLUTION TO THAT PROBLEM?
11. TELL ME A PROBLEM YOU MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH AN (opp term)_____.
12. HOW MIGHT (phlev)_____ HAVE BEEN A SOLUTION TO THAT PROBLEM?

**RUN LIBERAL QUANTITIES OF PC'S HAVINGNESS PROCESS
WHENEVER THIS PROCESS OR SESSION IS ENDED.**

Run to a stuck Tone Arm and test for 15 minutes. Or run all motion out of the TA. Use a new sheet for every pre-hav level.

Mark all pre-hav levels found into the pc's 3D form.

Get rudiments in before every session. It is as important to get rudiments in and keep them in for a 3D run as it is for 3D assessment.

Note: This process can be overrun for an hour without damage to the pc. It cannot be overrun by a session or two and still have the needle loose for assessment. TA motion may be slow and sluggish long before process is flat.

Note: So far on all tests I have made this is the only process that will bring the Tone Arm down in anything like a reasonable time. IF OTHER LEVELS HAVE BEEN PREVIOUSLY RUN ON OTHER PROCESSES, RUN THEM CONSECUTIVELY IN THE ORIGINAL ORDER AGAIN, USING THIS PROCESS. The first run on another process did no damage to the pc but will help this one flatten faster.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:lrh.rd

Copyright © 1961

by L. Ron Hubbard

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED [To be deleted per *Routine 3D Improved Commands of 28 Nov 61.*]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

Special Briefing Course

Preclear _____ Date _____ LEVEL _____
Auditor _____ TERMINAL _____
OPP TERMINAL _____

ROUTINE 3D IMPROVED COMMANDS OF 28 NOV 61
(Discard or delete all earlier command data)

Note: RUN ONLY AFTER ARC PROCESS IS FLAT TO A STILL ARM, NEEDLE AT SET, 20 MINUTES TEST. RUN THESE COMMANDS TO A STILL ARM, NEEDLE AT SET, 20 MINUTES TEST. GET RUDIMENTS IN THOROUGHLY BEFORE RUNNING, EVEN BETTER THAN IN ASSESSMENT. RUN PC'S HAVINGNESS COMMAND LIBERALLY DURING PROCESS, AFTER PROCESS, AFTER END RUDS.

Info: 3D LEVELS CAN BE RUN CONSECUTIVELY OVER AND OVER ON DIFFERENT PROCESSES.

1. TELL ME A PROBLEM YOU MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH AN (term)_____.
2. HOW MIGHT (phlev)_____ HAVE BEEN A SOLUTION TO THAT PROBLEM?
3. TELL ME A PROBLEM (term)_____ MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH YOU.
4. HOW MIGHT (phlev)_____ HAVE BEEN A SOLUTION TO THAT PROBLEM?
5. TELL ME A PROBLEM AN (term)_____ MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH AN (opp term)_____.
6. HOW MIGHT (phlev)_____ HAVE BEEN A SOLUTION TO THAT PROBLEM?
7. TELL ME A PROBLEM AN (opp term)_____ MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH AN (term)_____.
8. HOW MIGHT (phlev)_____ HAVE BEEN A SOLUTION TO THAT PROBLEM?
9. TELL ME A PROBLEM AN (opp term)_____ MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH YOU.
10. HOW MIGHT (phlev)_____ HAVE BEEN A SOLUTION TO THAT PROBLEM?
11. TELL ME A PROBLEM YOU MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH AN (opp term)_____.
12. HOW MIGHT (phlev)_____ HAVE BEEN A SOLUTION TO THAT PROBLEM?
13. TELL ME A PROBLEM OTHERS MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH A (term)_____.
14. HOW MIGHT (phlev)_____ HAVE BEEN A SOLUTION TO THAT PROBLEM?
15. TELL ME A PROBLEM A (term)_____ MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH OTHERS.
16. HOW MIGHT (phlev)_____ HAVE BEEN A SOLUTION TO THAT PROBLEM?

AFTER ASSESSING CLEAR THE LEVEL WITH THE PC FOR USE IN THE COMMANDS AND MAKE SURE THE VERSION OF THE LEVEL THAT YOU USE ALSO REACTS ON THE METER LIKE THE ASSESSED LEVEL DID.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:lrh.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[To be deleted per *Routine 3D Improved Commands of November 30, 1961*, page 441.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 29 NOVEMBER 1961

Sthil
Franchise
CenOCon
BPI

CLASS OF AUDITORS

(Adds to HCO Pol Ltr of Sept 29, 1961—“HGC Allowed Processes”)

All auditors shall be considered Class I until validated Class II by a Saint Hill Graduate or a Central Organization or at Saint Hill.

Classification as Class II may not be awarded by any class. It may be attained only by severe practical demonstration, and oral examination by an HCO Secretary or an appointee of HCO.

Class II auditors trained by anyone may not have pay status as Class II in a Central Organization until given a complete examination after going on staff by the HCO Area Secretary, regardless of any earlier examination. The only exception is a Saint Hill Graduate who has been specifically examined and specifically designated as Class II by HCO examiners at Saint Hill.

No auditor may be designated as or draw pay in a Central Organization as a Class III auditor unless first designated Class II and thereafter passing all examinations for Class III under the tutelage of a Saint Hill Graduate and operating as a Class III auditor. A Class III auditor must have successfully and correctly assessed and run preclears. Class III auditors must be examined and their preclears examined by HCO before the award of Class III is given.

A Class II auditor may assess and run advanced procedures only under the close personal supervision of a Saint Hill Graduate, and not by mail, telegrams or long distance telephone, but personally.

At Saint Hill all enrollees will be trained up to and examined as Class II auditors on arrival, regardless of any earlier training by anyone or any organization. No assessment or advanced procedures may be run by the Saint Hill trainee before Class II classification is awarded and only then under the closest supervision. When examined for Class II the passing grade is *perfect*.

(It follows that persons earlier classified as Class II will be able to reach Class II much more rapidly at Saint Hill. It also follows that a field classification as Class II may be able to reach Class II more rapidly in a Central Organization. But prior classification has no bearing on the Saint Hill Course and field classification has no bearing on Central Organization or City Office classification.)

Unauthorized Processes

Any auditor found using Class III skills in violation of the above shall be subject to suspension of certificate and, if continuing in fault, subject to public warning and revocation of all certificates and awards.

Serious damage can be done to Scientology and preclears by unauthorized use of Routine 3, 3A and 3D.

While no penalty attaches to a Class I auditor trying to Security Check and running Problems Intensives, he or she should clearly understand that all pc upset in their area is traceable to inexperienced handling of Security Checks.

Class I auditors are free to handle and use any procedure earlier than Security Checking (or October 1, 1960) except "Step 6" and Creative Processes.

Class I auditors are urged to obtain Class II classification as soon as possible in order to increase their results and minimize area disturbance. Good use of Class II skills gives wins. Use by persons not yet classified gives loses. Any inexpert use of Class III skills can be ruinous by actual test. We have, in Class III skills, for the first time violated the maxim that any auditing is better than no auditing. This is still true of processes prior to October 1, 1960. With clearing at speed has come liability of misuse. If we're going to have clears, we must have accurate Class III auditors.

Appended to these policies it is understood that Class II and Class III auditing will be done only on British Mark IV E-Meters or as improved. The discovery that 1958-59-60 and 61 American meters are wholly unsuitable for clearing and that squirrel meters are even less useful, makes it mandatory upon us, in order to guarantee any result, to insist upon the use only of meters I have supervised in construction and which have been tested after manufacture by HCO WW. The only American meter suitable for clearing was the 1957 blue meter I supervised. Unknown to me the pattern was thereafter altered. The only suitable U.K. meters prior to the Mark IV were the "Green and Gold" ACC Meter actually used on that London ACC, the Mark I, the Mark II, and the Mark III. I cannot guarantee any meter I did not check on. This is not a commercial statement. It is a vital fact in clearing. Therefore Class II and III auditors may not be classified as such unless they own or are issued a British Mark IV (or improved) E-Meter checked out by HCO WW.

These policies are vital and are binding on receipt.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:esc.cden
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES
28—30 November 1961

** 6111C28	SHSBC-85	Havingness
** 6111C29	SHSBC-86	E-Meter Tips
** 6111C30	SHSBC-87	Parts of 3D

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

Special Briefing Course

ROUTINE 3D IMPROVED COMMANDS OF NOVEMBER 30, 1961

(Discard or delete all earlier command data)

Note: RUN ONLY AFTER ARC PROCESS IS FLAT TO A STILL ARM, NEEDLE AT SET, 20 MINUTES TEST. RUN THESE COMMANDS TO A STILL ARM, NEEDLE AT SET, 20 MINUTES TEST. GET RUDIMENTS IN THOROUGHLY BEFORE RUNNING, EVEN BETTER THAN IN ASSESSMENT. RUN PC'S HAVINGNESS COMMAND LIBERALLY DURING PROCESS, AFTER PROCESS, AFTER END RUDS.

Info: 3D LEVELS CAN BE RUN CONSECUTIVELY OVER AND OVER ON DIFFERENT PROCESSES .

1. TELL ME A PROBLEM YOU MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH AN (term)_____.
2. HOW MIGHT (phlev)_____HAVE BEEN A SOLUTION TO THAT PROBLEM?
3. TELL ME A PROBLEM (term)_____MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH YOU.
4. HOW MIGHT (phlev)_____HAVE BEEN A SOLUTION TO THAT PROBLEM?
5. TELL ME A PROBLEM A (term)_____MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH A (opp term)_____.
6. HOW MIGHT (phlev)_____HAVE BEEN A SOLUTION TO THAT PROBLEM?
7. TELL ME A PROBLEM A (opp term)_____MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH A (term)_____.
8. HOW MIGHT (phlev)_____HAVE BEEN A SOLUTION TO THAT PROBLEM?
9. TELL ME A PROBLEM A (term)_____MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH ANOTHER (term)_____.
10. HOW MIGHT (phlev)_____HAVE BEEN A SOLUTION TO THAT PROBLEM?
11. TELL ME A PROBLEM ANOTHER (term)_____ MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH A (term)_____.
12. HOW MIGHT (phlev)_____HAVE BEEN A SOLUTION TO THAT PROBLEM?
13. TELL ME A PROBLEM (oppterm)_____ MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH YOU.
14. HOW MIGHT (phlev)_____HAVE BEEN A SOLUTION TO THAT PROBLEM?
15. TELL ME A PROBLEM YOU MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH A (oppterm)_____.
16. HOW MIGHT (phlev)_____HAVE BEEN A SOLUTION TO THAT PROBLEM?

(Note: Commands 13 & 15 may be term-others or oppterm-you, a tougher version.)

AFTER ASSESSING CLEAR THE LEVEL WITH THE PC FOR ORDER OF MAGNITUDE OF LEVEL AND MAKE SURE THE VERSION OF THE LEVEL THAT YOU USE ALSO REACTS ON THE METER LIKE THE ASSESSED LEVEL DID AND MAKES SENSE TO THE PC IN THE COMMAND.

LRH: esc.rd
copyright ©1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L RON HUBBARD

Franchise

ARC PROCESS 1961

IMPORTANT: FLATTEN THIS PROCESS ON ALL NEW PRECLEARS, HGC PRECLEARS, RAW MEAT PRECLEARS BEFORE DOING ANYTHING ELSE IN ORDER TO KEEP THEM MORE EASILY IN SESSION AND TO GET YOUR E-METER TO READ. THE E-METER KNOWS BEST ON EVERYTHING BUT ARC BREAKS.

An E-Meter has a frailty I have just discovered. It operates only if the auditor has some, even small, command value over the pc, and operates hardly at all when the auditor has no command value over the pc. Thus rudiments go out only on the ARC break section. When this is out nothing registers on the E-Meter including a casual question about an ARC break. Thus the E-Meter must be supplanted by an auditor's ability to recognize the existence of an ARC break. But once this is out of the way, the E-Meter is superior to any "knowingness" on the part of the auditor. With this reservation concerning registry of ARC breaks, the meter knows best, and auditors who think they know more than the E-Meter do nothing but get pcs in trouble. But conversely, the auditor who, on asking for ARC breaks (alone), thinks that the E-Meter knows more than he or she does will also err. WHEN THE PC HAS A SEVERE ARC BREAK IT WILL NOT REGISTER WHEN ASKED FOR ON THE E-METER, AND NOTHING ELSE WILL REGISTER EITHER. SO BE SURE THE PC IS WILLING AND ABLE TO TALK TO THE AUDITOR AFTER DOING GOALS AND BEFORE DOING ROOM, WITHHOLDS AND PTPS. MODEL SESSION WILL SHORTLY BE RE-WRITTEN TO ACCOMMODATE THIS AND THE NEW END QUESTION, "Have you done anything in this session to influence the E-Meter?" and Untruths.

FLATTEN THE FOLLOWING:

Do each question several times by itself in order to get off any triggered automaticities and to let the pc get through any misemotion. Then do the whole sequence one time each, over and over consecutively. GET ALL TONE ARM MOTION OFF THE CONSECUTIVE RUN BEFORE LEAVING PROCESS. Run this process more or less muzzled. Get session started, set goals and Life and Livingness. Then run this process:

1. WHO HAVEN'T YOU BEEN WILLING OR ABLE TO TALK TO ABOUT YOUR DIFFICULTIES?
2. WHO COULD YOU HAVE TALKED TO ABOUT YOUR DIFFICULTIES?
3. WHOSE DIFFICULTIES HAVEN'T YOU WANTED TO HEAR ABOUT?
4. WHOSE DIFFICULTIES HAVE YOU BEEN WILLING TO LISTEN TO?

This process is run to a still Tone Arm for 20 minutes with needle kept at set.

FUTURE RUDIMENTS QUESTION IN LIEU OF AUDITOR AND ARC BREAK:

"DO YOU FEEL WILLING TO TALK TO ME ABOUT YOUR CASE?"

If negative, run above.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:esc.vm:rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

sthil

RUNNING 3D LEVELS

To run a terminal found by 3D, you use ONLY the commands of 30 November 1961. Use NO OTHER Commands. The old 5-way bracket, any other bracket system, a two-way bracket WILL ONLY GET YOUR PC IN TROUBLE. You are sending the pc up against the core of the reactive bank, the Goals Problem Mass, and so far as auditing commands are concerned, only the commands of 27, 28 and 30 Nov are able to get him *through*. The 30 Nov commands are best.

The Goals Problem Mass is a problem in structure. It is so tough you have to run the *top* off of it. This is done by 3D level runs. Dating bits of it might work. Prior confusion will not work early in it. All other known command routine combinations in Scientology do not phase it at all. Clears went unclear because the Goals Problem Mass could come back in. So we can only run it. And so far only 30 Nov commands run it out. To use other previous command combinations, as used in Routine 3, can get your pc in trouble because you must use the opposition terminal and keep the mass in to be run.

To run levels on 3D terminal and “oppterm” (opposition terminal) do this:

1. Be sure the 3D items you are running are right by careful cross-checking and various two-way comm and height of PH level tests.
2. Be sure the “story” is right and that you really have the pc running his own terminal, not the oppterm. The story is logical. The oppterm *can* be run but it subjects the pc to more duress than needed and turns on the “winds of space”.
3. Use the Auxiliary Pre-Have Scale for 3D only, or as supplemented. Use for test the first 65 levels for “height of terminal”. Use the whole Auxiliary Scale for assessment of level to be run.
4. Check out 30 Nov commands for “problem” “situation” etc as will be released (the exact original version will work anyway).
5. Check out the found item for *intensity* and wording. Make sure the command will be answerable by the pc.
6. Run the level to a stuck needle, stuck TA and test for 10 or 20 minutes. (TA shifts because of body motion don’t count.)
7. Regardless of any needle action the level already run still gets, assess again on Aux PH and run the next level.
8. Run 6, 8 or 12 levels in this fashion, disregarding the fact that the needle may still twitch when a past level is mentioned. The rule here *could* be to run to “difficult Aux PH assessment”. I don’t know this yet; I do know you need lots of levels run to stuck TA, stuck needle. This early first run can stick *fast* (sometimes in 2 commands, but you always complete a bracket. It does no harm to do 2 or 3 more brackets, though the pc will get uncomfortable). (It sometimes takes a session or two to get the pc to approach the Goals Problem Mass. You always run it muzzled. The pc will get there.) (If nothing sticks, on this first run of levels in a series, your 3D assessment is for the loons and cormorants. You should know this when the first level *won’t* stick.)

RERUNS

9. Now having run a series of levels, you stick the final one and then go back and test the first level you found and ran. You see if it twitches on the needle. If it does, you run it again to a stuck TA, stuck needle, you leave it and check the next level. You take, in sequence, each level you can get to react by observing the needle as you say it and rerun it. You complete all levels this way.

THIRD RUN OF LEVELS

10. You now go back and repeat 9 as a Third run of levels.
11. You now assess for more Aux PH levels. Each time, however, before you run a new level, you recheck all former levels for an already run level still kicking.

This is a sort of wash out by levels in sequence. You must always run levels in sequence. On the second and third run you can skip nul levels, but always test and run in sequence. It doesn't matter how many times a level gets run. It does matter if you leave it before the needle and TA stick on the first and second and third run. You leave a level too live and it upsets the pc. You kill it too dead (by running a stuck TA and needle for a session or more after it sticks) and either way you get trouble.

Eventually all levels assessed will have to be flat, nul and went.

Stable data on 3D level runs:

Accurate assessment of items and levels makes Clears. Inaccurate assessment gives you a bad reputation and will sow all the trouble germs you'd ever want.

Always complete whatever you start. If an R3 was started, complete it by 3D using all existing parts *that check out* (use as much of an R3 as you can) (this contradicts the 1st B. on 3D but is right, I find). If a person was cleared on R3, use all R3 items used or run to assemble a 3D and run it according to book.

Only the assembly of the "story" is subject to judgment on 3D. All other 3D actions are by the book.

Me, you and the Mark IV Meter got it licked.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:esc.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES

5—6 December 1961

- | | | |
|------------|----------|----------------------|
| ** 6112C05 | SHSBC-88 | Assessing 3D |
| ** 6112C06 | SHSBC-89 | Sec Checks Necessary |

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 7 DECEMBER 1961

Sthil
Franchise
CenOCon

SEC CHECKS VITAL

It has been brought home to me by careful study of many cases that Security Checks and Problems Intensives are vital to easy assessment and accurate clearing by the new and very important Routine 3D.

The command value of the auditor over the pc, the response value to life and present time of the pc have been so low in all cases studied who have not had Sec Checking that *it is a waste of auditing time* not to give a pc at least a Sec Check and a Problems Intensive before attempting assessment.

It may take up to 200 hours to assess some 'raw meat' accurately on Routine 3D, and that with a magnifying glass on the E-Meter.

It may take up to 75 hours to assess on Routine 3D a Scientologist or processed person who has not been given 1A or a Problems Intensive or a thorough Security Check on a standard Pol Ltr form.

I can state, and your experience will bear out, that it is wasted time and causes agony to the pc to do a clearing 3D assessment on a person who has not had:

1. Sec Checks Standard Forms.
2. A Problems Intensive.
3. The ARC Process 1961.
4. Countless cracks at the rudiments through being given 1 and 2.

To do these may require up to 100 hours of auditing. To try to assess accurately through the messes of withholds, hidden standards and PTPs of the preclear will require up to 100 hours and *may* arrive at an improper assessment which will waste all the preclear's auditing—and painful auditing it was.

Now the Scientologist with his prior processing moves into his or her own. It all counts. Scientologists are *easier* to assess by half. Raw meat is either unassessable or assessable with difficulty unless the auditor has enormous altitude.

If anyone thinks he is saving time getting assessed for clear at once, let him or her think again. The whole period may be wasted and nothing come of it *because*:

The whole of the preliminary steps may have to be done anyway after assessment if not done before to let the pc survive 'going through the knothole', which is to say, running Routine 3D levels.

These are very hard to get through. Only one pat set of commands (Nov 30, 1961) get a pc moving through to Dynamic Clear.

Now as to auditor training, no auditor who does not have a quick enough eye and Meter experience enough to Security Check and run a Problems Intensive will ever be able to do an accurate Routine 3D Assessment.

Therefore it is economy to train an auditor to Class II level before permitting him or her to assess.

Class II requires a high ability on the Meter, perfect Model Session, TRs and a perfect knowledge of Sec Checking.

Sec Check Meter reactions are larger than 3D Assessment reactions. If an auditor cannot Sec Check, he or she surely can't read a 3D Meter Assessment.

A pc being given a Routine 3D Assessment for clear by an auditor who has no perfect rating on the Meter is in for endless wasted hours of upset and misery. These might better be spent on Rising Scale or Class I processes (all processes up to February 1961, really). ARC Straight Wire, 'Something you wouldn't mind forgetting' or even old Dianetic Engram running would do more for the pc than *fumbling* assessment. *Accurate* fast assessment does marvels for a case, but only if done by an accurate fast auditor.

Class II skills of Sec Checking, Problems Intensives, or even Routine 1A, produce definite plus gains for the pc, greater than those obtainable by Class I if done by an expert Class II auditor.

A Class III auditor can only become one if he or she has already become a Class II by examination and you have a rapid assessment on new Routine 3D toward a high stability as clear—providing that the pc has also had Sec Checks and other preparatory processes.

So there it is. Economy in auditing time entails the auditor becoming a Class II by examination and the pc becoming fit to be assessed through Class II skills. Very neat.

Micawber, a creation of my old friend Dickens, used to claim that twenty shillings earned, nineteen and six spent brought happiness, but that twenty shillings earned and twenty-one spent brought MISERY. I can paraphrase him broadly by saying, Class II skills reached by auditor and attained by pc bring happiness. Class I skills on Class III processes bring misery to auditor and pc alike.

In signing up anyone for auditing, in delivering any auditing, please point out these facts, please?

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :esc.cden
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES
7—12 December 1961

- | | | |
|------------|----------|--------------------------|
| ** 6112C07 | SHSBC-90 | Expectancy of 3D |
| ** 6112C12 | SHSBC-91 | Sec Checks in Processing |

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
RUN NO.

Special
Briefing
Course

7 December 1961

COMMAND SHEET FOR ROUTINE 3D

Preclear _____ Date _____ TERMINAL _____

Auditor _____ Level _____ OPP TERMINAL _____

Level Number _____ Levels alive this time on PHSc _____

RUN COMMANDS CONSECUTIVELY. MAKE SURE EVERY ONE IS ANSWERED. RUN WITH THE RUDS IN, DO NOT RUN WITH RUDIMENTS OUT. Use plenty of havingness. Flatten to still TA and still needle for 20 minutes if TA goes up and sticks. If TA does not stick, run to a completely inactive Tone Arm and be sure neither goal nor modifier react on retest. Carefully keep rudiments in during run. Carefully keep pc's havingness up.

METER TEST THE FOLLOWING WORDS AND USE MOST REACTING WORD AFTER "TELL ME" AND "THAT". PROBLEM SITUATION DIFFICULTY CONFUSION MESS TROUBLE OTHER:

METER TEST THE FOLLOWING AND USE MOST REACTING WORD AFTER "MIGHT" IN EVEN NUMBERS. SOLUTION SOLVED MADE OKAY CURED FINISHED ENDED OTHER:

(Make Commands make sense. Add ING to ph level if necessary in clearing command.)

COMMENTS AND ASSESSMENT

TELL ME A _____ YOU MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH A (term) _____.

HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE _____ THAT _____?

TELL ME A _____ A (term) _____ MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH YOU.

HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE _____ THAT _____?

TELL ME A _____ A (term) _____ MIGHT HAVE HAD
WITH ANOTHER (term) _____.

HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE _____ THAT _____?

TELL ME A _____ ANOTHER (term) _____ MIGHT HAVE
HAD WITH A (term) _____.

HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE _____ THAT _____?

TELL ME A _____ A (term) _____ MIGHT HAVE HAD
WITH ANOTHER (oppterm) _____.

HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE _____ THAT _____?

TELL ME A _____ A (oppterm) _____ MIGHT HAVE HAD
WITH A (term) _____.

HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE _____ THAT _____?

TELL ME A _____ A (term) _____ MIGHT HAVE HAD
WITH OTHERS (term) _____.

HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE _____ THAT _____?

TELL ME A _____ OTHERS (term) _____ MIGHT HAVE
HAD WITH A (oppterm) _____.

HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE _____ THAT _____?

TELL ME A _____ A (term) _____ MIGHT HAVE HAD
WITH OTHERS.

HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE _____ THAT _____?

TELL ME A _____ OTHERS _____ MIGHT HAVE HAD
WITH A (term) _____.

HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE _____ THAT _____?

TELL ME A _____ YOU MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH A
(oppterm) _____.

HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE _____ THAT _____?

TELL ME A _____ A (oppterm) _____ MIGHT HAVE HAD
WITH YOU.

HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE _____ THAT _____?

TELL ME A _____ YOU MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH YOU.

HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE _____ THAT _____?

TELL ME A _____ YOU MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH OTHERS.

HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE _____ THAT _____?

TELL ME A _____ OTHERS MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH YOU.

HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE _____ THAT _____?

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:esc.vmm.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Tech Depts
Franchise

VARYING SEC CHECK QUESTIONS

You only vary a sec check question when by repeating it you would create an impasse.

Example:	“Have you stolen anything?”	“Yes, an apple.”
	“Good. Have you stolen anything?”	“No.”
	“Good. (Look at meter.) Have you stolen anything?”	“No. “ (Meter reacts.)

NOW vary the question.

And always end by making sure the *original* question “Have you stolen anything?” is nul.

This *all* comes under the heading of getting one auditing question answered before you ask a second.

If you create an impasse you will pile up missed withholds, throw ruds out and really mess it up. Therefore, until you *do* find out what the answer was on a sec check question, you do NOT repeat the question—only variations (except to test for nul after getting a withhold) until the meter nuls on the first question.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: esc.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Franchise

RUDIMENTS MODERNIZED

I have been threatening to give you new rudiments questions for months. I am finally satisfied with their form and use and here they are.

The demands made on an auditing session by the new value and workability of Process Checks (Sec Checking), Problems Intensives and especially 3D have made it necessary to upgrade the form and use of rudiments.

For auditing to take place at all, the pc must be IN SESSION, i.e. willing to talk to the auditor, *and* interested in own case: the new Rudiment question "Do you feel willing to talk to me about your case?" can give the auditor an idea as to whether the pc is likely to go into session or not and can, if any reaction to the question is followed up, indicate whether the pc is ARC broken or is withholding.

Where an ARC break is found or is stated by the pc, probably the speediest method of handling is to locate the Prior Confusion to the disagreement—or whatever caused the ARC break—and run a Sec Check form of O/W (without mentioning any terminal in any way); e.g. clear, by Sec Check type questioning, this question, "During that confusion what did you do wrong?", then—when that no longer reacts—"During that confusion, what did you withhold?" This brings up the little (and big) overts and withholds which precede ARC breaks AND PTPs and, indeed, this Sec Check type O/W on Prior Confusions can be used on *any* out Rudiment to which it can be applied. When the meter shows no further reaction to overt or withhold, the Rudiment question is asked again and if a reaction shows, repeat procedure.

Where a pc is extremely prone to out Rudiments, lots of pc's HAVINGNESS process (or TR 10) can help, also an extended run on ARC Process 1961 (HCO B of Nov 30, 1961) run to a motionless Tone Arm for, say, 15-20 minutes. This can be followed by general O/W: "What have you done?"—"What have you withheld?" Also self O/W "What have you done to yourself?"—"What have you withheld from yourself?"

Prerequisites to all this in the auditor, of course, are technical excellence in TRs, E-Meter reading, and ability to control the pc with ARC, so that the pc will assign command value to the auditor.

To maintain Rudiments, auditors must be thoroughly familiar with the following listed HCO Bulletins:

November 30, 1961	—	ARC Process 1961.
November 23, 1961	—	Meter Reading.
November 16, 1961	—	Sec Checking.
November 2, 1961	—	The Prior Confusion.
October 19, 1961	—	Security Questions Must Be Nulled.
October 9, 1961	—	Rudiments, Change in.

There are many more Bulletins, tapes and publications on this subject.

On the actual Rudiments questions, if the rudiments are believed to be out, it should be remembered that each question should be asked in several different ways, to make sure that the question is thoroughly understood, and so that the pc's reality on the meaning of the question is reached.

It should be remembered that the whole meter can go out if ARC break is present. It alone does not read on the meter (ARC Process 1961) when very severe.

Any havingness process which loosens the needle can be used to handle any other rudiment.

A rudiment question can get a needle reaction if the pc is ARC broken about getting on with session. One clears this and asks the question again.

Out rudiments, on assessing for the changes in a Problems Intensive or 3D can cause everything to nul. The remedy is to get the ruds in and go over the list again with ruds in, at least from the point where ruds went out.

In 3D, the test before running a level or assessing is to repeat a known 3D item that has been found and proved to the pc. If it doesn't react, rudiments are out. Get ruds in until item reacts before continuing assessment or a level.

Out rudiments are the sole cause of difficulty in finding goals and other 3D items. It is a saving of time to run a pc on Processing Checks, and other preparatory measures for as much as 75 hours before an assessment is done. By that time rudiments can be kept in and needle response should be adequate for assessment.

Rudiments at the beginning of session involve:

1. Setting Goals.
2. Getting pc comfortable in environment.
3. Getting pc willing to talk to auditor about pc's own case.
4. Getting off withholds.
5. Checking for and handling PTPs.

The above are the Beginning Rudiments. One humanly detects No. 3. All others are handled by meter only. Excepting No. 3, in rudiments, if the others do not react you do not handle, but get on with session.

The End Rudiments are:

1. Half Truths or Untruths or effort to impress auditor.
2. Any effort to influence E-Meter.
3. Missed answering commands.
4. Missed withholds.
5. ARC break.
6. Havingness.
7. Goals and gains.

Number 5 is humanly detected. The remainder are meter detected only. Number 6 may be used profitably to finish up session time.

In Model Session, the Beginning Rudiments questions should be changed to:

1. "What goals would you like to set for this session?"
"Are there any goals you would like to set for Life or Livingness?"
2. "Look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room."
3. "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"
4. "Are you withholding anything?"
5. "Do you have a present time problem?"

In End Rudiments, the Model Session wording should be changed to:

1. "Have you told me any half truth, untruth, or said something only to impress me in this session?"
2. "Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter?"
3. "Have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you in this session?"
4. "Have you withheld anything from me?"

5. "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"
6. "Look around here and tell me if you can have anything."
7. "Have you made any part of your goals in this session?" And "Have you made any other gains you would like to mention?"

Rudiments, as in any assessment or Process Check item, are read on INSTANT NEEDLE READS only. Latent reads (taking place after a pause of half a second or more) are not pursued at all, either as Rudiments questions, Processing Check questions, Problems Intensive items or 3D assessment items.

(Note: Unapproved meters, many of them, have needle comm lags built into them "to protect the meter movement" which is usually poor. The needle acts only after a half of a second or more. Therefore, only 1957 American and British Mark IV meters can be used with confidence in modern auditing. This "comm lag" may also be true of most "lie detectors" including some costing \$18,000. The 1957 American was the first fully workable E-Meter. The British Mark IV is its only fully developed successor. The 1958, '59, '60 and '61 "American Hubbard Meters" may or may not work as their manufacturers refused to submit them to be checked out by me and HCO finds many were cheaply built and do not instant read or read sensitively. Few if any squirrel meters have ever worked to the level of modern demands.)

No assessment has any value if obtained by a faulty meter.

No session, whether Sec Checking (Process Checking), running a Problems Intensive, assessing or running 3D has any value if run with the rudiments out.

To make sessions have value, keep the rudiments in.

A rudiment is only run long enough to get it in, which is to say to get the exact rudiment question nul on the meter, or in the case of ARC, to get the pc to talk easily to the auditor. Rudiments are not sessions. They are there to make sessions count.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:esc.b.cden
 Copyright © 1961
 by L. Ron Hubbard
 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LECTURES
 14—20 December 1961

** 6112C14	SHSBC-93	Anatomy of Problems
6112C19	SHSBC-94	Parts of 3D
** 6112C20	SHSBC-95	Upgrading of Auditors

Franchise

MODEL SESSION SCRIPT, REVISED

(This cancels earlier versions of Model Session
and is for use on all cases except CCHs)

The exactness required of Modern Processing Checks (Sec Checks), Problems Intensives and 3D assessments and runs have made new demands on rudiments and their processes.

As described in HCO B of Dec 14, 1961, the rudiments questions, beginning and end, are changed in the Model Session Script. The body of the session patter is unaltered.

Model Session is memorized, is used exactly, and is delivered with the TRs in. Model Session is a requisite of an effective session. All auditing and assessing are done in Model Session form and no other. Excellent accurate Model Sessioning is the hallmark of the good auditor.

MODEL SESSION SCRIPT

Auditor sets up E-Meter and adjusts pc's chair. Any agreement concerning length of time of session is made if there is to be any such agreement.

"R" FACTOR

A session must have "R" or Reality. If the auditor feels ill or weary, or out of sorts or under other strain, the auditor should tell the pc, before session starts, the facts of the situation, giving the pc a chance to accept auditing under those conditions without feeling it is an overt. The time to put the pc's attention on the auditor is *before* the session starts, not after it starts. The pc is always quick to scent an upset and if such an upset is evident in session a mystery is created for the pc that will throw rudiments out. Once the "R" factor is handled it is not again referred to in the session by the auditor. This should not be used to upset the pc or make the pc guilty of "the overt of receiving auditing".

START OF SESSION

Auditor: "Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?"
Pc: "Yes."
Auditor: Acknowledges. "START OF SESSION." (Tone 40)
Auditor: "Has this session started for you?"

Note 1. If pc says "No," Auditor: Acknowledges. "START OF SESSION." (Tone 40) Then, "NOW has this session started for you?" If pc still says "No," the auditor acknowledges and says, "We will cover it in the rudiments," and continues the session.

BEGINNING RUDIMENTS

1. Goals

Auditor: "What goals would you like to set for this session?"
Pc: Sets goals or doesn't.
Auditor: Acknowledges. "Are there any goals you would like to set for life or livingness?"
Pc: Sets goals or doesn't.
Auditor: Acknowledges. (Goals are usually written down by auditor. If list goes beyond ten or twelve auditor gently stops writing and acknowledges.)

2. Environment

Auditor: "Look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room."

Note 2. If auditor gets a reaction that is not a body motion on the E-Meter, auditor says: "All right. Thank you. I am going to run some (TR 10 or pc's havingness process)." And does so. Repeats rudiment question soon. If now

nul on meter auditor goes on to 3 below. If not nul, runs more havingness. Etc. The rule is pc should be able to have or observe large objects before havingness is ended. (This is hard to apply on some havingness processes.)

3. Auditor Clearance

Auditor: "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

Note 3. If not, run a current process for this rudiment. Test again with rudiment question. This is not an E-Meter response rudiment but is done by observation of pc. This and 5 in end rudiments are the only rudiments so handled.

4. Withholds

Auditor: "Are you withholding anything?"

Note 4. If meter gets instant reaction (only read meters by instant reaction in any case for anything), clear it by getting withholds off. Do not leave any withhold that registers on this rudiment question. If pc will not give withhold, vary the question. If pc still will not, run current rudiments withhold process. Leave this rudiment by asking the rudiment question again and leave it only if nul. An ARC break can also nul meter. If in doubt repeat rudiment 3, straighten up 3 and then repeat 4. A pc who is being vicious to auditor at this stage has one or more withholds.

5. Present Time Problem

Auditor: "Do you have a present time problem?"

Note 5. Only if PTP registers on the meter should the PTP be handled. Question *can* cause an ARC break in a pc anxious to get on and needle can register the ARC break rather than a PTP. In this case clear with two-way comm and repeat PTP rudiment question. If it is obviously a PTP and not an ARC break, do not ask if it is an ARC break. Handle PTP with current rudiment process. When handled, repeat rudiment question. Do not leave unless nul on needle.

START OF PROCESS

Auditor: "Now I would like to run this process on you (name it). What would you say to that?"
Pc: Answers.

Note 6. If pc is unwilling to run the process, two-way comm objections away or relieve earlier invalidations of process. Never run a process dictated by pc as this is self-auditing, throws pc out of auditor control and throws out all rudiments. Pcs quite routinely object to certain processes, even though they must be run.

Auditor: Acknowledges. Clears the command for pc only for the first time the command is used.

Note 7. If, during clearing of the command or failure of needle to react, it seems that the pc will not be able to handle or do the announced process profitably, auditor says: "According to what we have been talking about, it would seem better if I ran (name another process)."

END OF PROCESS

1. Cyclical

Auditor: (Wishing to end process) "Where are you now on the time-track?"
Pc: Answers.

Auditor: Acknowledges. "If it is all right with you, I will continue this process until you are close to present time and then end this process."

Pc: Answers.

Auditor: Acknowledges. Auditor continues the process, asking after each pc answer, "When?" until the pc is close to present time.

Pc: Answers close to present time.

Auditor: Acknowledges. "That was the last command. Is there anything you would care to say before I end this process?"

Pc: Answers.

Auditor: Acknowledges. "End of process."

2. *Non-Cyclical*

Auditor: "If it is all right with you I will give this command two more times and then end this process."

Pc: Answers.

Auditor: Acknowledges and gives the command two more times.

Pc: Answers.

Auditor: Acknowledges. "Is there anything you would care to say before I end this process?"

Pc: Answers.

Auditor: Acknowledges. "End of process."

Note 8. The cyclical ending is only used on terminals that exist also in present time, and when pc is going into the past in his answers. It is not used after pc says he is in present time. Non-cyclical is used when the pc is running terminals which do not exist in present time or when the cyclic aspect can be neglected. 3D level runs and Processing Check answers are never given cyclical endings.

REPEATED COMMANDS

Auditor: Gives command.

Pc: "I don't know. I can't find any answer."

Auditor: Acknowledges. "I will repeat the auditing command." Repeats the command.

Note 9. If pc still cannot answer, two-way comm to discover why. Then get the command answered. Never leave an unanswered command.

COGNITION

Auditor: Gives command.

Pc: (Not having answered command yet.) "Say, that mass in front of my face just moved off."

Auditor: Acknowledges. Repeats command without announcing that it is a repeat.

END RUDIMENTS

1. *Untruths*

Auditor: "Have you told me any half-truth, untruth, or said something only to impress me or tried to damage anyone, in this session?"

Note 10. If meter reacts, clear the reaction fully. In a difficulty, compartment the command, clear the reacting part. Do not leave until meter is nul on repeating this rudiment question.

2. *Meter Influence*

Auditor: "Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter?"

Note 11. If meter reacts, clear it thoroughly, getting, if necessary, the first time the pc tried it. Invalidations of meter will also be present if pc has tried to influence it. These must also be removed with, "Have you ever invalidated the E-Meter?" Also, "Have you ever tried to prevent an E-Meter from reading?" Clear these on needle. Clear rudiment question before leaving. (As in all such checking only vary the command if the pc answers "No" while meter reacts, otherwise ask same question.) Leave when exact rudiment question is nul.

3. *Missed Answers*

Auditor: "Have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you in this session?"

Note 12. If meter reacts, find the question or command and get it answered. Leave rudiment with same question and only if nul.

4. *Missed Withholds*

Auditor: "Have you withheld anything from me?"

Note 13. If meter reacts, find and clear the withhold or withholds. Vary question only

if pc refuses to give up withholds. If pc still refuses, run current rudiments process for this. Do not leave until meter clear on this exact rudiments question.

5. *ARC Break*

Auditor: "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

Note 14. This is done by observation of pc, not by meter. If the answer is no, run current process for this rudiment. Leave it only when pc is willing to talk to auditor. If a process is run for this rudiment, repeat all end rudiments again.

6. *Havingness*

Auditor: "Look around here and tell me if you can have anything."

Note 15. If meter shows other than body movement, run TR 10 or pc's havingness process. Retest the question before leaving this rudiment.

7. *Goals and Gains*

Auditor: "Have you made any part of your goals for this session?"

Note 16. Auditor may remind pc of session goals if pc can't remember them.

Auditor: "Have you made any other gains in this session that you would care to mention?"

Pc: Answers.

END OF SESSION

Auditor: "Is there anything you would care to say or ask before I end this session?"

Note 17. Auditor may show pc relative TA positions reached in session and tell pc what he cares to know about session.

Auditor: "Is it all right with you if I end this session now?"

Pc: Answers.

Auditor: Acknowledges. "Here it is. End of Session !" (Tone 40) "Has the session ended for you?"

Pc: Answers.

Note 18. If session has not ended for pc, get pc's full attention and repeat "End of Session." (Tone 40) If session still has not ended for pc two way comm briefly to find what pc has been doing. If this doesn't ease it, say reassuringly, "You will be getting more auditing. End of session." And leave it at that.

Auditor: (Optional) "Tell me I am no longer auditing you."

Pc: "You are no longer auditing me."

Auditor: Acknowledges.

Note 19. The auditor has no further obligation to act as auditor when session is ended. However, this should not be used to evaluate for the pc concerning the session. But the auditor need not shun questions the pc puts to him or her directly concerning the auditor's own reactions in session if these excite curiosity of preclear. This is 'R' factor.

Exact Rudiments processes for above will be given from time to time in future HCOBs.

During early auditing short session a pc so as to handle fully end rudiments before session ends.

Short sessioning means that two or more sessions can be run in one auditing period.

LRH:esc.bh
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

26 December 1961

Special Briefing
Course

COMMAND SHEET ROUTINE 3D

Pc _____ Date _____ level No. _____ LALV _____

1. TELL ME A PROBLEM YOU MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH A (term) _____
2. HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE SOLVED THAT PROBLEM?
3. TELL ME A PROBLEM A (term) _____ MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH YOU.
4. HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE SOLVED THAT PROBLEM?
5. TELL ME A PROBLEM A (term) _____ MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH ANOTHER (term) _____.
6. HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE SOLVED THAT PROBLEM?
7. TELL ME A PROBLEM ANOTHER (term) _____ MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH A (term) _____.
8. HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE SOLVED THAT PROBLEM?
9. TELL ME A PROBLEM A (term) _____ MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH A (oppterm) _____.
10. HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE SOLVED THAT PROBLEM?
11. TELL ME A PROBLEM A (oppterm) _____ MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH A (term) _____.
12. HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE SOLVED THAT PROBLEM?
13. TELL ME A PROBLEM A (term) _____ MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH OTHERS.
14. HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE SOLVED THAT PROBLEM?
15. TELL ME A PROBLEM OTHERS MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH A (term) _____.
16. HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE SOLVED THAT PROBLEM?
17. TELL ME A PROBLEM YOU MIGHT HAVE HAD WITH YOU.
18. HOW MIGHT (phlev) _____ HAVE SOLVED THAT PROBLEM?

3D COMMANDS WHOLE TRACK O/W

NOTE: USE ON TERMINAL ONLY. BEFORE THIS CAN BE USED MANY LEVELS SHOULD BE RUN AND IT MUST BE PROVED BEYOND ANY POSSIBLE DOUBT BY ROUTINE TESTS THAT PC IS RUNNING HIS TERMINAL. THIS IS NOT A SUBSTITUTE FOR PH LEVEL RUNS BUT IS USED BETWEEN LATER RUNS.

1. WHAT ACTION OR ATTITUDE HAVE YOU HAD TOWARDS A (term)_____.
2. WHAT ACTION OR ATTITUDE HAS A (term)_____HAD TOWARD YOU?
3. WHAT ACTION OR ATTITUDE HAS A (term)_____HAD ABOUT OTHERS?
4. WHAT ACTION OR ATTITUDE HAVE YOU HAD ABOUT OTHERS?
5. WHAT ACTION OR ATTITUDE HAVE OTHERS HAD ABOUT A (term)_____.
6. WHAT ACTION OR ATTITUDE HAVE OTHERS HAD ABOUT YOU?
7. WHAT ACTION OR ATTITUDE HAVE YOU WITHHELD FROM A (term)_____.
8. WHAT ACTION OR ATTITUDE HAS A (term)_____WITHHELD FROM YOU?

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: ph.mw.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Franchise

**E-METER ELECTRODES
A DISSERTATION ON SOUP CANS**

I have just re-discovered a very important item about E-Meter electrodes and the behaviour of the instrument in Security Checks and assessments.

Any "E-Meter" will register proper tone arm position, can squeeze and body motion. Whether it was built by the Communist Party or the local cat-food factory. *Any* meter will register *body* reactions.

Only a specially built meter will also register mental responses. Thus any meter can act like an E-Meter so far as body reactions go. The TA and needle rise and fall, sensitivity increases and decreases. It all looks just like an E-Meter until you measure *amount of mental response* to a security or assessment question. The amount of mental response depends on the surface area contact and the circuit.

The history of it is this: In early 1951 Mathison delivered the first pair of mains current meters he had made for me. They responded to body action but I could get no valuable *mental response* on the needle. Jim Elliot and I worked with them and came up with the idea that a bigger electrode was necessary. Jim took two soup tin cans, put battery (crocodile jaw) clips on the leads, and we found that only then could we make these meters work to the *mind*. The soup can made enough skin contact with the pc to let his *thoughts* register as well as his physical tone. The old meters still would not let some pcs on at the bottom and lots of pcs left them at the top, but they were valuable.

At length Mathison refused to build anything that would register thinking, cut back to one-hand electrodes and generally developed his meter beyond any possible use to us and so we parted.

Many years later, after a lot of work, I had Don Breeding design a transistor meter. This, often refined and held on the rails by me, and often derailed by mind-is-matter "improvements" by others, became the modem meter. In England I did a great deal more developmental work and the British Mark IV finally resulted.

There are only five pieces of research I have not myself done in Scientology. One is the effect of vitamins on mental response, done by a New York nurse for us. One is the effect of restimulation on IQ, which I proposed and Don Rogers carried out. One is the basic meter made by Mathison after a lecture by myself. One is the actual circuit of the modern transistor meter done by Don Breeding. And one is the following, which is enormously important because there's a mistake in it.

In England, around 1957, the "mains meter" made by HASI London used aluminium electrodes, small pipes about an inch in diameter. I challenged their use. We used only soup cans on the 1957 American meter. I turned a test project over to the electronics department in D.C. and eventually they reported to me:

"There is no difference of meter response of any kind in using the thin aluminium tubes and American soup cans."

I relaxed about it then and for some years permitted aluminium tubes to be used, despite my original work in the early Mathison mains meter. After all, the experts had said they were okay.

And just two nights ago I found with horror that the aluminium electrodes are at fault !

You yourself can make the test. The same test I made. Take two old *aluminium* electrodes. Put a Kleenex wadded on the end of one for insulation and have a pc hold both in one hand. Now take a known item that gets constant mental response on a meter, such as the pc's goal or terminal or other 3-D item or some hot button. Note that *physical* response of the meter, the rise and fall of the tone arm, the can squeeze all look good. Now say the pc's goal or button and watch the needle. You may not even be able to detect a needle action!

Now have the pc hold the electrodes one in each hand as is usual. Say the pc's goal or button. You will be able to see some instant response.

Now remove the aluminium electrodes and put soup cans on the E-Meter leads. Say the same item to the pc as before.

You will find *three times* as much needle response as with the aluminium electrodes.

If the item gave you one dial division reaction with aluminium electrodes you will get nearly 3 dial divisions of response with soup cans.

So that's that. The moral of the tale is: Use Soup Cans.

Throw away your aluminium electrodes no matter how pretty they are or how nicely they fit.

Put the battery clip type on your E-Meter leads nearest the pc. These are a set of spring jaws with a screw in one end to fasten the wire. The jaws have teeth. The can end is about a third of an inch of teeth. These are simply bitten onto the edge of the soup can. The soup cans can then be snapped off or on, stowed or replaced at will.

The double wire of the lead should be pulled apart about two and a half feet up from the clips so that when the pc stretches, he can hold the cans as much as five feet apart without their becoming unclipped.

These clips can be bought at any dime store in the electrical department. Use the same plug-in jack that goes with the meter and came with the meter. If you buy new wire get a long double plastic-covered wire of *copper*, rather heavy so it won't part invisibly in the meter leads.

And as for the most important part, the soup cans, go down to the store and take a foot rule with you. Find some canned juice or soup with a *paper*, not a painted, label. The can should be exactly 3 inches in diameter and four and a half inches long. That's a very standard can. Don't get them thinner or thicker than this or shorter or larger. Buy four, so you'll have two spares.

Now, at home, use great care and a patent opener and open with a smooth edge. Consume the juice or soup or give it to the poor. In removing the top make sure you leave no rough edge.

Clip the crocodile jaws over the open edge of the can and you've done it.

Those withholds you've been missing will now read. 3-D items are a breeze. Rudiments can be found when out without cranking sensitivity to the moon.

Soup cans give enough skin contact and steadiness of grip to give you mental reaction.

Can squeeze tests are unchanged. But are more reliable.

No meter registry is shifted in any way, regardless of the increased size.

Pcs eat the tin off steel cans so be neat and get new cans often. Old cans get to looking pretty grim and feeling rough. Try new kinds of soup.

Well, it sounds like a fuss or to-do over soup cans.

But it's the difference between withholds found and withholds missed; rudiments in to rudiments out and 3-D items discovered where none seemed to exist before.

I have my own additional moral to the story. If I didn't do the actual research on something, it's liable to be a miss.

So bottoms up with the vegetable juice and onward and upward better meter reads.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: ph.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Central Orgs

3-D RULES OF THUMB

Current practice in finding and running 3-D items, according to data to hand, gives us the following rules of thumb:

1. Get any package you can get that checks out and reads consistently.
2. Orient the pc as to which is term and which is oppterm.
3. Do not try for another package. Assess and run what you've got.
4. The closer to present time and the more downgraded, the more confusion as to which is term or oppterm, as the items grow more identified with each other the later they are on track.
5. Watch early runs with a hawk eye to be sure the PH Scale isn't being brought more alive. The moment the Scale becomes liver on successive level assessments, get off it and re-orient package and look for new comparable level items.
6. Sudden beefing up of the whole PH Scale means *bad assessment*, choosing *wrong* items, not making a mistake in which is term or oppterm.
7. Run the side of the package that gives the pc sharp somatics. Avoid the side that merely makes pc dizzy or feeling fuzzy.
8. When somatics become unchanging and many levels have been run, or when the first item being run as term blows off, reassess.
9. Ignore comparable level. A present time sort of item as term can be run against a back track item as oppterm.
10. In reassessing always upgrade the package, never downgrade. Ignore items of lesser magnitude and later on track than original package. Seek items of larger magnitude earlier on track.
11. By the rule of Prior Confusion, earlier track items run best.
12. Be as careful in orienting a second package as the first, and as alert to the PH Scale coming alive.
13. Assessment becomes easier the more *any* 3-D is run.
14. Attempt to upgrade whenever pc ceases to change for two or three sessions or the black masses will not move.
15. It is easy to choose wrong 3-D items as the packages are so confused. Always be alert to the possibility of having done so. The goal may have been right, the selected terminal slightly off. Goals are more likely to be correct than terminals and oppterminals.
16. Chanting the term's Modifier at the pc, if it is right, can get the package reading again.
17. Item reads don't go nul by running so much as nul by invalidation. Keep invalidation by pc off the package at all times.

LRH:rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

CLEAN HANDS CONGRESS LECTURES

Washington, D.C.

30 December 1961—1 January 1962

L. Ron Hubbard delivered nine hours of lectures to the Clean Hands Congress attendees at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C.

** 6112C30	CHC-1	Scientology, Where We Are Going
** 6112C30	CHC-2	Auditing Perfection and Classes of Auditors
** 6112C30	CHC-3	Parts of the 3D Package
6112C31	CHC-4	The Goals Problems Mass
** 6112C31	CHC-5	The E-Meter and Its Use
** 6112C31	CHC-6	Havingness, Quality of Reach
6201C01	CHC-7	The Valence, How It Works
6201C01	CHC-8	Goals Package Balance of Valences and Identification
** 6201C01	CHC-9	Effectiveness and Your Effectiveness Now

SUBJECT INDEX

1960-1961

A

- abandon (Secondary Scale level), 303
- aberrated, aberration(s), aberrative,
aberrated self-determinism is end product of failures to help, 191
consists of wrong-way assistance, 122
dwindling spiral of aberration related to interest, communication, control and help, 120
effects are created by the person who has them, 38, 104
freeing of valences remedies pain and aberration, 105
goals terminal is that valence into which pc has interiorized and which carries the goal, modifier and aberration which pc attributes to self, 419
help, relationship to aberration; see help
how to clean up aberration [1960], 7
how to get pc over any condition or aberration he is agonizing to get rid of, 44
other people's causation is not aberrative, 19
O/W, what pc has done to others is aberrative, *not* what has been done to him, 92
psychiatry's basic assumption: shock cures aberration, 103
Scientology's basic assumption: a being without aberration will be good, ethical, artistic and powerful, 104
social aberration is a composite of individual aberrations, 45
somatics, aberrations, circuits and problems are postulate counter-postulate situations, 414
thetan is holding himself in a state of stupidity, aberration and even insanity, 38
third and fourth dynamic aberration, how it comes about, 45
- Academy stable data: new auditors should be able to audit in HCC [1961], 329
- Academy unit one and two, 330
- acknowledgements, TR 2, 247, 250
- action, cycles of; see cycles of action
- adjectival commands, beware running, 50
- agree (Secondary Scale level), 305
- allergy, example of handling, 65
- alter-is commands, tendency of pc to, relation to Change Processing, 256
- alter-issness, auditing Problems cures it in a case, 354
- alternate commands, how to avoid making mistake in correct next command, 140
- Alternate Confront [process], 116, 121
commands of, 140
Help used in conjunction with Alternate Confront and Havingness, 108, 110
stabilizing tool, 122
"What can you confront?" "What would you rather not confront?", 110, 118
- altitude is the factor that makes a pc receive and execute an auditing command, 134
- aluminium electrodes, don't use, 460
- analytical thought, Pre-Hav Scale is not a picture of ~, it is a picture of reactive thought, 331
- analytical vs. reactive, response of pc, 88, 331
- anaten-unconsciousness, flow run too long in one direction gives, 121
- anxiety and malnutrition can produce symptoms of insanity, 82
- APA, American Personality Analysis; see OCA/APA
- ARC break(s), 377
auditor taking order from pc causes pc to ~, 374
communication becomes a contest of overts in the ARC breaky case, 120
Havingness is a must on any Responsibility Process in presence of ARC breaks, 36
Help and, 85
meter can go out if ~ is present, 442, 450
pc and ARC breaks; see preclear, ARC breaks and prevention, 373
primary sources of ARC breaks are all under the heading of "no auditing", 421
session ~, caused by running pc over his head, 44
session ARC breaks, running O/W to handle, 43
withholds, PT problems and ~ can stop a case, 210
worsen the graph, 217
yanking pc's attention to the auditor is the source of a lot of ARC breaks, 43
- ARC Process 1961, 442
- ARC Straight Wire, Cause ARC Straight Wire, 51
- arrive (Secondary Scale level), 299
- arts, having abused, how to handle, 195
- assess, assessing, assessment(s), 124, 324
by Elimination (SOP Goals), 265
by goals to get a Help terminal, 124
by needle, audit by tone arm, rock slam is apparent exception to, 284, 318
- Case Assessment, 214; see *also* Preclear Assessment Sheet
- Change List of Problems Intensive, 414
for Help terminals, Regimen 1, 128
for new change (Problems Intensive), 415
- HGC preclear assessment, 108
- Know to Mystery Scale Assessment, 109
- laws of assessment, 131
of help, 119
- OT-3 Procedure assessments; see OT-3 Procedure
- OT-3A Procedure assessments; see OT-3A Procedure giving
- pc does not have to think or answer before needle responds, 331
- PE Co-Audit assessment, 70
- Pre-Hav Scale assessment, 197, 273, 282, 324
- rising needle treated as a null needle in assessment, 273, 333
- Routine 3D assessment; see Routine 3D

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

- assess, assessing, assessment(s) (*cont.*)
SOP Goals assessment; see SOP Goals assessment
terminal improperly assessed, how to detect during auditing, 132
to wait more than three seconds before uttering next word on list is complete waste of auditing time, 332
- Assessment Confirmation by D of P [SOP Goals], HCO WW Form CT2, 229
- association, Help resolves cases because it is the basis of all ~, 1 19
- association leads to identification, 1 19
- association of things, or thoughts, or classes, is considered all right but is half way to lazy thinking, 123
- assumption points of Scientology, sciences, and other subjects, 102
- atomic age, 102
- attention,
central valence or terminal is built in to demand total attention from pc, 406
needle fall shows what form of mest and life attention is fixed upon, 54
pc who is having lots of PTPs has attention very fixed on something, 61, 62
yanking pc's attention to auditor is source of a lot of ARC breaks, 43
- attention (Secondary Scale level), 298
- audit(ed)(ing),
attitude, 6
basic freeing action of ~, what it depends upon, 53
breaks are not counted as auditing time, 145
by tone arm (except in rock slam), assess by needle, 318
case that wants no processing, handling of, 178
command; see command
failures, there are no auditing failures, there are only errors in auditing, 58
first auditing, what to run [1961], 214
first rule of auditing is find something pc can do and improve that ability, 65
great deal of value of auditing lies in mechanics of session itself, 56
- auditing errors, 432
help is key button which admits auditing, 85
HGC ~ should convert earlier ~ losses to wins, 108
how to persuade a stranger to get audited, 72
inflexible regimen vs. experimental auditing, 38
insane should get rest and then exercise before auditing, 88
make auditors by making them audit, 376
maxims, 217
others can get gains when oneself is processed, 45
pc refuses auditing use Pre-session One (Help, Control, Communication, Interest), 175
pc where the pc's mind is, 43
pre-session; see pre-session
results, what they depend on, 64
room, 43
TR 10 on, 194
- audit(ed)(ing) (*cont.*)
self-auditing, 373
smoother the auditing, the better pc's havingness stays up, 54
terminal improperly assessed, how to detect during auditing, 132
training, get as well as auditing, 133
TRs, flubs in TRs are basis of all confusion in subsequent efforts to audit, 249
- auditor(s)('s), 377
Academy stable data: new auditors should be able to audit in HGC [196 1], 329
accepts and acknowledges goals pc has for session, life and livingness, 194
attitude to pc's data, 129
classes of auditors [1961], 385, 439
clearance (rudiment), 41, 194
confidence increased by standardized sessions, 53
control of session, 373
evaluation consists of telling pc what to think about his case, 129
failing to handle E-Meter, chief reason is TR failures, 261, 264, 432
fully responsible for session, 43, 373
giving pc full hours, 145
has more control over pc's reactive mind than pc, reason why, 332
HGC Auditor's Sec Check, 356
how to handle auditor saying "Process didn't work", 118, 432
make auditors by making them audit, 376
need subjective reality on bank, 374, 376
Q and A, change in pc causes auditor to stop or change process, 218
reality vs. pc's reality, 129
staff auditor's responsibilities, 214, 219
staff auditors, training of, ~961], 389
taking order from pc causes pc to ARC break, 373, 374
target of auditor is pc's reactive mind, 428
- Auxiliary Pre-Have 3D Scale, 434
- awareness, inability to differentiate is a decline in, 122
- Axiom 10, cycle of action and communication for gross mula become identified, 35
- Axiom 28, relationship to process workability, 155

B

- bad, people are never as bad as they think they are, 24
- bank; see reactive mind
- basic unit of this universe is two not one, 62
- be, being, beingness,
basic escape is into another being, thus one acquires beingnesses to escape, 368
be—do—have coordinated, 206
beingness is more involved with havingness than with confront, 122
doingness, havingness and ~ must be balanced; each must be flexible in pc for a stable gain, 207

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

- be, being, beingness (*cont.*)
Goals Processing finds beingness and mind's doingness toward it (Pre-Hav Scale) and results in havingness, 207
Help [process] handles problems of ~, 1 10, 1 19
thetan tends to move from source ~ to effect ~, 131
valences are mocked up other-beingnesses a person thinks he is, 104
- "beating the meter", 421
beefing up the bank, cause of, 35
beginning rudiments; see rudiments, beginning
betrayal, medicine considering man a body is a sort of betrayal, 86
betrayal, relationship to help; see help
black case, 9
blackmail and punishment are keynotes of all dark operations, 28
blows, causes for pc blows, 217
blows from Scientology orgs [1960], 1 1
body and E-Meter; see E-Meter
Bog Check by D of P [SOP Goals], HCO WW Form CT6, 232
books answer people's questions, 78
books, dissemination fails without ~ distributed, 78
B.Scen./HCS [1961], 261
building unit of a great society is the individual, 45
button, help is key button which admits auditing, 85
button, needle reaction starts to occur a fraction of a second after you utter the button, 332
buttons, way of clearing, 87
- ### C
- can squeeze, setting correct sensitivity on E-Meter, 32
"can't-haves", valences are all, so when valence is off havingness of pc comes up, 110
case(s); see *also* preclear
alter-ismness in case handled by auditing Problems, 354
Co-Audit, how it stalled cases, 185
Director of Processing's case checking hat, 228
dynamics and cases, relationship of, 166
havingness run as process stabilizes case, 168
Help, running cases with, 109
how to recognize low-toned case, 26
key to all cases is inability to have, 150
key to all cases is responsibility, 18
most of pc's case will be found connected with some general terminal, 49
no case gain in auditing, case has withholds or PTPs, 207
pc interested in own case, 66, 450
PTP, person in PTP is often current clue to case, 61
rudiments, don't run a case by, 274, 363
starting cases, 175
entrance point of case determined by ability to remedy objective havingness, 155
Formula is a method of getting a case started, 179
- case(s), starting (*cont.*)
how to start an old case, 108
revised case entrance [1960], 167
symptoms of case with overts and withholds, 4, 5
TA action, relationship to case progress, 144, 207, 225
tone arm, rather than needle, is foremost in analyzing case, 18
types of cases and handling,
ARC breaky case, communication becomes a contest of overts in, 120
average case, processes for, [1960], 168
big withhold case, 178
black case, formula to handle, 9
failed case can't confront overts, 5
HGC case, tips on how to crack, [1960], 154
hyper-critical case, 178
low case, processes for, [1960], 169
low graph case, 139
low-toned case, overt manifestations on, 26
"no auditor" case, 325
no responsibility case, 98
poor case, processes for, [1960], 168
"theetie weetie case" (sweetness and light), 325
UK case, control is more easily inverted on, 202
unmoving case, 4, 178
wants no processing, handling of, 178
what makes cases advance, 68
withholds, as case progresses it becomes conscious of more, 204
- Case Assessment, 214; see *also* Preclear Assessment Sheet
- causation, cause(s),
able to admit causation, able to withhold from, is anatomy of responsibility, 14, 19
Havingness, running Havingness restores pc at cause over matter, 53
other people's causation is not aberrative, 19
pc has as much bank as he has denied cause, 19
pc has creation tangled up with cause and cause tangled up with overt-motivator sequence, 35
run the pc always at cause, 44
(Secondary Scale level), 316
terminals, run always causative terminals never effect terminals, 132
thetan cannot withhold, then compulsively causes things that are bad, 19
thetan is at obsessive cause while trying to do overts or get motivators, 191
- Cause ARC Straight Wire, 51
run to give pc win on getting audited, 48
- Cause Elementary Straight Wire turns on recall in pc, 52
- Cause/Withhold version of Responsibility, 17, 19
- CCHs, 325
correct way to run CCHs, 347
Joburg Sec Check and CCHs, 348
Routine 1 and CCHs, 334
thinking at command is a sort of CCH on thinkingness, 121

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

- CCHs (*cont.*)
when to run CCHs before SOP Goals, 255
when verbal commands fail, CCH 3 and CCH 4 can be used, 155
wrong idea that they are for nuts, 334
- certificates, cancellation of auditor's certificates, reason for, 30, 96
- certificates, restoration of certificates, 34
- change(s),
basic curve of change compares to cycle of action, 258
belongs at "inverted control" on Pre-Hav Scale, 320
Model Session is designed to avoid unpredictable changes, 54
Problems Intensive and ~; *see* Problems Intensive
rapidity of change of state, unpredicted, definition of surprise, death and forgetfulness, 54
resisted change is basis of all mass in physical universe and every stuck point on track, 256
turning points are simply self-determined changes in pc's life, 401
unpredicted change lessens havingness, 54
- Change Processes, 253, 256; *see also* Start—Change—Stop
- Change brackets and commands, 258
clarification of, 320
make a release, 261
tendency of pc to alter-is commands, and ~, 256
5-way bracket, 258
15-way bracket, 259
- checksheets, use in training, 329
- children and help, 85
- Children's Security Check, ages 6—12, 378
- choice, power of, is senior to responsibility, 24
- chronic somatic(s); *see* somatic, chronic
- churches used mechanism of confession, 12
- circuits, mental mass, pictures, ridges, thetan accumulates to degree that he misassigns responsibility 18
- circuits, somatics, aberrations and problems are postulate counter-postulate situations, 414
- clean hands make a happy life, 387
- Clear(s),
confidence regained makes Clears, not quantity of stuff run, 44, 65, 66
doesn't react on E-Meter because he is able to be conscious, 331
dynamic clears, 416
false clear read, 26
first Clears made easily by others were done with assessments and five-way Help brackets on terminals, 92
is best described *in DMSMH*, 80
mest clear, defn, 137
Help is flat on ~, 116
process package which makes mest clears, theta clears and OTs [1960], 133
to theta clear requires an address to sixth dynamic with Help Processes, 174
- Clear (*cont.*)
no responsibility case, a mockery of Clear, how to check this out, 98
theta clear, 133, 174
attained by handling sixth dynamic to attain a straight seventh, 166
valence, if pc were in no valence, but was himself completely, he would be wholly Clear, 102
why Clear would go unclear, 443
- clear, clearing,
by SOP Goals, 217
curriculum for Clearing Courses ~1961], 374
lies in confronting, not escaping, 374
materials used for clearing [1961], 370
things that prevent clearing, 217
to clear pc give him series of realized wins, 65
valences key to clearing, 368
- Clear Check by D of P [SOP Goals], HCO WW Form CT8 [1961], 233
- co-audit(s), co-auditor,
Formulas and Regimens were never for co-audits, 176
HAS Co-Audit, 188
ended, 176
is for people "trained" on a PE Course, 188
Process I and II, 189
resumed, 185
how Co-Audit stalled cases, 185
in groups, 64
Instructor audits each case through the co-auditor, 70
PE Co-Audit processes, 70
team should run O/W [1960], 21, 25
- codes of conduct mutually agreed, 388
- cognition, *defn.*, something pc suddenly understands or feels, 42
- cognition, don't use "I wiU repeat the auditing command" after a cognition, 42, 164, 222, 455
- collect (Secondary Scale level), 308
- command(s),
altitude is the factor that makes a pc receive and execute an auditing command, 134
CCH 3 and CCH 4 can be used when verbal commands fail, 155
never let any auditing command go unanswered, 44
pc's ability to follow, 134
repeated commands, 42, 164, 222, 455
tendency of pc to alter-is commands, 256
terminals, beware running adjectival commands, 17, 50
- Comm Course, PE becomes a dissertation in Scientology and a Comm Course, 182
- communication; *see also* pre-session
becomes a contest of overts in the ARC breaky case, 120
cycle of action, communication formula and Axiom 10 become identified in the mind with one another, 35
interest, communication, control, help, sequence of breakdown in aberration, 120

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

- communication (*cont.*)
O/W is junior to various laws of communication, control and help, 186
Pre-Hav Scale command for Communication, 211 (Secondary Scale level), 287
what makes communication work in processes is duplication part of communications formula (Axiom 28), 155
communication bridge, use of, 51
Communication Process on body part, 70
communists try to convince people that you're guilty of their overt, 321
comcompartmenting the question, 322
compete (Secondary Scale level), 292
Concentrate—Shift Attention Process, run on stuck needle, 218
Concept Help, 121
Confront straightens out any “mugginess” churned up by Concept Help, 122
two-way ~ on general terminal, 117
condition, how to get pc over any unwanted ~ or aberration that he is agonizing to get rid of, 44
condition, process that turns on bizarre or unwanted condition will always turn it off, 218
conduct, codes of, mutually agreed, 388
confession, mechanism used by churches, 12
confidence,
auditor confidence increased by standardized sessions, 53
it's confidence regained that makes Clears, not quantity of stuff run, 44, 65, 66
only thing wrong with pc is his lack of confidence in handling himself without hurting others, 67
scale of increasing confidence, 8
confront(ing); *see also* pre-session
auditors failing to handle E-Meters, chief reason is mainly confront, 261
beingness is more involved with havingness than with confront, 122
clearing lies in confronting, not escaping, 374
concepts are more in kind with confronting than with creating, 121
create and confront, 35
failed case can't confront overt, 5
havingness is an objective and somewhat obscure method of confronting, 122
less a pc can confront two things, the more he fixes on one, 62
PTP is basically inability to confront dual terminal nature of universe, 61
Responsibility is confront and is very senior to Confront as a process, 35
rising needle means pc can't confront it, 333
TR 0; *see* TR 0
Confront Processes, 151, 154
Alternate Confront, 121
commands of Alternate Confront, 140
can be run as a prelude to any and all Responsibility, 50
Confront Processes (*cont.*)
commands for Pre-sessions II—X, 142
commands in order of test for pcs, 152
Confront is a Responsibility Process, 35
Continuous Confront, 123
survival is translated for processing as Continuous Confront, 127
Failed Help as the Confront Process, 171
Havingness is a Confront Process and straightens out the create factor, 35
Havingness Processes and ~, finding; *see* EME
order of test of Havingness and Confront
mands, 151, 152
straightens out any “mugginess” churned up by Concept Help, 122
confusion,
flubs in TRs are basis of all confusion in subsequent efforts to audit, 249
prior confusion; *see* prior confusion
problem consists of two opposed stable data and therefore two confusions, 354
somatics, handling by sec checking area of confusion, 409
stable datum and confusion, 62
(two or more opposed views or actions) stays in position because it is hung on a single fixed point, 62
connect (Secondary Scale level), 286
conscience, uneasy lies the head that wears a guilty ~, 27
Consequences Process, 57
Continuous Confront, survival is translated for processing as ~, 127
control, *see also* pre-session
change belongs at “inverted control” on Pre-Hav Scale, 320
Formula 20 is an effort to run control on thought level, 213
interest, communication, control, help, sequence of breakdown in aberration, 120
is more easily inverted on UK case, 202
pc under auditor's control to extent of doing the process, 66
(Secondary Scale level), 289
session without proper rudiments is a session with out control, 56
“counselor”, Scientologist as a -, 114
counter-postulate; *see* postulate
courage that we can observe what we observe and say what we have observed, 203
create, created, creating, creation,
concepts are more in kind with confronting than with creating, 121
confront and create, 35
Create Processes are limited, 35
cycle of action: create—survive—destroy, 126
discreditable creations, 7
fundamental urge of a thetan, 126
Havingness is a Confront Process and straightens out create factor, 35

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

- create, created, creating, creation (*cont.*)
how to handle subject of create, 116
person in any valence is victimized by his own creation, 116
preclear has creation tangled up with cause and cause tangled up with overt-motivator sequence, 35
reactive mind, basis of, is creativeness done below level of consciousness, 116
reactive mind toughened up by creating, how to handle, 116
responsibility of individual for his creation, 35, 147
science goes mad when it is “creating in order to destroy”, 127
(Secondary Scale level), 314
survival is apparency of creating, 126
Create Processes are limited, 35
criminal, criminality, *defn.*, one who thinks help cannot be on any dynamic or uses help on anyone to injure and destroy, 101
always assistshimself to be caught, 12
how a person becomes criminal, 24
individual rights not originated to protect criminals, 27
is in fact insane, 83
war and criminality, 45
will not receive orders called law, 136
would not register on overts, 19
critical, hyper-critical case, 178
criticism is justification of having done an overt, 12
criticism, 1.1, is effort to reduce size of target of overt, 13
cures tend to become a new illness, 103
cycle of action, 35
applied to work, 126
basic curve of change compares to cycle of action, 258
communication formula and Axiom 10 become identified, 35
create—survive—destroy, 126
double action cycles, 126
inversion of, 35
old action cycles, 126
session is a cycle of action, 56
cycle of deterioration from independent being to being critical of self, 186
cyclical process, how to end, 42, 221
cyclic aspect of recall type processes, phenomena of pc bouncing into PT, 51
- D**
- dating, stuck picture, handling by dating, Responsibility and O/W, 16
datum, stable datum and confusion, 62
Dear Alice; *see* TR I
death, *defn.*, rapidity of change of state, unpredicted, 54
death (*cont.*)
past, “Where Are You Buried?” project, 55
preclear who only gets death pictures or bad pictures is somewhere late on cycle of action or late on an inversion cycle, 35
dependency, aberration on the subject of help would be a fear of dependency, 85
“Describe the problem to me” “How does it seem now?”, PTP Process, 42
desire (Secondary Scale level), 305
destroy, destruction, destructive,
criminal is one who uses help on anyone to injure and destroy, 101
in order to survive is not a duplication, 126
keynote of insanity is destructive efforts on various dynamics, 82
preclear who believes that every cause brings about a destruction, 35
science goes mad when it is “creating in order to destroy”, 127
(Secondary Scale level), 295
determinism, psychotic goes berserk at thought of doing anything told him by another determinism, 136
Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health, Clear best described in *DMSMH*, 80
contains a bridge between uninformed and informed public on subject of Scientology, 79, 81
disseminate *with DMSMH*, 80
handles public arguments and questions concerning the mind, 79, 81
why it was written, 78
differentiate, inability to, is a decline in awareness, 122
difficulties (ARC Process 1961), 442
difficulty is a get-rid-of desire, goal is an actual desire, 420
Director of Processing(‘s),
case checking hat, 228
checks assessment, new goals and terminals, and pc on rudiments, 215, 216
Check Type Forms 1-8 [SOP Goals], 228-33, 254
handling of auditors who say “It didn’t work”, 118
pcs D of P may refuse to audit [1961], 334
pc “transferred” to D of P, how to handle, 216
relationship of staff auditor to, 214
role of D of P, 228
disagree (Secondary Scale level), 306
disassociation from identities, 7
discreditable creations, 7
dishonest person, his way out, 27
dislike (Secondary Scale level), 292
disperse (Secondary Scale level), 312
disseminate, dissemination,
books are dissemination, 78
interest is not first step in dissemination, 74
Pre-session Processes assist dissemination, 72, 73
with *DMSMH*, 80

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

- Dixie, are you waiting for the meter to play ~, 331
- do, doingness,
beingness, doingness and havingness must be balanced; each must be flexible in pc for a stable gain, 207
Goals Processing finds beingness and mind's doingness toward it (Pre-Hav Scale) and results in havingness, 207
how all doingness becomes bad, 24
rehabilitation of willingness to do, 25
unwillingness to do, 24
withholding of, 24
- D of P; see Director of Processing
- "dones", get "dones" not thoughts or natter on withholds, 424
- "don't know" version, Sec Checking, 425
- "don't know" version, withhold pulling, 424
- double action cycles, 126
- dramatization, psychiatry is a dramatization, 103
- D.Sc./HGA, 262
- dual universe, 62
- duplicate, duplication, duplicative,
communication works in processes due to duplication part of communications formula (Axiom 28), 155
deteriorated willingness to duplicate, 186
havingness and duplication, 155
havingness is apparently the willingness and ability to duplicate in all senses of the word, 155
Mimicry Processes are Duplication Processes and work only because they raise havingness, 155
Overt/Withhold assists duplication and therefore havingness, 145
pc's ability to duplicate, process to rehabilitate, 52
(Secondary Scale level), 307
Tone Scale, position on Tone Scale is determined by willingness and ability to duplicate, 155
TR 3, Duplicative Ouestion; see TR 3
- Duplication Straight Wire, "What would you permit to have happen again?", 52
- dynamic(s),
development of knowledge on dynamics, 111
help and the dynamics, 119
Overt/Withhold Process on terminal representing dynamic, 22, 26; see also Dynamic Straightwire [in full index]
1st and 2nd dynamics, Scientologists handle, only to achieve better function on third and fourth, 112
3rd dynamic,
examples of Scientology applied to third dynamic, 114
for Scientology, 2
what our third dynamic organization should do, 113
3rd and 4th dynamics, aberrated, 45
3rd and 4th dynamics, Scientologists are "doctors" on 3rd and 4th dynamics, 113
5th dynamic and eating, 126
- dynamic(s) (*cont.*)
6th and 7th dynamics,
cases (and banks) are an inversion of 8 dynamics into sixth dynamic and they then invert into seventh dynamic, 166
mest clear to theta clear requires an address to sixth dynamic with Help Processes, 174
Precession Two is based on theory that one is taking the sixth dynamic off the seventh dynamic, 141
taking the sixth dynamic off the seventh, 166
theta clear is attained by handling sixth dynamic to attain a straight seventh, 166
- Dynamic Assessment on pc, 17, 49
- dynamic clears, 416

E

- Earth, peace on, 28
- eating and fifth dynamic, 126
- economic strangulation of individual in western society, 24
- Effect List of terminals, 271
- effect, run causative terminals, never effect terminals, 132
- effect (Secondary Scale level), 315
- effect, thetan tends to move from source beingness to effect beingness, 131
- Einstein's theory of relativity, 102
- electrodes; see E-Meter, electrodes
- elimination, assessing [SOP] goals list by, 239, 265, 266, 270
- elimination, assessing [SOP Goals] terminal list by, 240, 267
- elimination, assessment on Pre-Hav Scale is not by, 273
- E-Meter; see also *E-Meter Essentials*
ARC broken pc, E-Meter doesn't register on, 442, 450
auditor having trouble with, 261, 264, 432
behavior on Routine 3D commands, 426
body motions and E-Meter, 421
British E-Meter operation, 32
compartmenting the question, 322-23
dating on meter, 60; see also *EMD*
dropping needles tell you charge and shifting tone arms tell you increased or decreased responsibility, 42
electrodes, use soup cans, not aluminium, 459, 460
errors in reading E-Meter, 331, 432
fall; see fall
false E-Meter reactions, 321
frailties; see *E-Meter Essentials*
future E-Meters; see *E-Meter Essentials*
history of, 459
how to read an E-Meter on a silent subject, 59
how to set up and use E-Meter, 32
mental responses only register on specially built meters, body reaction registers on all, 459

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

- E-Meter (*cont.*)
- needle; *see* needle
 - never lies, but you can ask a sloppy question, 323
 - oddities; *see E-Meter Essentials*
 - only the meter knows, 332
 - overt acts and ~, 18, 323
 - pc “beating the meter”, 421
 - reacts only on reactive mind; Clear doesn’t react because he is able to be conscious; an aberree reacts because he can’t think without thought exciting the reactivity of reactive mind, 331
 - reads degree of mental mass surrounding thetan in a body, 18
 - reads, tell pc what he wants to know about, 218
 - responds instantly, 332
 - rudiments and meter reactions, 363
 - Security Check, use of E-Meter in, 97
 - sensitivity; *see* sensitivity
 - sensitivity knob; *see E-Meter Essentials*
 - students must know *E-Meter Essentials*, 264
 - theory; *see E-Meter Essentials*
 - tone arm; *see* tone arm
- emotional (Secondary Scale level), 288
- end rudiments; *see* rudiments, end
- endure (Secondary Scale level), 304
- enforce (Secondary Scale level), 306
- engram(s),
- reactive self-restraint is the purpose of all , 69
 - recall, use before running engrams, 65
 - running [1960], 65
 - running using “unknown” [1961], 372
 - source of engrams, 1 16
- enter (Secondary Scale level), 307
- entheta and attacks in press, 148
- environment, handling, 194
- environment, session, 41
- escape, basic escape is into another being, thus one acquires beingnesses to escape, 368
- escaping, clearing lies in confronting, not ~, 374
- Ethics hat, Ron wearing, 99
- ethics, Overt/Withhold and Help can handle out-ethics, 99
- evaluation consists of telling pc what to think about his case, 129
- evil, old religious beliefs that man is basically ,12
- “evil” valence, 105
- evil, withholds are cause of continued evil, 12
- Expanded Gita run without creating mock-ups, 65
- experience-scarcity, 155
- exteriorization, difficult, is caused by person’s considerations of thought being matter, self being matter, 53
- exteriorization is stable when thetan is used to mest, 166
- F**
- facsimile (s),
- pc made facsimile to restrain himself from ever doing it again, 38
- facsimile (s) (*cont.*)
- pc who only gets death pictures or bad pictures is somewhere late on cycle of action or late on an inversion cycle, 3 5
 - pictures bridge the language barrier, 54
 - stuck picture, how to handle, 9, 16
 - run W/H on terminal in picture, 48
 - thetan accumulates mental mass, pictures, ridges, circuits, etc., to degree that he misassigns responsibility, 18
 - “unknown” used on, 374
 - “What part of that picture could you be responsible for?”, 66
- Factual Havingness, trio form, 36
- failed communication (Secondary Scale level), 288
- failed control (Secondary Scale level), 289
- failed endure (Secondary Scale level), 304
- failed havingness (Secondary Scale level), 286
- failed help,
- aberrated self-determinism is end product of failures to help, 191
 - action of help is not aberrative, failure to help is, 119
 - failures to help can bring about confusion of identities, 191
 - overt/withhold mechanism stems from failures to help, 186
 - O/W running discloses failed helps, 187
 - (Secondary Scale level), 291
 - whatever pc thinks is wrong he has failed to help, 210
- Failed Help [process],
- how and when to run, 167,168,170
 - lowest verbal entrance point, 168
 - run ~ as the Confront Process [Formula 13] ,171
- failed importance (Secondary Scale level), 299
- failed interest (Secondary Scale level), 287
- failed leave (Secondary Scale level), 301
- failed overt (Secondary Scale level), 294
- failed protect (Secondary Scale level), 302
- failed to abandon (Secondary Scale level), 303
- failed to arrive (Secondary Scale level), 299
- failed waste (Secondary Scale level), 303
- failed withhold (Secondary Scale level), 297
- faith (Secondary Scale level), 316
- fall(s),
- difference between needle fall and change of needle pattern, 363
 - dropping needles tell you charge, and shifting tone arms tell you increased or decreased responsibility, 42
- E-Meter falls on things pc is interested in and will talk about, 175
- E-Meter fall, what it means, 132,175
- needle drops only on those terminals pc still feels some responsibility for, 38
- no fall = meter response for “no” or negative or don’t know, 59
- shows thing wrong with case that can be remedied at this time, 38

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

- fall(s) (*cont.*)
show where pc's mind is fixed, 43, 54
slight fall = meter response for "maybe" "you're getting close", 59
steep fall = meter response for "yes" or "correct", 59
- field,
black field case, 9
clear pc's field with Responsibility, 16, 49
mysterious, 66
pc has a field, somatics, malformity or aberration, how to cleanup, 7
- fifth dynamic; *see* dynamic, 5th
first dynamic; *see* dynamic, 1st
five-way bracket, 240
five-way Concept Help commands, 121
Flat Check by D of P [SOP Goals], HCO WW Form CT5, 232
flow run too long in one direction gives anaten— unconsciousness, 121
force opposing force with resultant mass, 426
forgetfulness, *defn*, rapidity of change, unpredicted, 54
Formula is a method of getting a case started, 179
Formulas and Regimens were never for co-audits, 176
Formula 13, 171, 179
cases that do not move on Formula 13, 178
how to run, 171
Formula 14, 179
Formula 15, 179
Formula 16, cases that don't respond well on O/W use ~, 180
Formula 17, 181
Formula 19, theory and commands, 205
Formula 19, "Who have you failed to help?", 194
Formula 20, theory and commands, 213
fourth dynamic; *see* dynamic 4th
freedom of speech does not mean freedom to harm by lies, 27
freedom, what freedom means, 27
freeing action of auditing, what it depends upon, 53
free, thetan will not let himself go free unless he can operate without danger to others, 19
Freud's libido theory, 103
- G**
- gains, Objective Havingness established and used often is necessary for stable gains, 167
gains, others can get gains when oneself is processed, 45
games condition evolves from separateness, 54
General Check-up on a Session by D of P [SOP Goals], HCO WW Form CT3, 230
generalities won't do—Sec Checking, 424
General O/W, co-audit teams run ~, 25
Gita, Expanded, run without creating mock-ups, 65
goal(s); *see also* SOP Goals
defn, something pc wanted to be, to do or to have, whether pc abandoned it, failed in it or not, 419
- goal(s) (*cont.*)
defn, an actual desire, 420
as escape, 368
assessing for goals and terminals by elimination [SOP Goals], 239
assessment, 239, 267, 417
assessment by goals [Help], 124
auditor accepts and acknowledges goals pc has for session, life and livingness, 194
basic types of goals: improvement goal, no-change goal, deterioration goal, 57
D of P must check all new goals and terminals [SOP Goals], 216
eliminate nulled goals [SOP Goals], 270
goal modifier [R3D], 418
goal + modifier [R3D], *defn*, visible goal is added to heretofore invisible modifier; the whole track desire of pc plus threat to self or others if that desire is not accomplished, 419
goals terminal for pc's goal + modifier [R3D], 418
must be contained in one basic terminal [R3D], 413
has anatomy of problem and is not only postulate counter-postulate but also terminal counter terminal [R3D], 416
in rudiments, 56
life is a series of attained goals, 58
list,
always recheck goals list [SOP Goals], 270
assessing goals list by elimination [SOP Goals], 239
complete goals list [SOP Goals], 270
do full list of goals on pc [SOP Goals], 265
how to assess goals list [SOP Goals], 236
modifier is that consideration which opposes the attainment of a goal and tends to suspend it in time [R3A], 413
modifier is unseen modification pc has placed before or after his goal to insist upon winning or threaten with if he does not win, or to keep the goal in a games condition unknown even to himself [R3D], 419
modifier on goals [R3A], 412
opposition goal, 417, *defn*, idea that is interlocked against pc's goal, making it a postulate counter-postulate situation of long duration; it is not actually the goal of the opposition terminal as the opposition terminal would see it, but only what pc believes it was as it affects him, 419
opposition terminal; *see* opposition terminal
out rudiments bury goal, 374, 423
pc in bad condition is more likely to have succumb [rudiment] goals than survive goals, 58
preliminary goal [SOP Goals], 236
principal goal [SOP Goals], 237
prove up the goal, how to, [SOP Goals], 267
PTPs expressed as session goals, 210
session goals, 41, 56, 210

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

- goal(s) (*cont.*)
simplest process to clear pc on direction [goal] is a Problem Process, 57
terminal, *defn*, that valence into which pc has interiorized and which carries the goal, modifier and aberration which pc attributes to self, 419
assessing goals terminal with Primary Pre-Hav Scale, 283
for pc's goal + modifier [R3D], 418
when a goals terminal is flat [SOP Goals], 209
terminals and goals searches require a repeat over and over of goal or terminal on list in order to get them to go null [SOP Goals], 273
test [R3D], 419
to stay fixed, goal must have a counter-postulate, 413
“X” and “/” signs, use of in goals assessment, 266
Goal Problem Mass described, 426
Goals Problem Mass, core of the reactive bank, 443
Goals Problem Mass could come back in, reason Clears went unclear, 443
Goals Processing finds beingness and mind's doingness toward it (Pre-Hav Scale) and results in havingness [SOP Goals], 207
good, man is basically good and is damaged by punishment, 104
gross auditing errors are reason for all failure, 432
group(s),
auditing session begins with group auditor explaining what he means to do and why, 177
co-auditing in groups, 64
need time to assimilate new concept, 91
Scientology can have a group win, 45
guilt, guilty,
chronic somatics, find out who pc is making guilty by having them, 7
justification is tantamount to a confession of guilt, 12
overts include making another person guilty, 6
uneasy lies the head that wears a guilty conscience, 27
- H**
- Hand Mimicry; *see* TR 5
HAS certificates [1960], 1, 71
HAS Co-Audit; *see* co-audit, HAS Co-Audit
HAS Processes III—VIII, 192
have, havingness; *see also* pre-session
defn, willingness and ability to duplicate in all senses of the word, 155
beingness, doingness and havingness must be balanced; each must be flexible in pc for a stable gain, 207
beingness is more involved with havingness than with confront, 122
failed havingness (Secondary Scale level), 286
familiarity, predictability, is strongly connected with ability to have or own, 54
have, havingness (*cont.*)
Goals Processing finds beingness and mind's doingness toward it (Pre-Hav Scale) and results in havingness, 207
havingness takes edge off bank, 116
inability to have, key to all cases, 150
lowest rung of responsibility, 36
Model Session is designed to retain havingness by retaining pattern, 54
must be up when running “thetan”, 195
necessity for, 53
objective havingness, ability to remedy, determines entrance point of case, 155
objective havingness, high and low TA cases have low objective ~, 144
Overt/Withhold assists duplication and therefore havingness, 145
precise mechanics of, 155
(Secondary Scale level), 286
smoother the auditing, the better pc's ~, 54
TA action, havingness and overts are keys to, 144
unpredicted change lessens havingness, 54
valences are all “can't-haves” so when valence is off havingness of pc comes up, 110
Havingness Process(es), *defn*, one that returns tone arm to clear read and frees needle [1960], 152
can be run on any pre-session type session, 90
can help on out ruds, 450
check for, 167, 174
commands, a dozen is enough to show if Havingness Process is going to work or not, 151
commands, list of, 142, 152, 154
Confront Processes and , finding; *see* EME
Factual Havingness, trio form, 36
Help used in conjunction with Alternate Confront and Havingness, 108, 110
if it can't be found use O/W, if still not, use Failed Help, 167, 170
in presence of ARC breaks, Havingness is a must on Responsibility Process, 36
is a Confront Process and straightens out the create factor, 35
“Look around here and find something you could have”, 118, 139, 154
objective and somewhat obscure method of confronting, 122
Objective Havingness established and used often is necessary for stable gains, 167
O/W as a Havingness Process, 171
O/W is needed to make a Havingness Process work, 167
“point out”, 143
run as process that stabilizes case, 168
running Havingness restores pc at cause over matter, 53
HCA/HPA level, [1960] 69, [1961] 261
HCO WW Form Check Types [SOP Goals], 228-33, 254
HCS/B.Sc. Courses, OT procedures for, 6
“healing”, mental, on whole track, how to handle, 195

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

- help, 85; *see also* pre-session
aberration on help is a barrier to Scientology, 95
aberration on ~ would be a fear of dependency, 85
aberration, sequence of breakdown is interest,
communication, control, help, 120
ARC breaks and help, 85
as assistance, is an identification of mutual interest
in survival; thus we have (1) possible confusion
of beingness and (2) continuation, 123
betrayal and help,
below 2.0 help is betrayal, 89
help-betrayal identification, 85, 86, 88
“help-is-injury” mechanism, 94
how help became betrayal, 94
psychiatry as betrayed help, 86
button the world spun in on, 94
children aberrated on help, 85
clearing help, 86
cojoining of vectors of life, 186
common denominator world can understand, 92
criminal is one who thinks help cannot be on any
dynamic or uses help on anyone to injure and
destroy, 101
degradation of, 86
deterioration of, 88
dynamics and help, 119
failed help; *see* failed help
insane, why they won’t be helped, 88
is key button which admits auditing, 85
is rejected, why, 94
judge people from what they think of help, 101
make-break point between sanity and insanity, 85
mest clear, Help is flat, 1 16
pc apparently will not be helped, don’t think he is
evil and cannot be helped, 88
pc protests which denote a breakdown of help but-
ton, 85
Processing; *see* Help Processing
psychotic will not receive the orders that bring real
help, 136
punishment doesn’t make man work, he works as
long as he can help, 148
resolves cases because it is the basis of all asso-
ciation, 119
(Secondary Scale level), 290
session depends on pc willing to be helped by audi-
tor, 66
Step 6 made bank toughen up if ~ was unflat, 116
terminals, 124, 125
assessment for Help terminals, 128
Regimen 8, never change Help terminal, 174
valence, help as valence problem, 109
valences and identification stem from help, 119
wrong-way help brings about aberration, 122
Help Process, *defn.*, one that moves tone arm atleast
3 tones per hour and brings reading always a bit
closer to clear read [1960], 1 52
Help Processing, 86, 92; *see also* pre-session
Alternate Confront, Havingness and ~, 108, 110
any Help run is better than no Help run, 119
Help Processing (*cont.*)
assessment of Help, 119
Concept Help; *see* Concept Help
does not flatten very easily on a late specific termi-
nal, 119
Failed Help; *see* Failed Help
five-way bracket, 87
general processes which assist Help, 110
handles problems of beingness, 119
help check as a security check, 98
Help O/W, commands, 93, 108
hints on running cases with Help, 109
mest clear to theta clear requires an address to
sixth dynamic with Help Processes, 174
on terminals reduces a heavy or thick bank, 116
Overt/Withhold and Help can handle out-ethics, 99
O/W data applies to running Help, 92
pcs readily get idea that Help on some terminal
“will never flatten” even though it is flattening
nicely, why and handling, 123
primary reason for the Clears in 1957-58, 89
restimulative process on auditor, how to handle,
119
run on motion, commands, 133
run on pan-determined basis, 191
two-way bracket, 87
two-way comm on help, 87
valences, Help sheds, 110
ways Help could be run, 92
“What help could you confront?” “What help
would you rather not confront?”, 87
HGC,
allowed processes [1961], 369, 385
auditing should convert earlier auditing losses to
wins, 108
Auditor’s Sec Check, 356
check sheet for, [1960], 68
preclear assessment, 108
Pre-Processing Security Check, 403
hidden standards are the result of prior confusion,
409
hidden standards, problems being hidden standards
by which all auditing progress is judged, 354
high scale manifestation or activity, every ~ has a low
scale mockery, 26
high TA; *see* tone arm, high
honest people are impeded by disciplinary laws aimed
at the dishonest, 27
honest people, freedom is for, 27
horticulture discoveries at Saint Hill, 29
HPA Course change proposal to London, 40
Hubbard Certified Auditor; *see* HCA
Hubbard Electrometer; *see* E-Meter
Hubbard Guidance Center; *see* HGC
Hubbard, L. Ron, financial support from orgs for
research, 31
Hubbard, L. Ron, wearing Ethics hat, 99
humanitarians, Scientologists are ~, not revolution-
aries, 114
hyper-critical case, 178

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

I

- identification, 122
 association leads to, 119
 basis of all mental upsets, 119
 valences and identification stem from help, 119
- identity, identities,
 any “identity” is a misidentification, 7
 confusion of ~, failures to help can bring about, 191
 disassociation from, 7
 past life identities, 7
 famous or enduring, 17, 49
 recent, 17
- Identity Process, “What about (name) would you be willing to be?” “What about (name) would you rather not be?”, 49
- illness, cures tend to become a new illness, 103
- ill, pc is ill because he is restraining himself from doing wrong, 69
- ills, social ills of man are a composite of his personal difficulties, 45
- importance (Secondary Scale level), 298
- incidents, difference between flattening Dianetically and Scientologically, 65
- incident, source of engrams is pc who creates a picture of incident below his level of knowingness and recreates it into a “key-in”, 116
- individual(s),
 building unit of a great society is the ~, 45
 responsibility of ~ for his creation, 147
 rights, not originated to protect criminals, 27
 social aberration is only a composite of ~ aberrations, 45
 train individuals, not a class, 329
 western society, economic strangulation of individual, 24
- individuation and O/W, 191
- individuation, how it comes about, 191
- inflows, thetan tends to maintain position on Tone Scale where inflows are comfortable, 131
- inhibit (Secondary Scale level), 307
- insane, insanity,
 criminal is in fact insane, 83
 cure of insanity is light handling, no violence, 83
 help and insanity, 85, 86, 88
 keynote of, is destructive efforts on various dynamics, 82
 malnutrition and anxiety can produce all the symptoms of insanity, 82
 scientific treatment of, 82
 should get rest and then exercise before auditing, 88
 South Africa insanity rate, 82
 thetan holding himself in state of insanity, handling, 38
- in session; *see* session, in
- instant read, *defn*, needle falls within a tenth of a second after question is asked, 355
- integrity, personal, 203
- intensives, end of, 219
- intention, problem is an intention counter-intention that worries pc, 210
- intention, problem is intention vs. intention or “two or more opposing and conflicting views on the same subject”, 61
- interaction, law of physics of, 186
- interest; *see also* pre-session
 communication, control, help, sequence of breakdown in aberration, 120
 is not first step in dissemination, 74
 (Secondary Scale level), 286
- interrogation, 59
- invented answers by pc, handling of, 110
- inverted communication (Secondary Scale level), 311
- inverted control (Secondary Scale level), 309
- inverted help (Secondary Scale level), 308
- inverted interest (Secondary Scale level), 312
- irresponsible, irresponsibility,
 high or low TA, pc in an area in time when pc was being very irresponsible, 18
 how to get withholds off the irresponsible pc, 424
 overt acts proceed from, 19
 overts and withholds are the same as ~, 37
 rising needle tells you the pc is being , 42

J

- Johannesburg Processing Check, 325, 327
- Johannesburg (Joburg) Security Check; *see* Security Check
- justification, mechanism of, 12

K

- key-in, source of engrams is pc who creates a picture of incident below his level of knowingness and recreates it into a “key-in”, 116
- Know to Mystery Scale Assessment, 109

L

- language barrier, pictures bridge, 54
- language, thought discharges dependency on ~, 54
- language trouble, example of handling, 125
- latent reads, don't take up, [R-1A], 355
- law, criminal will not receive orders called law, 136
- laws, honest people are impeded by disciplinary laws aimed at the dishonest, 27
- leave (Secondary Scale level), 300
- lectures by Ron needed to give student flavor and idea of Scientology, 329
- libido theory, Freud's, 103
- lie reaction questions, purpose of, 275
- lies, freedom of speech, does not mean freedom to harm by lies, 27

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

life, *defn*, a series of attained goals, 58
life, help is a cojoining of vectors of life, 186
life, survive is dynamic principle which motivates
most biological life, 126
like (Secondary Scale level), 292
limited process, any process which makes pc create,
35
losses to wins, HGC auditing should convert earlier
auditing ~, 108
“Love thy neighbor”, when it is no longer a willing-
ness, is enforced by theory of O/W, 186
low scale mockery, every high scale manifestation or
activity has a ~, 26
low TA; *see* tone arm, low
low-toned case, how to recognize, 26

M

malnutrition and anxiety can produce all symptoms
of insanity, 82
man is basically good, 12
and is damaged by punishment, 104
massless terminal, do not run ~, 50
mass, problem is force opposing force with resultant
~, 426
mass, resisted change is basis of all mass in physical
universe, 256
matter, difficult exteriorization is all caused by a per-
son’s considerations of thought being matter,
self being matter, 53
matter, running Havingness restores pc at cause over
matter, 53
matter, “Think about matter”, pretty steep for most
cases and would not be real to many, 54
Mau-Mau uprising in Kenya killed whites who helped
them, 86
medicine considering man a body is a sort of betrayal,
86
mental,
E-Meter reads degree of mental mass surrounding
thetan in a body, 18
“healing” on whole track, how to handle, 195
health, real program of mental health is vital, 82
identification is basis of all mental upsets, 1 19
mass, pictures, ridges, circuits, etc., thetan accu-
mulates, to degree that he misassigns responsi-
bility, 18
responses will only register on specially built meters,
body reaction registers on all meters, 459
mest,
basic freeing action of auditing depends upon
separation of thought from matter, energy,
space and time and other life, 53
exteriorization is stable when thetan is used to
mest, 166
has six parts—matter, energy, space, time, form
and location, 166
overt act, basic, is making somebody else want
mest, 53

mest (*cont.*)
people go out of present time because they can’t
have mest of present time, 155
target of Theory 67 is mest, 166
mest clear; *see* Clear, mest
meter(ing); *see* E-Meter
Mimicry Processes are Duplication Processes and
work only because they raise havingness, 155
mind, audit pc where pc’s mind is, 43
mind, *DMSMH* handles public arguments concerning
the mind, 81
mis-emotional (Secondary Scale level), 296
misidentification, identity is a, 7
mockery, every high scale manifestation or activity
has a low scale mockery, 26
Model Session, 41, 137, 271, *defn.*, exact form and
sequence of a session and exact wording of one,
41; *see also* session
is a Model Session because of its “patter”, not
because of specific processes, 220
is designed to avoid unpredictable changes, to
retain havingness by retaining pattern, retaining
predictability by pc, 54
presession is run without a Model Session, 180
script of a Model Session, [1960] 163, [1961]
220
change, 172, 204
revised [1961], 453
modifier, 418; *see also* goals
defn., that consideration which opposes the attain-
ment of a goal and tends to suspend it in time,
413
defn., unseen modification pc has placed before or
after his goal to insist upon winning or threaten
with if he does not win, or to keep the goal in a
games condition unknown even to himself, 419
mores, transgressions against mores of one’s race,
group and family cause unhappiness, 387
motion,
how Help can be run on motion, 133
mutual motion is all right—until we act in cruelty
to the rest, 387
(Secondary Scale level), 294
motivators, thetan is at obsessive cause while trying
to do overts or get ~, 191
mutual action is key to all our overt acts, 387

N

needle; *see also* each needle characteristic by name;
E-Meter Essentials
assess by needle, audit by tone arm, 284, 318
assessment, pc does not have to think or answer to
make needle respond on, 331
manifestations on SOP Goals, 271
reactions, 333
start to occur a fraction of a second after you
utter button, 332
response is reactive, 332

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

- needle (*cont.*)
tone arm, rather than needle, is foremost in analyzing the case, 18
Nixon, Richard M., 76-77
“no auditing”, ARC breaks are all under the heading of ~, 421
“no auditor” case, 325
no effect (Secondary Scale level), 316
no motion (Secondary Scale level), 304
“not know” version of Security Checking, 372
null, [SOP Goals] goals and terminal searches
require a repeat over and over of goal or terminal on list in order to get them to go null, 273
- O**
- objective havingness, ability to remedy it, determines entrance point of case, 155
obsessive can't have (Secondary Scale level), 314
OCA/APA,
ARC breaks worsen the graph, 217
present time problem sticks the graph, makes it register no change, 61
profile on our tests is a picture of a valence, 102
opposition assessment [R3D], 417
opposition goal, 417, *defn.*, idea that is interlocked against pc's goal, making it a postulate counter-postulate situation of long duration; it is not actually the goal of the opposition terminal as the opposition terminal would see it, but only what pc believes it was as it affects him, 419
opposition terminal, 417, *defn.*, person, group or object that has consistently opposed pc's goal, making it a terminal counter-terminal situation of long duration, 419
steps of running levels on 3D terminal and opp-term, 443
orders, persons who refuse orders, 136
organization, what our third dynamic ~ should do, 113
organization, why Ron decided in 1950 to concentrate on research, 111
orgs, blows from Scientology orgs, 11
originations; *see* TR4
others can get gains when oneself is processed, 45
OT Procedure [1960], 15
for HCS/B.Sc. Courses [1960], 6
OT-3 Procedure—HGC allowed processes [1960], 16
OT-3A Procedure—HGC allowed processes [1960], 48
expansion of OT-3A Procedure, Step Two—HGC allowed processes, 51
outflow, thetan's reality on a terminal depends upon degree of outflow he can tolerate from that class of terminals, 131
out of session; *see* session, out of
out rudiments; *see* rudiments, out
overt(s),
basic assumptions of Scientology versus overts, 102
overt(s) (*cont.*)
basic overt act is making somebody else want mest, 53
communication becomes a contest of overts in the ARC breaky case, 120
criminals would not register on overts, 19
criticism is justification of having done an overt, 12, 13
failed case can't confront overts, 5
high or low TA, responsibility is the key to them, not overts, 17
how to get them recognized by pc, 26
include making another person guilty, 6
manifestations on a low-toned case, 26
mechanism of effort to lessen size and pressure of overt, 12, 13
meter reacts on any person or thing on whom subject has committed overt acts, 323
mutual action is the key to all our overt acts, 387
people guilty of overts demand punishment, 13
people withhold overt acts because they conceive that telling them would be another overt act, 12
person who does an overt act to another life form has already abandoned responsibility for that other life form, 37
proceed from irresponsibility, 19
recoils upon one because one is already in a valence similar to that of the being against whom the overt is leveled, 105
responsibility increases, then new overts are realized, 326
responsibility level needed for overt to show on meter, 18
responsibility, when responsibility declines, overt acts can occur, 19
running, don't be snide, 44
(Secondary Scale level), 293
TA action, keys to, are havingness and overts, 144
thetan is at obsessive cause while trying to do overts or get motivators, 191
valences, why a being with valences commits overts harmful to others, 105
overt-motivator sequence, 388
pc has creation tangled up with cause and cause tangled up with the overt-motivator sequence, 35
overt/withhold(s),
ARC breaky pc, look for overts and withholds, 6
are the same as irresponsibility, 37
by transfer, 186
can occur only when help has failed, 186
case that does not advance under auditing has undisclosed overts and withholds, 5
cause social aberration, 45
expressions of abandoning responsibility already extant, 37
individuation and ~, 191
is an effort to regain the status of independent being without taking responsibility for any of intervening steps, 186

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

overt/withhold(s) (cont.)

is a theory which sets in when aberration sets in; it is not a high natural law; it is junior to various laws of communication, control and help, 186
is not the senior law of the universe, 187
list sent to HCO WW, 2
“Love thy neighbor”, when it is no longer a willingness, is enforced by the theory of O/W, 186
mechanism applies only to a strata of existence and it stems from failures to help, 186
on auditor is far too accusative and invalidates pc, 194
pc with ~ is afraid to talk or talks to cover up, 62
problem, one cannot have a problem without overts and withholds against people involved in it, reason why, 414
secretofall~mechanismsisvalences, 102
symptoms of case with overts and withholds, 4
theory, 92,186
theory of, poetically described by Ron, 387
what pc has done to others is aberrative, not what has been done to him, 92
when O/W sets in, 186
worry is the most easily dramatized O/W, 187
Overt/Withhold (O/W) Process(es),
assists duplication and therefore havingness, 145
cases that don’t respond well on O/W use Formula 16,180
co-audit teams, types of O/W to run, 21, 25
Havingness Process, if it can’t be found use O/W, if still not, use Failed Help, 168,170,171
Help and ~ can handle out-ethics, 99
how to run O/W and Responsibility, 37
is needed to make a Havingness Process work, 167
on terminal that represents dynamic [process], 22, 26; see *also* Dynamic Straightwire [in full index]
overt finding processes, “What could you admit causing a (terminal real to pc)?” alternated with “What could you withhold from a (same terminal)?”, 50
PE Co-Audit Process, O/W on a selected terminal, 70
PTP, repeatedly on same person, run O/W, 39, 61
Regimen 6 O/W commands, 3 versions of, 160
Responsibility Processes: Havingness, Confront, O/W, Responsibility, 35
running ~ discloses failed helps, 187
run Responsibility Process after O/W, 37
session ARC breaks, running O/W to handle, 43
stuck picture, handling by dating, Responsibility and O/W, 16
why O/W is run, 186
3D commands whole track O/W, 458
own, familiarity, predictability, is strongly connected with ability to have or own, 54
Oxford Capacity Analysis; see OCA/APA

P

pain, freeing of valences remedies pain and aberration, 105
pan-determined basis, Help on, 191
passive resistance, how to handle, 60
past deaths, “Where Are You Buried?” project, 55
past life, past lives; see *also* HYLBTL?
identities, 7
famous, enduring, recent, 17
immediate past lifetime or lifetimes of pc, 17, 49
pc; see preclear
PDH, defn., pain-drug-hypnotism, 321
PE,
becomes a dissertation in Scientology and a Comm Course, 182
Co-Audit processes, 70
Course, way to run, 70,188
personnel and admin, 183
procurement, 70
test section, 182
peace on Earth, 28
people’s questions, answer with books, 78
personal difficulties, social ills of man are a composite of his~,45
personal efficiency; see PE
personal integrity, 203
philosophy that failed, psychiatry, 77
physics, law of interaction, 186
picture; see facsimile
political slavery, on what it is built, 28
postulate(s),
goal has anatomy of ~ counter-postulate, 416
goal must have a counter-postulate to stay fixed, 413
opposition goal, a postulate counter-postulate situation of long duration, 419
problem is caused by a balanced postulate counter postulate, 413, 414
problem is two or more ~ in opposition, 354
somatics, aberrations, circuits and problems are postulate counter-postulate situations, 414
power of choice is senior to responsibility, 24
power, thetan reduces his own, 19
practitioners, working alone, banish that idea, 112
preclear(s)(’s); see *also* case
ability to duplicate, process to rehabilitate, 52
ability to follow auditing command, 134
auditor’s reality vs. pc’s reality, 129
auditor’s relationship to pc; see auditor
ARC break(s) and pc,
auditor taking order from pc causes pc to ARC break, 374
E-Meter doesn’t register on ARC broken pc, 442
look for overts and withholds on ARC breaky pc, 6
pc permitted to be responsible for session will ARC break, 373

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

- preclear(s)(‘s) (*cont.*)
- pc who refuses to answer has an ARC break or a withhold, 175
 - restless or ARC breaky pc, how to handle, 43
 - yanking pc’s attention to auditor is source of a lot of ARC breaks, 43
 - “beating the meter”, 421
 - beingnesses in pc, general form of Help which discovers, 110
 - blows, causes for, 217
 - completedpc, adminhandling, 219
 - confront, less a pc can confront two things, more he fixes on one, 62
 - did it all himself and must gradually come to realize that with total subjective reality, 38
 - E-Meter falls on things pc is interested in and will talk about, 175
 - feels a security when all his sessions are predictable as to pattern, 53
 - feels weird running Concept Help, then run Alternate Confront, 122
 - going upscale to boredom, continue the process, 175
 - has a field, somatics, malformity or aberration, how to clean up, 7
 - ill because he is restraining himself from doing wrong, 69
 - improve pc, not valence, 368
- condition is more likely to have succumb
- goals than survive goals, 58
 - interested in own case, 43, 66; *see also* session, in invented answers by pc, handling of, 110
 - made facsimile to restrain himself from ever doing it again, 38
 - may be sane analytically and still react violently at times in session, 88
 - often gives a PT problem when asked for goals, 210
 - only thing wrong with pc is his lack of confidence in handling himself without hurting others, 67
 - out of session; *see* session, out of
 - priorly audited, how to handle, [1961], 21 6
 - problems tend to snap in on pc, cause of, 61
 - protests that denote a breakdown of the help button, 85
 - refuses to answer or refuses auditing, what to run, 175
 - response onmeter, analytical vs. reactive, 331
 - rudiments, establish them more often with touchy pcs, 48
 - run thepc always atcause,44
 - “transferred” to D of P, how to handle, 216
 - trouble, formula of attack on area where pc is having trouble, 25
 - unchanging, what to do, 219
 - unwanted pc condition or aberration, how to handle, 44
 - what is right and wrong with pc, scale of, in order of importance, 121
- preclear(s)(‘s) (*cont.*)
- what is wrong with pc is not known to pc; if pc knows all about it, it isn’t wrong with him, 331
 - “What question shouldn’t I ask you?”, if pc evades this, how to handle, 180
 - when pcs don’t recover very fast, they don’t want to, how to handle, 58
 - who always has problems, 63
 - who believes that every cause brings about a destruction, 35
 - who only gets death pictures or bad pictures is somewhere late on cycle of action or late on an inversion cycle, 35
 - willing to be helped by auditor, 66
- preclear assessment, HGC, 108
- Preclear Assessment Sheet, purpose of, 392
- predictability is strongly connected with ability to have or own, 54
- Pre-Have 3D Scale, Auxiliary, 434
- Pre-Havingness Scale, 197
- amended and revised, 282, 335, 375
 - assessment, 207, 225, 324
 - not by elimination, 273
 - how to assess Pre-Hav Scale,332
 - change belongs at “inverted control” on ~, 320
 - commandforcommunicationon ,211
 - command sheet—Pre-Havingness Scale, 199
 - flat, cases may slump between sessions until Pre in bad Hav Scale is flat, 209
 - general runs on ~, 317
 - without terminal, 326
 - level(s), 418
 - assess for ~ on SOP Goals, how to, 268
 - flatten a level before reassessing, 327
 - “flat” when the TA moves only 1/4 to 1/8 of a division up or down in 20 minutes of auditing, 283
 - mistakes in running, 327
 - null all Pre-Hav levels that react on assessment on the first terminal, 269
 - rock slams, handling, 283
 - TA behavior on, 238
 - not a picture of analytical thought; it is in order it is in because it is a picture of reactive thought, 331
 - one-time Pre-Hav rule, 273
- Primary Scale, 282, 285
- amended, 336
- PTPs of long duration, run on Pre-Havingness Scale, 271, 326
- Secondary Scale, 286
- contains nearly all simple verbs in English language, properly placed for level and repeated on other levels,282
 - use of, 198, 282
 - in SOP Goals Intensive, 206
 - when first terminal is flat, 216
- Pre-Intensive Interview and Pre-Goals Assessment Check by D of P [SOP Goals], HCO WW Form CT1, 228, 254

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

- present time, cyclic aspect of recall type processes, phenomena of pc bouncing into PT, 51
- present time is only referral point that exists; in its absence all becomes "bank", 155
- present time, people go out of present time because they can't have the most of present time, 155
- present time problem, 43, 61, 377; *see also* problem *defn.*, basically the inability to confront the dual terminal nature of this universe, 61
- defn.*, a special problem that exists in the physical universe now on which pc has his attention fixed, 62
- defn.*, problem that exists now in physical universe, 210
- ARC breaks, withholds and PT problems can stop a case, 207, 210
- goals and PT problem, 210
- handling, 63, 194
- long duration PTPs, 271
- run on Pre-Hav, 326
- out of session, caused by W/Hs and PTPs, 62
- pc often gives a PTP when asked for goals, 210
- pc who is having lots of PTPs has his attention very fixed on something, 61
- person in the PTP is often the current clue to the case, 61
- prevents progress, 217
- run O/W on constant restimulator of PTPs, 39, 61
- sticks the graph, makes it register no change, 61
- what is a PTP, 61
- Present Time Problem Process, "Describe the problem to me." "How does it seem now?", 42
- Present Time Problem Processes, 61
- presession(s),
- additions, 134
 - auditing presession, 141
 - help is first button, 86
 - is run without a Model Session, 180
 - of the 1st Saint Hill ACC, 142
 - pre-presession stage that's a confessional, 89
 - thirty-six new presessions, 156
 - type session, havingness can be run on any, 90
- Presession Processes, 74
- assist dissemination, 72, 73
 - commands for Presessions II-X, Havingness and Confront, 142
 - handle: help factor, control factor, pc communication factor, interest factor, 72
 - Presession Communication, 135
 - Presession Control, 134, 135
 - Presession Help: two-way Help on auditor-pc, 134
 - Presession Interest: live or die, 134
 - Presession One (Help, Control, Communication, Interest), 175
 - Presession Two, 139
 - based on theory that one is taking sixth dynamic off seventh dynamic, 141
 - steps of, 139
- Presession 37, 180
- method of getting off withholds, 180
- Presession Processes (*cont.*)
- Presession 37 (*cont.*)
- use of, 204
 - "What question shouldn't I ask you?", 154, 194
 - what to do for person after ~, 79
- press, enttheta and attacks in, 148
- Primary Scale; *see* Pre-Havingness Scale, Primary Scale
- primitives, help = betrayal, 86
- primitives, insanity rises when venerated by white customs, 82
- prior confusion, 401, 409
- all problems are preceded by, 409
 - finding, 415
 - hidden standards are result of ~, 409
 - sec checking area of prior confusion, 406, 414
 - Security Checking includes ability to locate area of prior confusion, 390
 - stuck points on time track stick because of ~, 414
 - use of ~ in Problems Intense, 414
- problem(s); *see also* present time problem
- defn.*, intention vs. intention or "two or more opposing and conflicting views on same subject", 61
 - defn.*, an intention counter-intention that worries pc, 210
 - defn.*, two or more postulates in opposition to each other, 354
 - defn.*, postulate counter-postulate, 413
 - all problems are preceded by a prior confusion, 409
 - auditing Problems cures alter-ness in a case, 354
 - confronting ~ without doing something about it, 61
 - consists of two opposed stable data and therefore two confusions, 354
 - dating the problem in Problems Intensive, what it does, 415
 - force opposing force with resultant mass, 426
 - goal has anatomy of problem, 416
 - hidden standards by which all auditing progress is judged, 354
 - most stuck point on track is a problem, 414
 - old solution causing new problems, 62
 - one cannot have a ~ without overt and withholds against people involved in it, for one cannot be so individuated as to not influence others unless one has O/Ws on those others, 414
 - pc in looking over problems falls into realizing what his actual desires are, 57
 - pc who always has problems, 63
 - solutions are ordinarily an alter-is of problems, 54
 - somatics, aberrations, circuits and problems are postulate counter-postulate situations, 414
 - tend to snap in on the pc, 61
 - why problems hang and float in time, 414
- Problem Process(es), 61, 354
- Problem and Solution Processes, 54
- Sec Check and Problem, ratio between in terms of time [R1A], 355

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

- Problem Process(es) (*cont.*)
“Tell me your problem.” “How does it seem to you now?”, 61
“Tell me your problem.” “What part of that problem could you confront?”, 62
“Tell me your problem.” “What part of that problem have you been responsible for?”, 62
“What motion have you been responsible for?”, 62
“What problem about a leg could you confront?”, 54
“What problem could you confront?”, 61
“What problem have you been (or might you have been) responsible for?”, 62
“What two things can you confront?”, 62
- ProblemsIntensives, 401, 414
assessment, example, 410
for staff clearing, 392
turning points are simply self-determined changes in pc’s life, 401
use of the prior confusion, 414
- process(es),
all fail if pc is out of session, 175
allowed [1961], 325, 385
are run as long as they produce tone arm change, 218
developed to facilitate application, 64
ending a process, [1960] 42, 164, [1961] 221, 454
how long to run process, 42, 218
limited process, any process which makes pc create, 35
never restart a process the moment it is ended, 44
safe processes, 406
sequence of, [1960], 90
start of ~, [1960] 42, 163, [1961] 221, 454
stopping a process, 218
that turns on a bizarre or unwanted condition will always turn it off, 218
- processing; *see* auditing
Processing Check, Johannesburg, 325
Processing Security Check, 356
process levels-necessity for training, 261
professional Scientologist is one who expertly uses Scientology on any area or level of society, 106
profile; *see* OCA/APA, profile
propitiate (Secondary Scale level), 298
protect (Secondary Scale level!), 301
protests, pc, denote a breakdown of the help button, 85
- psychiatry(‘s),
as betrayed help, 86
basic assumption: shock cures aberration, 103
basic assumption that enough punishment will restore sanity is disproven, 104
- dramatization, 103
philosophy that failed, 77
why it failed, 88
- psychosis, new definition of, 136
psychosomatic, chronic, is an effort to succumb, 57
psychotic, *defn.*, that person who cannot receive orders of any kind, who sits unmoving or goes berserk at the thought of doing anything told him by another determinism, 136
- PT; *see* present time
PTP; *see* present time problem
public arguments concerning the mind, *DMSMH* handles them, 81
public asking questions, best answer: read *DMSMH*, 79
public, uninformed and informed on subject of Scientology, *DMSMH* contains a bridge between them, 79
- punishment,
blackmail and are keynotes of all dark operations, 28
doesn’t cure anything, 103
doesn’t make man work, he works as long as he can help, 148
earlier assumption to punishment is that some thing can be done to another being, 104
is just another worsening of overt sequence and degrades punisher, 13
man is basically good and is damaged by punishment, 104
mechanisms of, 13
people guilty of overts demand, 13
psychiatric basic assumption that enough punishment will restore sanity is disproven, 104

Q

- Q and A, *defn.*, auditor doing whatever pc says, 374, 375
change in pc causes auditor to stop or change process, 218
examples, 373
questions, books answer people’s ~, 78
questions, public asking, best answer: read *DMSMH*, 79

R

- reach, high tone arm shows loss of ability to start or reach, 38
- reactive,
all needle response is reactive, 332
engrams, reactive self-restraint is the purpose of all, 69
help is almost always betrayal in reactive zones and areas, 88
pc response, analytical vs. reactive, 331
Pre-Hav Scale is a picture of reactive thought, 331
responsibility is very aberrated in its reactive definitions, 87
- reactive mind,
attention, when too much attention is given another terminal, bank reacts to prevent that attention, 406

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

- reactive mind (*cont.*)
auditor has more control over pc's reactive mind than pc since pc is influenced by reactive mind responses and auditor is not so influenced, 332
auditors need subjective reality on bank, 374, 376
basis of a reactive mind is creativeness done below the level of consciousness, 116
beefing up the bank, cause of, 35
before tackling a bank, you have to have a session, clearing is a qualitative return of confidence in self not quantitative handling of bank, 66
E-Meter reacts only on the reactive mind, 331
Goals Problem Mass, core of reactive bank, 443
havingness takes edge off a bank, 116
Help on terminals reduces a heavy or thick bank, 116
pc has as much bank as he has denied cause, 19
present time is only referral point that exists; in its absence all becomes "bank", 155
responds instantly, 331
Responsibility Processes and Help reduce bank's heaviness, 116
target of the auditor is pc's reactive mind, 428
there is no time in the reactive mind, 332
toughened up by creating, how to handle, 116
use a gradient approach to bank, 65
- read(s),
can occur due to charged words in a question with no charge on question itself, 323
clear read, false, 26
compartmenting the question, 322
instant read, *defn*, needle falls within a tenth of a second after question is asked, 355
latent reads, don't take up, 355
meter reading; *see* E-Meter
- real, reality,
auditors need subjective reality on bank, 374, 376
auditor's reality vs. pc's reality, 129
case who runs with no reality, 4
do not run things that are not real to pc, reason why 17
pc did it all himself and must gradually come to realize that with total subjective reality, 38
scale of pc reality on terminals, 131
- recall, Cause Elementary Straight Wire turns on recall in the pc, 52
- recall, cyclic aspect of recall type processes, phenomena of pc bouncing into PT, 51
- recall, use recall before runninggrams, 65
- recover, when pcs don't recover very fast, they don't want to, 58
- recovery of past skills, 125
- Regimen is workhorse combination of processes that boosts case to Clear after it has been started, 179
- Regimens and Formulas were never for co-audits, 176
- Regimen 1, 117, 128
is a stop-gap bridge between old style formal auditing and a complete grasp of pre-sessioning and Model Sessions, 128
steps of Regimen 1, 128
- Regimen Two, 137
steps of Regimen Two, 137
- Regimen 3, 179
- Regimen 3/II and 3/V, 142
- Regimen 6 O/W commands, 3 versions of, 160
- Regimen 8, 179
never change the Help terminal, 174
rehabilitation of willingness to do, 25
relativity, Einstein's theory of, 102
- Release, 318
"Release" Check Sheet by D of P [SOP Goals], HCO WW Form CT7, 233
- religious beliefs, old, that man is basically evil, 12
- reports, staff auditor reports, 219
- research advances, 31
- research project, 55
- resistance, passive, how to handle, 60
- resisted change is basis of all mass in physical universe and every stuck point on track, 256
- responsibility, *defn*, admit causing, able to withhold, 14
anatomy of ~ is able to admit causation, able to withhold from 18, 19
auditor must take full ~ for the session, 43
create is bad only when one does not take ~ for the creation, 35
E-Meter tone arm, level of ~ causes it to fluctuate, 18
Formula 19 improves ~ and brings up awareness of withholds and improves case, 205
havingness is the lowest rung of responsibility, 36
high and low tone arms, ~ is key to them, not overts, 17
is very aberrated in its reactive definitions, 87
key to all cases, 18
needle drops only on those terminals that pc still feels some responsibility for, 38
new overts are realized when ~ increases, 326
of individual for his creation, 147
overt act and withhold are evidently expressions of abandoning ~ already extant, 37
overt acts on E-Meter, it takes a certain level of responsibility to show up, 18
O/W is an effort to regain status of independent being without taking responsibility for any of intervening steps, 186
person who does an overt act to another life form has already abandoned responsibility for that other life form, 37
power of choice is senior to responsibility, 24
relationship of and Cause/Withhold, 19
shifting tone arms tell you increased or decreased responsibility, 42
thetan accumulates mental mass, pictures, ridges, circuits, etc., to degree that he misassigns ~, 18
when ~ declines, overt acts can occur, 19
- Responsibility Process(es)(ing), 14
can be run on a no-mass terminal or significance, 87
Cause/Withhold, ~, how to run, 17, 19

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

- Responsibility Process(es)(ing) (*cont.*)
chronic somatic, running Responsibility on, 17
clearing pc's field with Responsibility, 16, 49
Confront can be run as a prelude to any and all
Responsibility, 50
generalize terminal if overt is very bad, 48
goal of, 25
Havingness, Confront, O/W, Responsibility, 35
Havingness is a must on any Responsibility Process
in presence of ARC breaks, 36
how to run O/W and Responsibility, 37
is Confront and is very senior to Confront as a
process, 35
is not workable when pc is in a valence, 1 16
reduce the bank's heaviness, 116
run Responsibility on matter, energy, space, time,
motion and thought, 50
run Responsibility Process after O/W, 37
stuck picture, handling by dating, Responsibility
and O/W, 16
theory of Responsibility Processing, 24
"What about a victim could you be responsible
for?", 16,17, 49
"What have you done to a (terminal)?" "What
have you withheld from a (terminal)?" , 25, 36
"What part of your life have you been responsible
for?", PE Co-Audit Process, 70
restimulator, run O/W on constant restimulator of
PTPs, 39
rest, insane should get rest and then exercise before
auditing, 88
restraining, pc is ill because he is restraining himself
from doing wrong, 69
restraint, reactive self-restraint is the purpose of all
engrams, 69
revolts kill an awful lot of natives, 60
revolutionaries, Scientologists are not ~, we are
humanitarians, 114
R-factor, Security Check, 242, 276
R-factor, use of in starting session, 453
ridges, thetan accumulates mental mass, pictures,
ridges, circuits, etc., to degree that he misas-
signs responsibility, 18
rights, honest people have rights, too, 27
rights, individual, not originated to protect criminals,
27
riots, 60
rising needle(s),
are disregarded, 274
has no meaning for purposes of assessment, 273,
333
means pc can't confront it, 333
SOP Goals assessment, ignore all rises of needle,
266
tells you the pc is being irresponsible, 42
rock slam(s),
are strongest indicator [SOP Goals], 271
audit by tone arm (except in rock slam), assess by
needle [SOP Goals], 318
is the strongest reaction there is, 284
rock slam(s) (*cont.*)
Pre-Hav level rock slams, handling, 283
what rock slams mean, 272
Ron; *see* Hubbard, L. Ron
room, rudiment on, 377
Routine One [1961], 325, 348, 369
CCHs and Routine 1, 334
Routine 1A [1961], 354, 369
steps, 354
value of Routine 1A, 355
Routine Two [1961], 326
steps, 326
Routine Three [1961], 326, 369
Routine 3A [1961], 412
steps, 412
Routine 3D, 416
assessments, tips on, 427
cautions, 420
commands, 426, 438, 441
commands for whole track O/W, 458
command sheet, 437, 447, 457
goalsassessment,417
levels, tips on running, 429, 443
meter behavioron Routine 3Dcommands,426
opposition assessment, 417
prerequisites, 445
reruns, 444
rules of thumb,430,462
terminal and oppterm, steps of running levels on,
443
vocabulary, 419
rudiments, 41,163, 220, 423
are not something it is nice to do; they must be
done, 56
are used to get pc in session, 274
auditor and ARC break rudiment, 43
auditorclearance,41, 194
beginning rudiments [1 96 1], 451 , 453
and end rudiments, 215
change in, [1961], 391
clean rudiments, 271
clearingandrudiments [1961],410
commands [1961], 377
D of P checks pc out on rudiments, 215
don't run a case by, 274
end rudiments, 43,164, 222, 451, 455
establish them more often with touchy pcs, 48
exist to run enough to get pc into session, not to
audit the case by rudiments, 363
goals in the rudiments, 56
handling of rudiments [1961], 194
Havingness, "Look around here and find some
thing you can have" always works on any pc if
~ are done thoroughly, 154
Havingness Process (or TR 10) can help on out
ruds, 450
list of rudiments bulletins, 450
metering rudiments [1961], 363
modernized [1961], 450
out, example of out ~ preventing clearing, 410

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

- rudiments (*cont.*)
out ~ hide goals and terminals, 374, 423
overt-withhold on auditor is far too accusative and invalidates pc, 194
parts of modern rudiments, 56
session without proper rudiments is a session without control, 56
withholds and rudiments, 204
Rudiments Check by D of P [SOP Goals], HCO WW Form CT4, 231
R (number); *see* Routine (number)
- S**
- Saint Hill Manor, data about, 29
sane, sanity,
help is the make-break point between sanity and insanity, 85
not necessary to process every person on Earth to bring sanity to Earth, 45
pc may be sane analytically and still react violently at times in session, 88
psychiatric basic assumption that enough punishment will restore sanity is disproven, 104
scale of increasing confidence, 8
scale of pc reality on terminals, 131
scale of wins [1947], 65
science goes mad when it is “creating in order to destroy”, 127
sciences, assumption points of, 102
scientific treatment of the insane, 82
scientists once stood for truth and tried to serve humanity; now they serve economics and political creeds, 146
Scientologist(s)(’s),
are not revolutionaries, we are humanitarians, 114
as a “counselor”, 114
be part of society and improve it, 107, 114
“doctors” on third and fourth dynamics, 113
handle first and second dynamics only to achieve better function on third and fourth, 112
professional ~ is one who expertly uses Scientology on any area or level of society, 106
role in life, Special Zone Plan, 111
what we expect of a Scientologist, 106
Scientology(’s),
assumption points of ~ and other subjects, 102
basic assumption: a being without aberration will be good, ethical, artistic and powerful; this has become a basic truth, 104
described at public level in *DMSMH*, 79, 81
examples of ~ applied to third dynamic, 114
lectures by Ron needed to give student flavor and idea of Scientology, 329
results verify its basic assumption, 104
sell Scientology by action, 115
situation in South Africa [1960], 161
Theory 67, 149
third dynamic for Scientology, 2
S-C-S; *see* Start-Change—Stop
second dynamic; *see* dynamic, 2nd
Secondary Scale; *see* Pre-Havingness Scale, Secondary Scale
Security Check(s)(ing), 30, 355, 445; *see also* confessional; Integrity Processing [both in full index]; *E-Meter Essentials*
against a chronic somatic, 389
always flatten original question, 449
compose Sec Check, 415
confused area, 415
somatics, possible to eradicate by sec checking area of confusion, 409
don’t act accusatively, 98
generalities won’t do, 424
help check as a security check, 98
how to do, 97
main danger of, 402
only valid Security Check, 275
preventing a missed Sec Check question, 425
prevention of ~ being left unflat, 402
prior confusion and , 390, 406, 409, 415
ratio of time run between Problem and ~ [RIA], 355
R-factor, 242, 276
R3D, Sec Checks during, 422
types of,
Children’s Security Check, ages 6-12, 378
“don’t know” version, 425
for staff, main points to be included [1960], 23
HGC Auditor’s Sec Check, 356
HGC Pre-Processing Security Check, 403
Johannesburg (Joburg) Security Check, 242
275, 317
as preparation for assessment, 270
CCHs and Joburg, 348
“not know” version of Security Checking, 372
Processing Security Check, 356
Scientology Students’ Security Check, 349
Student Practice Security Check, used by Academy students learning E-Meter use, 400
Whole Track Sec Check, 337
use of E-Meter in Security Check, 97
varying Sec Check questions, 449
when a person is flunked on a Sec Check, 275
withhold pulling and Sec Check, increase E-Meter sensitivity for, 273
Security Form 2 (Joburg Security Check Sheet), 242
Security Form 7A (for staff applicants), 381
Security Form 7B (for persons now employed), 383
Security Form 8 (Children’s Security Check), 378
security risk, don’t let a bad ~ near a staff position, 89
self-auditing, 373
self-determinism, aberrated, is end product of failures to help, 191
sensitivity,
on E-Meter, how to get correct by pc can squeeze, 32, 273
Sec Check and W/H pulling, increase , 273
setting on meter, how to get significant readings, 32

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

- separateness, games condition evolves from , 54
separate (Secondary Scale level), 297
session(s); *see also* Model Session
 ARC break caused by running pc over his head, 44
 ARC breaks, running O~W to handle, 43
 auditor clearance, 41
 auditor fully responsible for session, 43
 before tackling a bank you have to have a ~, 66
 ending a session, 43,164, 223, 456
 environment, 41
 first sessions, 214
 General Check-up on a Session by D of P [SOP Goals], HCO WW Form CT3, 230
 general requirements of sessions, 129
 goals, 41 solution, Problem and reason for session goals, 56
 in session, *defn, pc* interested in own case and willing to talk to auditor, 43, 62,173, 175, 450
 exception to case interest, pc going upscale goes through boredom, 175
 howtogetandkeeppcin session,43,175
 key to fast, high results is “pc in session”, 175
 rudiments are used to get pc in session, 274
 is a cycle of action, 56
 mechanics of session, great deal of value of auditing lies in, 56
 out of session, degrees of being, 175
 out of session, processes all fail if pc is ~,1 75
 out of session, reasons for, 62
 patterns, well followed, tend to run out earlier sessions, 53
 pc feels a security when all his sessions are predictable as to pattern, 53
 pc permitted to be responsible for session will ARC break, 373
 rudiments at the beginning of session [1961], 451
 rudiments exist to run enough to get pc into ~, 363
 secondsession,215
 standardized sessions, 53
 starting ~, [1960] 73,163, [1961] 220, 453
 how to start a session [1960], 41
 points which should be in before starting ~, 67
 what session depends on, 66
 without proper rudiments ~ is without control, 56
seventh dynamic; *see* dynamic, 7th
sex, Freud’s libido theory, 103
shock cures aberration: psychiatry’s basic assumption, 103
significance process, no ~ moves a low graph case, 139
significance, Responsibility can be run on a no-mass terminal or significance, 87
silent subject, how to find out a person’s name on a ~, E-Meter interrogation, 59
sixth dynamic; *see* dynamic, 6th
skills, recovery of past skills, 125
slant, “/” symbol to show a goal reads, 266
slave (s),
 masters, 148
 scientists as slaves, 146
 state, 27
 decline into, 24
slavery of thought, 147
slavery, political, on what it is built, 28
social aberration is only a composite of individual aberrations, 45
social ills of man are a composite of his personal difficulties, 45
society, individual is building unit of a great ~, 45
society, Scientologists should be part of society and improve it, 107,114
Solution Processes, 54
solutions are ordinarily an alter-is of problems, 54
solutions, why these hangup problems, 62
somatics,
 aberrations, circuits, somatics and problems are postulate counter-postulate situations, 414
 chronic somatic,
 find out who pc is making guilty by having them, 7
 is an effort to succumb, 57
 running Responsibility on, 17
 sec checking against a chronic somatic, 389
 handling ~ by sec checking area of confusion, 409
 pc has a field, somatics, malformity or aberration, how to clean them up, 7
SOP Goals, 224
 assessingfor SOPGoalsimproved, 270
 assessing terminal list by elimination, 240
 assessment, 215
 by elimination, steps, 265
 for goals and terminals,239,326
 for Pre-Hav level, 268
 for terminal by elimination, 267
 goals assessment problems sorted out, 236
 ignore all rises of needle, 266
 incorrect assessment on SOP Goals means an infinity of auditing without clearing, 265
 Joburg Sec Check as preparation for ~, 270
 mistakes, 273
 must be perfect, 270, 271
 right way to do ~, 265
 sensitivity level during assessment, 273
 two types of terminals to assess, 270
 be—do—have coordinated, 206
 cases not on SOP Goals, 218
 CCHs, when to runbefore SOPGoals, 255
 Change Process, when to run before ~, 253, 255
 clearing by SOP Goals, 217
 data on Goals SOP, 209
 errors, 246
 goals list, how to assess, 236, 239
 goals list, how to make, 266
 goofs, 234
 how to prove the terminal, 268
 intensives, 206, 224, 241
 Pre-Hav Scale used in SOP Goals Intensive, 206

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

- SOP Goals (*cont.*)
- mistakes, 318
 - modified, 227, 241
 - pc's priorly run on SOP Goals, handling of, 216
 - preparatory steps of SOP Goals, 317
 - primary sources of wasted time on ~, 246
 - procedure, use of, 212
 - releasing and preparing a case for ~, 317
 - repairing a case, 238
 - session, example, 208, 226
 - terminals list, how to make, 267
 - tone arm behavior on Pre-Hav levels, 238
 - TRs, Model Session, meter, Change Processes, must be known to run SOP Goals, 264
 - works too fast to allow bad technical application, 261
- soup cans, use ~ as E-Meter electrodes, 460
- source beingness, thetan tends to move from ~ to effect beingness, 131
- South Africa, insanity rate of, 82
- South Africa, Scientology's situation in, [1960], 161
- Special Zone Plan, 111, 114
- speech, freedom of, does not mean freedom to harm by lies, 27
- stable datum and confusion, 62
- staff auditor; *see* auditor, staff
- staff position, don't let a bad security risk near a ~, 89
- Start—Change—Stop, 48
- “stand still” step, 202
- start, high tone arm shows loss of ability to start or reach, 38
- Step 6 made the whole bank toughen up, if Help was unflat, 116
- Step 6, running Step 6 in a valence is courting disaster as pc is in a picture that increases in mass and gives him somatics, 109
- Step 6 was abandoned, 92, 109
- stop, low tone arm (below the clear reading) shows loss of ability to stop or withhold, 38
- Straight Wire,
 - Cause ARC Straight Wire, 51
 - Cause Elementary Straight Wire turns on recall in the pc, 52
 - Duplication Straight Wire, “What would you permit to have happen again?”, 52
- stuck needle [in Sec Checking] can be freed by processing or by getting off withholds, 276
- stuck needle, run Concentrate—Shift Attention Process, 218
- stuck picture, how to handle, 9, 16, 48
- stuck point, most ~ on track is a problem, 414
- stuck point on track, resisted change is basis of every ~, 256
- student(s); *see also* training
 - HCO WW Security Form 5A, for all HPA/HCA and above students before acceptance on courses, 407
 - Practice Security Check used by Academy students learning E-Meter use, 400
 - Scientology Students' Security Check, 349
- substitute (Secondary Scale level), 308
- succumb, chronic psychosomatic is an effort to ~, 57
- succumb goals, pc in bad condition is more likely to have ~ than survive goals, 58
- surprise, *defn.*, rapidity of change of state, unpredicted, 54
- survive, survival,
 - creation brings about an effort to continuously create which becomes “survive”, 126
 - destroy in order to ~ is not a duplication, 126
 - dynamic principle which motivates most biological life, 126
 - help is an identification of mutual interest in survival, 123
 - is the apparency of creating, 126
 - is translated for processing as Continuous Confront, 127
 - primary law of Book One, dominant part of create—survive—destroy, 126 (Secondary Scale level), 300
- sweetness and light, “theetie weetie case”, 325

T

- TA; *see* tone arm
- talk, pc with overts and withholds is afraid to talk or talks to cover up, 62
- talk, willing to talk about difficulties, 442
- tapes, to whom tapes are sold and played, 10, 149
- terminal(s),
 - assess for ~ by elimination [SOP Goals], 267, 271
 - beware running adjectival commands such as “frigid woman”, 17, 50
 - by profession [Help], 124
 - central valence or terminal is built in to demand total attention from pc, 406
 - do not run a massless ~ such as “sex” or “help”, 50
 - do not run things that are not real to pc, reason why, 17
 - dual terminal nature of this universe, 61
 - finishing off a difficult terminal [Help], 110
 - flatten the terminals, 109, 209
 - generalize terminal if overt is very bad, for Responsibility Process, 48
 - general terminal, most of pc's case will be found connected with some, 49
 - general terminals run better than specific, why, 109, 119
 - goal and modifier must be contained in one basic ~, otherwise postulates would not be out of reach of pc [R3A], 413
 - goal has anatomy of problem and is terminal counter-terminal, 416
 - goals and terminals, D of P must check all new [SOP Goals], 216
 - goals and terminals, out rudiments hide ~, 423
 - goals and terminals searches require a repeat over and over of goal or terminal on list in order to get them to go null [SOP Goals], 273

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

- terminal(s) (*cont.*)
- goal terminal, 418, *defn.*, that valence into which pc has interiorized and which carries goal, modifier and aberration which pc attributes to self, 419
 - when is a goals terminal flat [SOP Goals], 209
 - Help does not flatten very easily on a late specific terminal, 119
 - Help on ~ reduces a heavy or thick bank, 116
 - Help terminal, Regimen 8, never change ,1 74
 - Help terminals, 124,125,128
 - improperly assessed, how to detect during auditing, 132
 - list [SOPGoals],
 - always recheck terminals list, 271
 - assessing terminal list by elimination, 240
 - causative list of terminals, 271
 - effect list of terminals, 271
 - how to do a terminals list on SOP Goals assessment, 267
 - needle drops only on those terminals that pc still feels some responsibility for, 38
 - opposition terminal, 417, *defn.*, person, group or object that has consistently opposed pc's goal, making it a terminal counter-terminal situation of longduration,419
 - Overt/Withhold Process on general and specific ~, 37
 - Overt/Withhold Process on terminal representing dynamic, 26
 - Pre-Hav Scale, when first terminal is flat, 216
 - Responsibility can be run on a no-mass terminal or significance, 87
 - run always causative ~, never effect ~,132
 - scale of pc reality on terminals, 131
 - SOP Goals assessments for goals and ~, 326
 - SOP Goals, how to prove the terminal, 268
 - stable data on selecting terminals, 165
 - start case on first terminal ever run, 108
 - thetan's reality on a terminal depends upon degree of outflow thetan can tolerate from that class of terminals, 131
 - two types of ~ to assess [SOP Goals], 270
 - terrorist is insane, 83
 - test profile patterns, valences are source of, 102,104
 - test section, PE, what it does, 182
 - "theetie weetie case" (sweetness and light), 325
 - theory 6 7*,149, *defn.*, 166
 - target of Theory 67 is mest, 166
 - theta clear; *see* Clear, theta
 - thetan(s),
 - accumulates mental mass, pictures, ridges, circuits, etc., to degree that he misassigns responsibility, 18
 - create, fundamental urge of a thetan, 126
 - dug himself in, lost sight of why, and is holding himself in a state of stupidity, aberration and even insanity, 38
 - E-Meter reads degree of mental mass surrounding thetan in a body, 18
 - thetan(s) (*cont.*)
 - exteriorization is stable when thetan is used to mest, 166
 - havingness must be up to run "thetan", 195
 - position on Tone Scale, 131
 - reality on a terminal depends upon degree of outflow a thetan can tolerate from that class of terminals, 131
 - reduces his own power, 19
 - takes a valence that he believes will help others or the universe, 109
 - tends to become that on which he has produced non-beneficial effects, 131
 - tends to move from source beingness to effect beingness, 131
 - tries to help something or somebody and fails and last stage of his effort is to mock up a picture of the thing and try to help it, 109
 - who sleeps too much and does too little, 24
 - will not let himself go free unless he can operate without danger to others, 19
 - "Think about matter", pretty steep for most cases and would not be real to many, 54
 - thinking at command is a sort of CCH on thinkingness, 121
 - "Think of something you could withhold." "What could you admit causing?" [process], 7
 - think (Secondary Scale level), 314
 - third dynamic; *see* dynamic, 3rd
 - thirty-six new precessions, 156; *see also* precessions
 - thought(s),
 - discharges dependency on language, 54
 - Formula 20 is an effort to run Control on thought level, 213
 - run Responsibility on matter, energy, space, time, motion and thought, 50
 - slavery of thought, 147
 - time, there is no time in reactive mind, 332
 - time track, *defn.*, time span of individual from beingness to present time on which lies sequence of events of his total existence, 51
 - most stuck point on track is a problem, 414
 - sticks on ~ stick because of prior confusion, 414
 - tone arm, 144; *see also E-Meter Essentials*
 - always audit a process until tone arm is lower on it than when process was started, 42
 - audit by tone arm (except in rock slam), assess by needle, 284, 318
 - beware sticking a tone arm, 272
 - high and low TA cases have low objective havingness, 144
 - high and low tone arms, responsibility is key to them not overts, 17
 - high or low TA, pc in an area in time when pc was being very irresponsible, 18
 - high ~ shows loss of ability to start or reach, 38
 - low ~ (below clear reading) shows loss of ability to stop or withhold, 38
 - low tone arm, processes to make ~ rise [1960], 16

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

tone arm (*cont.*)

- TA, rather than needle, is foremost in analyzing case, 18
- what the tone arm tells you, 144
- tone arm action, 134
 - indicates case progress, 144, 207, 225
 - keys to ~, (a) havingness, (b) overts, 144
 - Pre-Hav levels, TA behavior on, 238, 283
 - processes are run as long as they produce tone arm change, 218
 - responsibility, level of, causes TA to fluctuate, 18
 - shifting tone arms tell you increased or decreased responsibility, and dropping needles tell you charge, 42
- Tone Scale, position on ~ is determined by willingness and ability to duplicate, 155
- Tone Scale, thetan tends to maintain a position on ~ where inflows are comfortable, 131
- track; *see* time track
- training; *see also* students
 - auditor training, 445
 - necessity for training, 133, 261
 - schedule [1960], 69
 - staff auditors [1961], 389
 - things to be stressed in training, 246
 - train individuals, not a class, 329
 - use checksheets, 329
 - 8-C = good course, 71
- training drills or routines; *see* TRs
- transfer, O/W by transfer, 186
- “transferred”, pc to D of P, how to handle, 216
- transgressions against the mores of one's race, group, family cause unhappiness, 387
- transgressions, clearing of one's, 46
- trouble, formula of attack on area where pc is having trouble, 25
- TRs,
 - auditors failing to handle E-Meters, chief reason is TR failures, mainly confront, 261
 - flubs in TRs are basis of all confusion in subsequent efforts to audit, 249
 - modernized, 249
 - must be good to run SOP Goals, 264
 - TR 0, 247, 249
 - E-Meter reading and TR 0, 264
 - TR 1, Dear Alice, 247, 250
 - TR 2, Acknowledgements, 247, 250
 - TR 3, Duplicative Question, 248, 251
 - TR 4, Preclear Originations, 248, 252
 - TR 5, Hand Mimicry, 248
 - TR 5N, Auditor Clearance, 194
 - TR 10 on auditing room, 194
 - TR 10 or Havingness Process can help on out ruds, 450
- true, what is true for you, 203
- turning points are simply self-determined changes in pc's life, 401
- two-way Concept Help commands, 121
- two-way Concept Help on general terminal, 117

U

- UK case, control is more easily inverted on UK case, 202
- “Ultimate” Processes 1-6, 195
- unauthorized processes, 439
- unconsciousness, flow run too long in one direction gives anaten—unconsciousness, 121
- universe, basic unit of this universe is two not one, 62
- universe, O/W is not the senior law of ~, 187
- “unknown”, engram running using, [1961], 372
- “unknown” used on pictures, 374
- unpredicted change lessens havingness, 54
- unpredicted change of state, rapidity of, would be a definition of surprise, also of death and forgetfulness, 54
- unwillingness to do, 24
- upsets, identification is basis of all mental, 119

V

- valence(s), *defn*, mocked up other-beingnesses a person thinks he is, 104
 - are all “can't-haves” so when valence is off, havingness of pc comes up, 110
 - central valence or terminal is built in to demand total attention from pc, 406
 - freeing of ~ remedies pain and aberration, 105
 - goals terminal is that valence into which pc has interiorized and which carries goal, modifier and aberration which pc attributes to self, 419
 - help as valence problem, 109
 - Help basically sheds valences, 110
 - identification and valences stem from help, 119
 - if pc were in no valence but was himself completely, he would have perfect test response and would be wholly Clear, 102
 - improve thepc, not the valence, 368
 - is the way pc used to prevent experience of an environment he never as-ised, 368
 - key to clearing, 368
 - low tone arm is valence of a mindless object and last resort of pc to withhold, 16
 - overts, why they recoil, 105, 490
 - person in any ~ is victimized by his own creation, 116
 - profile on our tests is picture of a, 102, 104
 - Responsibility is not workable when pc is in a ~, 116
 - running Step 6 in a valence is courting disaster as pc is in a picture that increases in mass and gives him somatics, 109
 - secret of all overt-withhold mechanisms is ~, 102
 - thetan takes ~ he believes will help others or the universe, 109
 - why a being with valences commits overts, 105
 - why people become a valence, 109
- Vedic hymn, “The Hymn to the Dawn Child”, 126

SUBJECT INDEX— 1960/1961

victim, flatten Responsibility on, 17
victim, game of, 94
victim, "What about a victim could you be responsible for?" [process], 16, 49
violence, cure of insanity is light handling, no violence, 83

W

wait (Secondary Scale level), 300
want to know (Secondary Scale level), 305
war, 45
waste (Secondary Scale level), 302
western society, economic strangulation of individual, 24
"What about a victim could you be responsible for?" [process], 16, 49
"What creation could you confront?" "What creation would you rather not confront?" [process], 116
"What have you done to a (terminal)?" "What have you withheld from a (terminal)?" , Responsibility Process, 25, 36
"What have you done to me?" "What have I done to you?" [process] is of limited value, 92
"What help have you given?" "What help have you not given?" [process], 93
"What problem could help be to you?" [process], 87
"What unkind thought have you had about (terminal)?" [process], 180
whole track,
 goal + modifier is whole track desire of pc plus threat to self or others if that desire is not accomplished, 419
 mental "healing" on ~, how to handle, 195
 O/W, 458
 run down any famous or enduring identities of pc on whole track, 17, 49
willingness to do, rehabilitation of, 25
willing to talk about difficulties, 442
wins, to clear a pc give him or her a series of wins he or she realizes are wins, 65
wins, 1947 scale of, 65
withdraw (Secondary Scale level), 308
withhold(s), 377; *see also* overt/withhold
 ability to withhold furthers willingness to do, 25
 added to rudiments, 204
 as a case progresses it becomes conscious of more withholds, 204
 big withhold case, 178
 cases don't move when heavy ~ or PTPs are present, 5, 207, 210, 217
 cause-withhold version of Responsibility, 17, 19
 entirely the cause of continued evil, 12
 Formula 19 improves responsibility and brings up awareness of withholds and improves case, 205
 get "dones" not thoughts or natter, 424
 half truths and untruths, 391
 how to get withholds off irresponsible pc, 424
 low TA (below clear reading) shows loss of ability to stop or withhold, 38

withhold(s) (*cont.*)
 low tone arm is the valence of a mindless object and last resort of pc to withhold, 16
 out of session, caused by W/Hs and PTPs, 62
 pc who refuses to answer has an ARC break or ~, 175
 people withhold overt acts because they conceive telling them would be another overt act, 12
 Pre-session 37 is a method of getting off ~, 180
 prior confusion, get the withholds in, 401
 pulling, "don't know" version, 424
 pulling, increase E-Meter sensitivity, 273
 rehabilitate pc's ability to withhold, 7, 17
 responsibility, anatomy of, is able to admit causation, able to withhold from, 14, 19
 (Secundary Scale level), 296
 stuck needle can be freed by processing or by getting off withholds, 276
 stuck picture, run W/H on terminal in picture, 48
 thetan cannot withhold then compulsively causes things that are bad, 19
 thetan will not restore his own ability until he is certain he can withhold from things, 19
withholding of doingness, 24
Withhold Process, "What could you withhold from a _____?", 17
work, cycle of action applied to work, 126
work, forcing people to work, 24
worry is the most easily dramatized O/W, 187
Worry Process, 187
Worse Than Process, "Think of something worse than abad foot", 58
wrong(ness),
 if pc knew what was wrong with him it wouldn't be wrong, 332
 only thing wrong with pc is his lack of confidence in handling himself without hurting others, 67
 pc is ill because he is restraining himself from doing wrong, 69
 "We don't treat wrongness. We treat people", 69
 whatever pc thinks is wrong he has failed to help, 210
 what is right and wrong with pc, scale of, in order of importance, 121

X

"X" symbol, use of in goals nulling, 266

Z

zone, Special Zone Plan, 111, 114

Numerals

1.1 criticism, effort to reduce size of target of overt, 13
3D; *see* Routine 3D
8-C = good course, 71
"/", slant, symbol to show a goal reads, 266
"X" symbol, use of in goals nulling, 266

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF TITLES

Academy Schedule, Clarification of	329	Concerning the Campaign for Presidency	76
Academy Training	<i>OEC Vol 4-302</i>	Create Again	116
ACC Lecture Tapes	149	Create and Confront	35
Additional HAS Processes	192	Current News	161
Administrative Procedure for Reducing Overts	<i>OEC Vol 4-514</i>	Current Rundown-Concept Help	121
Advances in Technology	370	Curriculum for ACCs	<i>OEC Vol. 4-355</i>
<i>Anatomy Congress-South Africa Lectures</i>	193	Curriculum for Clearing Cowses	374
<i>Anatomy of the Human Mind Congress Lectures</i>	190	Dear Scientologist	99
Announcing New Technology	150	De-certification, How You Should Support It	96
ARC Process 1961	442	Director of Processing's Case Checking Hat, The	228
Assessing	324	D of P Form—Check Type One	254
Assessing for Goals and Terminals or Elimination	239	Double Action Cycles	126
Assessing for S.O.P. Goals Improved	270	E-Meter Electrodes—ADissertation on Soup Cans	459
Assessment by Elimination—S.O.P. Goals	265	<i>E-MeterEssentials</i>	260
Assessment Data	273	E-Meter Horror	264
Assessment of Help,The	119	E-MeterWatching	331
Association Secretary Letter—Tapes	84	Expansion of OT-3A Procedure, Step Two —HGC Allowed Processes	51
Auxiliary Pre-Have 3D Scale	434	Failed Help	170
Basic Assumptions of Scientology Versus Overts, The	102	Formula 13	171
Basic Staff Auditor's Hat (20 Mar. 61)	214	Formula 19	205
Basic Staff Auditor's Hat (26 May 61) <i>OEC Vol 4-536</i>		Formula 20	213
Black Case, The	9	GeneralitiesWon7t Do—SecChecking	424
Books Are Dissemination	78	Giving the Pc Full Hows	145
Brief Outline of an HGC as Cwrently Done, A	<i>OEC Vol 4-518</i>	Goalsin the Rudiments	56
British E-Meter Operation	32	Handling of Rudiments	194
By Their Actions	101	HAS Certificates	
Cancellation of Certificates	30	HAS Co-Audit Ended	176
Captive Brains	146	HAS Co-Audit Resumed	185
Case Files	<i>OEC Vol 4-117</i>	<i>Have You Lived Before This Life?</i>	47
Casualties	11	Havingness and Duplication	155
CCHs and Routine 1	334	HCA/HPA Rwndown or Practical Course Rundown for Academies	<i>OEC Vol 4-285</i>
Change Brackets and Commands	258	HCO WW Security Form SA	407
Change on Model Session	172	HCO WW Security Forms 7A and 7B	381
Change Processes (23 Apr. 61)	253	Help	85
Change Processes (27 Apr. 61)	256	Help Processing	92
Change Processing and CCHs see footnote—	320	HGC Admin Partial Hat—Staff Auditor Assignment	<i>OEC Vol 4-118</i>
Check Sheet for HGC	68	HGC Allowed Processes (24 Aug. 61)	369
Check Type One—D of P Form	254	HGC Allowed Processes (29 Sept. 61)	385
Clarification of "Change Processing"	320	HGC Allowed Processes—Expansion of OT-3A Procedure, Step Two	51
Class of Auditors	439	HGC Auditor's Sec Check	356
<i>Clean Hands Congress Lectures</i>	463	HGC Preclear Assessment	108
Clean Hands Make a Happy Life	387	HGC Pre-Processing Security Check	403
Clearing Routine	173	Hints on Running Cases with Help	109
Co-Audit Team, The	21	Honest People Have Rights, Too	27
Command Sheet for Routine 3D	447	How Help Became Betrayal	94
Command Sheet—Pre-Havingness Scale	199	How to Run O/W and Responsibility	37
Command Sheet Routine 3D	457	HPA Course Change Proposal to London	40
Concept Help—Current Rundown	121		

HPA/HCA Rundown Change see footnote—	330	Prior Confusion, The	409
<i>Hubbard Clearing Scientologist Course</i>		Problems Intensive for Staff Clearing	392
<i>Lectures</i>	3	Problems Intensives	401
Important Data on Goals S.O.P.	209	Problems Intensive, The—Use of the	
Information on Clears	364	Prior Confusion	414
Interrogation	59	Processes Allowed	325
Johannesburg Security Check	242	Process Levels—Necessity for Training	261
Justification	12	PT Problem and Goals	210
Key to All Cases, The—Responsibility	18	Regimen Two	137
Laws of Assessment, The	131	Regimen 1	128
<i>London Congress on Dissemination and</i>		Releasing and Preparing a Case for	
<i>Help Lectures</i>	130	S.O P. Goals	317
<i>London Open Evening Lectures</i>	115	Reputation of Saint Hill, The	29
Making Clears and Picking Up HGC Quality	117	Research Advances	31
Metering Rudiments	363	Research Project	55
Meter Reading	432	Responsibility	14
Model Session Script, Revised	453	Responsibility—The Key to All Cases	18
Model Session, The	41	Restoration of Certificates	34
Modification of HPA/HCA, BScn/HCS		Revised Case Entrance	167
Schedule	<i>OEC Vol. 4-296</i>	Rising Needle: Skip It!, The	333
Necessity for Training—Process Levels	261	Routine One	348
New Assessment Scale	197	Routine 1A	354
New Clearing Breakthrough!	367	Routine 3A	412
New Definition of Psychosis	136	Routine 3D	416
New Facts of Life	372	Routine 3D Commands	426
New Formulas	179	Routine 3D Command Sheet (27 Nov. 61)	437
New Help Data	191	Routine 3D Command Sheet (26 Dec. 61)	457
New PE and the New HAS Co-Audit, The	188	Routine 3D, Command Sheet for	447
New PE Data	70	Routine 3D Improved Commands of	
New Pre-Hav Command	211	November 30,1961	441
New Pre-session Data and Script Change	204	Routine 3D Improved Commands of	
New Rudiments Commands	377	28 Nov. 61	438
New Summary of Auditing, A	64	Rudiments and Clearing	410
New Training Schedule	69	Rudiments, Change in	391
Only Valid Security Check, The	275	Rudiments Modernized	450
Order of Test of Havingness and		Running CCHs	347
Confront Commands	151	Rwning 3D Levels	443
OT Procedure	15	Sad Tail of PDH, The	321
OT Procedures for HCS/BScn Courses	6	Safe Auditing Table	406
OT-3 Procedure—HGC Allowed Processes	16	<i>Saint Hill Special Briefing Course</i>	
OT-3A Procedure—HGC Allowed Processes	48	<i>Lectures</i>	263
Our Technical Programme	89	Scientific Treatment of the Insane, The	82
Overt Manifestations on a Low Toned Case	26	Scientologist's Role in Life, The	
O-W A Limited Theory	186	—Special Zone Plan	111
Pc Scheduling	<i>OEC Vol 4-117</i>	Scientology Can Have a Group Win	45
PE Change	182	Scientology Students' Security Check	349
Personal Integrity	203	Script of a Model Session (13 Oct. 60)	163
Powerful Pre-session Additions	134	Script of a Model Session (21 Mar. 61)	220
Preclear Assessment Sheet see footnote—	401	Sec Checking—Generalities Won't Do	424
Pre-Havingness Scale—Command Sheet	199	Sec Checks Vital	445
Pre-Hav Scale Revised	282	Sec Check Whole Track	337
Present Time Problem, The	61	Secondary Scale	286
Pre-session Processes	72	Security Check	23
Pre-sessions of the 1st Saint Hill ACC, The	142	Security Check Children	378
Pre-session Two	139	Security Checks (8 Feb. 60)	30
Pre-session 37	180	Security Checks (26 May 60)	97
Primary Scale Amended	335	Security Questions Must Be Nulled	402

Send Your Clipping Files	77	Theory of Responsibility Processing	24
Some Help Terminals	124	Theory 67	166
S.O.P. Goals	224	Third Dynamic for Scientology, A	2
S.O.P. Goals—Assessment by Elimination	265	Thirty-Six New Presessions	156
S.O.P. Goals Assessments	<i>OEC Vol 4-535</i>	Tips on How to Crack an HGC Case	154
S.O.P. Goals—Errors	246	Tone Arm, The	144
S.O.P. Goals—Goals Assessment Problems		Training Course Rules and Regulations	
SortedOut	236		<i>OEC Vol 4-152</i>
S.O.P. Goals Goofs	234	Training Drills	247
S.O.P. Goals—Marvellous New Breakthrough		Training Drills Modernized	249
—Be-Do-Have Coordinated	206	Training of Staff Auditors	389
S.O.P. Goals-Modification I	241	UK Cases Different	202
S.O.P. Goals Modified	227	“Ultimate” Processes, The	195
S.O.P. Goals—Repairing a Case	238	Unmoving Case, The (7 Jan. 60)	4
Special Zone Plan—The Scientologist's		Unmoving Case, The (24Nov. 60)	178
Role in Life	111	Use of S.O.P. Goals Procedure	212
Staff Auditor Assignment—HGC Admin		Valences Key to Clearing	368
Partial Hat	<i>OEC Vol 4-118</i>	Varying Sec Check Questions	449
Staff Auditors	<i>OEC Vol 4-534</i>	Vital Information	133
Standardized Sessions	53	What We Expect of a Scientologist	106
Starting Cases	175	<i>1st Saint Hill Advanced Clinical Course</i>	
<i>State of Man Congress Lectures</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Lectures</i>	138
Student E-Metering	<i>OEC Vol 4-307</i>	3-D Rules of Thumb	462
Student Practice Check	400	<i>3rd South African Advanced Clinical</i>	
Tapes—Association Secretary Letter	84	<i>CourseLectures</i>	193
Tapes for Sale	10	<i>22nd American Ad vanced Clinical</i>	
Terminal Stable Data	165	<i>CourseLectures</i>	190