



SUPER  
POWER

Explanation by: Dan Koon

# **Super Power, or What I Can Recall of It**

by Dan Koon

Some people have asked me about Super Power. As part of the LRH Technical Research and Compilations Unit, I was involved in the project to compile Super Power and thought that it might be interesting to relate my experiences with it. Had I written this twenty-some years ago when I compiled the rundowns, I could have quoted them chapter, line and verse. As it stands today, some of the rundowns that are part of Super Power I still recall well, while others, unfortunately, hardly at all. What I am giving here are my personal recollections having been involved with the original piloting and, years later, with the first complete compilation of the rundowns. Anyone is free to make of this what they will and use it or not as they see fit. Many thanks to John Aaron Williams for putting all the references together.

## **Backstory**

At the beginning of 1978, LRH returned to his home in La Quinta, California near Palm Springs, after having been away for several months following the FBI raid in Los Angeles in July 1977. Soon after returning he wrote about the need for locating Sea Org staff members who had been, intentionally, he put it, gumming up the works and hindering Scientology expansion. The few staff who were truly dedicated to stopping the show were termed List 1 R/Sers. (I have heard from another that this project had been in the works even before the FBI raid, but I did not learn about it until late winter 1978.)

An R/S is a rock slam, the wild and crazy manifestation of the E-meter needle. It indicates, per E-meter theory, that an evil intention has been touched on regarding whatever topic was under discussion at the time the R/S manifested. List 1 is a list of subjects for discussion in auditing that relate to Scientology, its organizations and principles, such as L. Ron Hubbard and Mary Sue Hubbard or organization executives. You can find a copy of List 1 [here](#).

LRH's solution for locating the staff who he felt needed to be taken off the lines was to sec check each S.O. staff member on the subject of List 1. If the person being sec checked turned on an R/S, that meant he or she had an evil purpose on the subject under discussion. If such were found, the staff member was to be taken off post and sent to the RPF to have the evil purpose handled before being allowed back into the general group. LRH's expectation was that the few staff who did have R/Ses would be located and moved off for handlings with little disruption to the organization and significant improvement in its operation. That was not what happened in practice.

The key technical person over the project had a crashing misunderstood on the difference between a rock slam and a dirty needle and the confusion resulted in half the staff at LRH's base in La Quinta being sent to the RPF and an almost equal number RPFed at Flag and the PAC base. It was probably the biggest debacle in the Sea Org's history up to that time. As word spread about the number of staff disappearing and winding up in the RPF, people going in for their own List 1 sec checks were nervous and under stress and this tended to produce more dirty needles, which, called R/Ses, landed them with their fellow staff in the RPF.

Meanwhile, LRH had immersed himself deeply, very deeply, in shooting the first technical training films. That pretty much consumed his days, every day for the first 2/3rds of the year. In late summer, though, he came up for air and asked for a report on the status of the project. He was shocked and horrified when he learned the number of people who had been RPFed. He stepped in and removed the person responsible and ordered people incorrectly RPFed to be reprieved. The RPFs emptied rapidly and people returned to their jobs.

The original situation, however – unproductive staff members – remained. The List 1 Project was basically an ethics-type approach to the problem and it failed miserably. LRH came up with another handling and called it the Humongous Rundown or, as we know it today, Super Power.

## The Rundowns

LRH laid out 12 individual rundowns that make up Super Power. The initial concept was to help staff members become more causative and efficient on their posts so as to create faster expansion for Scientology. Blithely ordering someone to find the List 1 R/Sers on staff and remove them had not worked out too well, so LRH dug in more thoroughly this time to get to the bottom of staff inefficiencies. (This, by the way, was the approach he commonly took: when faced with a situation to deal with, try the simplest, fastest way possible and if that doesn't work, then dig in more energetically.) He began working with a recently formed compilations unit called LRH Technical Compilations (today called LRH Technical Research and Compilations, RTRC) to prepare and pilot the individual components of Super Power. At the time RTRC formed up I was an auditor in the Qual Div of WHQ but joined RTRC the following year, in 1979.

### Ethics Repair List

The existing situation in September 1978 was that the entire Sea Org had just been through a terrible mauling emotionally, physically, third dynamically and case-wise from the severe injustices of the year. His first handling, then, came in the form of the Ethics Repair List which you can find here. Thirty-five years after its development anyone simply reading over the questions on the list will likely find that they can easily think of answers to most of them. So, far beyond the initial reason for its development, the Ethics Repair List will do a lot for a person's button on the lack of justice existing in the world.

Auditors at the La Quinta base began running the list of those recently reprieved from the RPF and the list was modified based on the pilot reports being received. LRH would review and correct as needed each of these revisions and finally authorized the list for use in its final form. Late in the year the ERL was broadly released for a short time but then pulled out of circulation. It has been on the Internet for many years and freely available for download and use.

### Personal Revival Rundown

The next rundown LRH worked to develop was the Personal Revival Rundown. The theory of this action was explained in HCOB 27 Oct. 78, COLLECTIVE IDENTITIES, an excerpt of which is quoted here:

“There's an implant on the track on the subject of “We are all one”, “All is one”. Someone stuck in this actually goes from the generality of “All is one” and then individuates from that! That's actually the basic definition of individuation (as different from individuality).

“A thetan who is “dead” acts like . . . there's nobody running the show . . . This is the Socialist, everyone belongs to “The State”, individualism is negated, it's all “The People”.

“TV, Drugs and Socialism are the factors that are bringing about the current deterioration of society, and with these three you can predict a super break up. You get NCG cases, or subtle NCG cases (these make only minor gain), they are a collective mass. The speed of effect of auditing would go up after an Ethics Repair List and Criminality Rundown because on the Criminality Rundown you'll get a “de-mutualization”. If you have a TV and Drug culture and enter in a Welfare State you'll get this. In Communism a person is severely punished if he shows any individuality.

“There are crime waves after waves which are due to a super association with Death. Then guys have seen so much Death, they consider themselves dead. It isn't that they're taught to kill, it's that by association with Death, they have become “dead” and irresponsible.

“Therefore as a rule, while engaging in any collective social or organizational activity, you have to foster individuality.”

LRH's general notion was that some (or many) staff were irresponsible on their jobs because they were, as stated above, more or less dead as beings. In fact, the colloquial name for the rundown when it was piloted was the Dead Man Pilot. The general approach, as near as I can remember, was to assess a list of possible conditions such as deadness, unconsciousness, unfeeling, numbness, etc., on the pc and then address whatever read with processes. The processes were recall processes on whatever items read. For example, if "deadness" read on the list, the auditor would run, F1, "Recall deadness." F2, "Recall another's deadness," F3, "Recall others' deadness," F0, "Recall your own deadness," or commands to that effect.

The idea was to take the person out of whatever past experiences had been laying on him or her like a lead blanket and enable them to come back to life.

This rundown was piloted to some extent in 1978 but not finalized at that time that I recall. It is also known as the Criminality Rundown in some issues, so far as I recall.

### **Consequences Rundown**

Once the person was freed from whatever "deadness" he was manifesting, the next part of Super Power was directed at helping him look some distance into the future and heighten his ability to predict consequences of his actions. A couple relevant bulletins explain the theory of this rundown:

From HCOB 24 MARCH 1960, GOALS IN THE RUDIMENTS, which you can find here:

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.

Then, from HCOB 6 JUNE 1969, PREDICTION AND CONSEQUENCES, which you will find here:

Probably the reason omissions of omission and commission are done at all lies in man's inability or faulty ability to predict and to realize consequences.

Men are rather thoroughly stuck in the present and so involved with its confusions that they rarely foresee anything and are mainly oblivious to any consequences of their own actions or failures to act.

A process relating to this was from Ability Magazine Major 6 [1955, ca. early September], available here:

### **IX. CONSEQUENCES:**

"What would happen if you were apathetic?"

Repeat, etc.

"What would happen if you got angry?"

Repeat, etc.

APPLY TO TONE SCALE AND AWARENESS SCALE.

Because a criminal doesn't really think about the consequences of his actions (i.e., he doesn't see that if he breaks into the house to steal some stuff that the police are going to come looking for him and put him in jail), this rundown helps the pc improve his or her ability to predict the consequences of their actions. The basic thrust of the process was to ask the person to recall an action of theirs in the past and then ask that when they decided to take that action, did they think of the consequences. In other words, did they think of whatever happened afterwards as a direct result of what they had decided to do.

This seems to be a different slant on one of the processes on Grade 1 (taken from the Grade 1 Process checklist of November 1987):

### 13. GOALS

(Ref: PAB 137, SOME MORE CCH PROCESSES, Section on Goals  
PAB 146, PROCEDURE CCH)

#### Part One:

1. **WHAT ARE YOU ABSOLUTELY SURE WILL HAPPEN IN THE NEXT TWO MINUTES?** (one hour, three days, one week, three months, one year, etc.)

Discuss it to complete pc certainty on each time span before continuing to the next one, i.e., one hour, three days, one week, three months, one year, etc. The auditor must all the time be sure that the preclear is certain that these things are going to happen in the next two minutes (or whatever the time span is) to ensure that the process really bites.

(Run to EP per instructions above.) \_\_\_\_\_

2. **TELL ME SOMETHING THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO DO IN THE NEXT TWO MINUTES** (one hour, etc., increasing span of time.)

(Run to EP per instructions above.) \_\_\_\_\_

#### Part Two:

1. **TELL ME SOMETHING YOU ARE SURE WILL BE THERE IN TWO MINUTES,** etc.)

(Run to EP per instructions above.) \_\_\_\_\_

2. **TELL ME SOMETHING YOU WOULD LIKE TO HAVE IN TWO MINUTES,** etc.)

(Run to EP per instructions above.) \_\_\_\_\_

### Bright Think Rundown

One of the aspects that keeps a person pulled out of present time and less aware of what is going on around him is resolved by the next rundown, the Bright Think Rundown. Like the Ethics Repair List, this too was made broadly available for a short time in late 1978 and so the rundown is available on the Internet today. You can read all about it here.

One of the values of Super Power when delivered to a Dianetic Clear is that the Bright Think Rundown accomplishes in part what Power Processing was designed to handle on a case. Dianetic Clears may not receive the Power Processes but may be run on Super Power including the Bright Think Rundown.

This was the last Super Power rundown that was worked on before LRH's death in 1986. The remaining rundowns were listed out and he wrote one or more dispatches to RTRC or Snr C/S Int about the remaining parts of Super Power, including how it was supposed to be exported to St. Hill Orgs. But no other rundowns were compiled and nothing was ever again submitted to LRH on Super Power.

What happened was that in the late fall 1978, LRH called for a team of auditors from each St. Hill org as well as Flag to be brought to the WHQ base (winter headquarters in La Quinta) for training on Super Power. His first action was to call for demonstrations of their TRs. This ran headlong into a barrier in that their TRs were inadequate to deliver Super Power. At this point Super Power went off the radar and LRH's focus of attention for most of the next year was TR training. Large TR courses were established at Flag and in PAC and LRH spent a lot of time looking at TRs videos, dictating critiques to

students and, because it became like pulling teeth to get students to submit acceptable videos, working out broad, large scale handlings to deal with the situation of a “world out of comm,” as he described it. These offshoots of the TRs evolution became the Key To Life Course and the Life Orientation Course. Numerous other bodies of tech grew out of his work during this period including a codification of False Data Stripping, the Product Debug Checklist and the Purification Rundown among others.

RTRC struggled to even keep up with the flood of dispatches and orders and Super Power became back-burnered. The RTRC Dir, Phoebe Mauerer, bless her, dutifully filed every piece of paper relating to Super Power and stored them in bankers boxes and for the next 8 years kept these boxes right above her desk until the day she died in late 1986. (Phoebe and LRH were close. She was one of the early S.O. members and served well and with distinction for many years. After LRH died in early 1986, she just kind of said, “Screw this, I’m out of here,” and a lifetime of smoking did the rest. Her sense of humor stayed with her until the end, remarking at one point with appropriate irony, “Dan, my Int is really out right now!”)

RTRC did not get around to Super Power again until the fall of 1991, 13 years after LRH began work on it. Phoebe’s careful filing and protection of the papers on Super Power made the job of completing compilation of the remaining rundowns merely difficult instead of hopeless. Some of the remaining rundowns LRH said very little about and it was left to RTRC to search high and low for clues how to assemble them.

### **Study Rundown**

At this juncture in his Super Power processing, the person will be pretty cleaned up of certain factors that were dragging his attention back into the past. So, now his ability to learn and think with data can be addressed. The first stage of this is the Study Rundown, which consists of being audited on The Study Green Form, which is available [here](#).

Many people develop blocks against assimilating information and learning because of oppressive schooling or other reasons. The Study Green Form locates these and addresses them.

### **False Data and Loss Rundown Part 1**

False data is something LRH was onto even from the early days of Dianetics. While developing Super Power he theorized that when a person experienced a loss, he or she was likely to adopt false data as a stable datum to help resolve the confusion resulting from the loss. The losses tend to keep the person pinned to the false data adopted at a rough time in the person’s life. Imagine, for instance, being taken off your post and put in the RPF. For many, that would be a loss: loss of post, status within the group, your spouse, friends, etc. People might start to adopt false data after such an experience, such as the RPF leaders telling the person they are no good and deserve to be where they are, etc.

The handling developed was to find areas in the person’s life where he or she might be having difficulties as the result of false data, find a false datum and strip it off using FDSing tech and then locate the loss prior to accepting the false data. Then, once the loss was found, to audit that out using various tools (perhaps Recalls on Clears and OTs or NED on preclears), including, as needed False Purpose Rundown. Note that FPRD was not developed until 1984 and LRH mentioned the correlation between False Data and Loss in 1978. Whether this was LRH’s intention will never be known.

### **False Data and Loss Rundown Part 2**

LRH’s idea here was that once the person had been rid of his false data proneness, his thinking could be freed up and this is done using the HC (Hubbard Consultant) Lists which were developed during LRH’s work on the Data Series. This step is fairly straightforward and you will find the HC Lists [here](#).

## **Cause Rundown**

Well, I draw a blank when I scour my memory for what this process consists of. I don't recall that it was anything too remarkable like some of the other rundowns and no one who received it on the pilot said too much about it. That may not be the case but I simply don't recall anything about this particular rundown or the process it entailed. I can theorize now that it would have to do with helping the pc reestablish his level of causation, now that he or she had been cleaned up to the extent that the previous rundowns would have accomplished that.

## **Power of Choice Rundown**

As is the case with the Cause Rundown, I really do not remember much about the Power of Choice Rundown.

The theory of it, however, likely is not too far off from LRH's bulletin of 4 February 1960, THEORY OF RESPONSIBILITY PROCESSING, which you can see here and wherein LRH makes the point that a person's power of choice is more important than his responsibility level. Another relevant writing is HCOB 23 May 71R, rev. 4 Dec. 74, Basic Auditing Series 10R, RECOGNITION OF THE RIGHTNESS OF THE BEING, which you will find here.

The way these would apply to Super Power and making a staff member more effective on his job would be to rehabilitate his power of choice about doing his job. (As a note, should more information about these two rundowns or any of the rest become available it will be made known, either in a revision to this article or in a new one.)

## **Perception Rundown**

Amid the hoopla surrounding Super Power, the Perception Rundown is smack dab in the center of it. The reason for this is the many different kinds of equipment and special rooms that have been developed for this part of Super Power.

As is well known in Dianetics and Scientology and in other fields as well, a person's ability to use one or more of her sense channels can be impaired or blocked by traumatic incidents from the person's past. Ray Charles was said to have lost his sight at a young age when his brother drowned in a washing tub in front of his eyes; shortly thereafter, overwhelmed by guilt, his eyesight began to deteriorate and he went blind for the rest of his life. Whether or not this is a convenient coincidence to support the claim, nearly everyone recognizes that one's eyesight or hearing or sense of smell is capable of fluctuating in keenness from day to day, even throughout the day.

The Perception Rundown was designed to sharpen or even restore a person's ability to communicate with the world through any or all of the 57 sense channels described by LRH in HCOB 23 July 78R, LIST OF PERCEPTICS, which you can find here. The rundown consisted of first locating and auditing out charge that may be inhibiting a person's ability to see, hear, smell, touch, etc. Then, once the charge is handled on a specific sense channel, the person drills using that particular channel which puts him more in control of it and can greatly heighten his awareness of communication along that line.

The first part of the rundown simply consists of clearing and assessing the entire list of perceptics and finding the ones that are charged. The mental aspects of the reading items are audited out using R3RA for cases below Clear and recall processes on four flows for Clears and above.

## **Perception Drills**

Once the charge is handled on a particular perceptic, one drills the perceptic to improve the ability to use it. The total amount of direction that LRH gave about how to put those drills together is contained in the previous sentence. It was one line in a despatch saying to drill the pc on the perceptic after the charge had been handled.

RTRC (me, the compiler) undertook a several days long search to find some clue to these drills. The solution was found in materials around the time LRH wrote Science of

Survival and the action was to alternate putting one's attention on the sense channel and taking one's attention off of it. Simple, when we finally found it.

Say the person had trouble with his hearing. You'd put a ticking clock (or something similar) on the table and have the pc put his attention on the clock (listen to it) and then take his attention off the clock (causatively don't listen to it). The general idea is to have the pc put his attention on the perceptic channel and take his attention off it and alternate this back and forth to the end phenomena of the process.

From this description of the rundown it seems likely that the perceptions which a person has trouble with (and REALITY on) and which will therefore read are the usual suspects such as sight, sound, touch and smell. Sense channels along which the person has little or no reality will not read, per basic auditing theory.

Nevertheless, the church has spent millions researching, prototyping and producing fancy machines, stations and entire rooms so a person can drill such esoteric perceptics as Awareness of Awareness, Saline Content of Cells, Perception of Conclusions (past and present) and the like. That is not to say that someone could not drill each of his perceptions using this equipment but that is most definitely NOT part of the rundown as laid out by LRH. Of course, if something reads it will be run and then drilled. The likelihood of some of these rooms and machines every being used seems to indicate the incursion of marketing and fundraising considerations into tech.

### **Learning Drills**

By this time the person receiving Super Power has been brought out of any case condition what might distract him from doing a good job in his post, he is in present time and his senses have been sharpened up nicely.

Now he/she does the Learning Drills as laid out in PAB 110, 15 April 1957, EDUCATION, which you will find here.

### **Physical Universe Drills**

The final step of Super Power is to drill the person on the actions of his/her job or post. The basic idea here is to drill the person to become more adept at the mechanical actions of his job. This is a matter of isolating the actions and their sequences that the person does in his or her work. You then have the person go through these motions and drill him to become more efficient and faster at doing them. Each aspect of the job is covered until the person, in present time, is capable of assimilating data and learning and with heightened awareness becomes a whiz at his or her job.

For example, say a guy is a cabinet maker. You would drill him on measuring a piece of wood, drill him on setting up his saw and cutting the wood, drill him on sanding and planing the wood, drill him on assembling the cabinet, installing the hardware, staining and finishing it, etc. Pit crews at the Indy 500 drill tire changes and filling gas tanks and it pays off. Same idea here.

That completes Super Power.

### **Compilation and Piloting**

As mentioned earlier, the first few Super Power rundowns were piloted and some were finalized in 1978. After that nothing was done until 1991. Then, the project was picked up again and each rundown and related issues were compiled in pilot form, which was the first time the entirety of Super Power existed. The issues were approved by Ray Mithoff who was Inspector General Tech (or maybe Snr C/S Int) at the time. They did not go to Miscavige as all tech issues did for final approval. These were just pilot issues.

Once compiled, a group of Gold staff were selected to receive the rundown. Several Qual and Snr C/S Int Office auditors were trained on the rundowns and began auditing their pcs. Pilot reports and success stories received from the pcs after each rundown were encouraging. Some particularly remarkable things occurred during the Perception Drills. Pcs commented how sharp their perceptions became from the simple drilling of



putting their attention on the sense channel and then taking it off the channel. LRH had commented that some people did not hear well, for example, simply because they did not listen, meaning they had muffled or closed down that channel. Drilling opened the channel back up and put people at cause over their perceptions again. One pc remarked how it was almost scary how sharp and attuned her perceptions had become. (As a note, no fancy equipment was developed for use on the pilot, but simply objects, odors, sights and sounds readily available.)

Each pc who completed the rundowns felt they had experienced many many positive gains. The proof, however, would come in their post performance afterwards. Without exception each pilot pc performed exceptionally well on post for a good long period, a year or more.

However, in the LRH dispatches he laid out how Super Power should be delivered to a staff. One would put each member of an area, such as a division of the org, through Super Power before going on to the next division. (For purposes of the pilot, this was not possible.) The reason, he said, is that the staff working around the Super Power completion would eventually drag the person down again with slowness, inefficiencies, etc. And this is what happened with the pilot pcs. They did well for a long time but eventually ran into trouble in one form or another. A couple, I think, even ended up in the Hole, the infamous lockdown for certain staff at the Int/Gold base.

### **Primary Public for Super Power**

It should be clear that Super Power was intended for staff to make them more effective on their posts. Yes, LRH said that Dianetic Clears could receive it but nowhere in his writings about Super Power does he mention it as a mainline public service.

A couple of the Feshbach brothers came to Gold and received the rundown in the mid-90s in exchange for each donating \$1,000,000 to the Super Power Project coffers.

### **Caveat**

I am writing this up more than 20 years after compiling the rundowns. I have put it together as best I can remember and have had it checked by other ex-staff who received some or all of the rundowns. Naturally the specific tech for each rundown is not given but someone interested in delivering it outside the control of the church will be able to figure out a fair approximation of the process for each part of the overall rundown. Two of the most key parts of Super Power, the Ethics Repair List and Bright Think Rundown exist as LRH approved them in 1978. Other parts such as the Study Green Form, HC Lists and Learning Drills have existed for decades.

Undoubtedly, people at Int have recompiled Super Power and what eventually is released by the church may bear little resemblance to what is laid out above. From all the attention being paid to, and resources being poured into, the Flag delivery building, it certainly appears that Super Power will become a main line service for paying public at Flag. That was never LRH's intention. In fact, if one reviews the various parts of the rundown it is obvious that LRH pulled extensively from tech or tech theories that already existed and sequenced it in an order that would accomplish the desired product of a competent, efficient staff member. Super Power was and always will be primarily for STAFF. Only secondarily is Super Power for Dianetic Clears. That is not to say that public will not benefit from it. Anyone would. Yet, Super Power does not supplant anything on the Grade Chart. It is not superior in some way to SA Lists, Book One, the Expanded Lower Grades, NED, Power, R6EW, the Clearing Course, OT levels I to VIII and the Ls.

But if you put yourself in LRH's shoes in late August 1978, with a Sea Org, half of whose members had just spent months falsely assigned to the RPF with the wrong item of List 1 R/Ser, what actions would you take to help clean them up and help them do better when they returned to their posts?

That is Super Power.

**HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE**  
**Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex**

**HCO BULLETIN OF 24 NOVEMBER 1962**

Central Orgs  
Mission

**ROUTINE 2-12**  
**LIST ONE – ISSUE ONE**  
**THE SCIENTOLOGY LIST**

This is the List One of Routine 2-12. You can lengthen but do not shorten this list for Step 1 of R2-12.

This list is used over and over on all 12 steps until no reaction of any kind can be gotten off of it. If an item on it reads sporadically, even, use it on the 12 Steps.

The Scientology List is called LIST ONE. Others, 1A, 1B, are called by their designations. All lists, including the Scientology List, are referred to in general as "A first list," or "The first list."

<u>PC NAME</u>	<u>DATE</u>
<u>AUDITOR</u>	<u>LOCATION (CITY)</u>
SCIENTOLOGY	A DIANETIC ORGANIZATION
SCIENTOLOGISTS	ORG SURVIVAL
AN AUDITOR	A CENTER
STUDENTS	HCA's
AND E-METER	DSCNs
METERS	HGC PCs
A SESSION	ACCs
CLEARING	MENTAL SCIENCE
A CLEAR	A SCIENCE OF THE MIND
A RELEASE	MENTAL DOCTORS
A PRECLEAR	SAINT HILL
A PATIENT	COURSES
INSANITY	STATEMENTS
THE MIND	UNITS
MINDS	SCIENTOLOGY PAY
MENTAL HEALTH	WORD CLEARING
DIANETICS	RON
BOOK ONE	L. RON HUBBARD
DIANETIC BOOKS	THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SCIENTOLOGY BOOKS	THE GOVERNING DIRECTOR
A SCIENTOLOGY MAGAZINE	THE FOUNDER
RON'S ARTICLES	MARY SUE
A SCIENTOLOGY CONGRESS	MARY SUE HUBBARD
A BULLETIN	THE ASSOCIATION SECRETARY
A POLICY LETTER	THE ORGANIZATION SECRETARY
A HAT	THE HCO SECRETARY
HATS	SECURITY
A SCIENTOLOGY ORGANIZATION	WITHHOLDS FROM SCIENTOLOGY
STAFF MEMBERS	OVERTS AGAINST SCIENTOLOGY
A REGISTRAR	YOUR CASE
SCIENTOLOGY LETTERS	PEOPLE'S CASES
INSTRUCTORS	TECHNIQUES
STAFF AUDITORS	PROCEDURES
THE D OF P	A SQUIRREL
THE D OF T	PSYCHOLOGISTS
HCO	PSYCHIATRISTS
HASI	HUMAN RIGHTS
THE CHURCH	ENTHETA
THE FOUNDATION	RUMORS
THE CENTRAL ORG	BAD AUDITORS
THE ACADEMY	BAD AUDITING
THE HGC	SECURITY RISKS
HSRF	ROCK SLAMMERS
THE CO-AUDIT	NO RESULTS
CO-AUDITING	

---

A bad person in Scientology

---

The worst auditor pc had

---

A bad person in Scientology

---

A Scientology exec

---

A bad person in Scientology

---

A Scientology exec

---

Auditor's formal Name

---

A prominent Scientologist

\_\_\_\_\_  
Auditor's formal Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Something in Scientology worrying pc

\_\_\_\_\_  
An auditor pc had

\_\_\_\_\_  
Something in Scientology worrying pc

\_\_\_\_\_  
The first auditor pc had

\_\_\_\_\_  
Something in Scientology worrying pc

\_\_\_\_\_  
The best auditor pc had

Note: Fill in all blanks with pc's help.

Note: The above when found can be terms or oppterm. It doesn't matter which. All that matters is meter reaction unless and RI is found on this list. If so identify the Term or Oppterm as in Step 7 and continue R2-12.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

**HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE**  
**Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex**

**HCO BULLETIN OF 5 NOVEMBER 1978**  
Issue II

C/Ses  
Tech/Qual  
Auditors  
HCOs

**ETHICS REPAIR LIST**

PC's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Auditor: \_\_\_\_\_

**PREREQUISITE**

- 1. A complete Drug Rundown.**
- 2. A C/S 53RL done to F/Ning list.** (Done per HCOB 30 Oct. 78, C/S SERIES 53, USE OF.)

WITHOUT THE ABOVE 2 FULLY DONE THIS REPAIR LIST WILL FAIL!

**TRIPLE VS QUAD**

Determine whether the pc is a Triple or Quad Flow pc before starting this list, as you must not start running Flow 0 on a Triple Flow pc.

DO NOT RUN **ANY** FLOW THAT DOES NOT READ. Check each flow for read before running it.

**EXTERIOR**

Nothing is more likely to exteriorize a pc than this list. If the pc goes exterior during this list, do not audit past it, gently end off the session.

The last question on the list is there to detect exteriorization. If the pc went exterior on this action his Int must be checked, and if out, fully handled before continuing this list or any other auditing.

If the pc has a big win, end off the session and let him have his win. When he is off the win, the list is then resumed.

In all cases the Ethics Repair List is completed through to the end of the list.

**INSTRUCTIONS**

This list is assessed and handled by Method 3.

All questions that read are taken to F/N or E/S to F/N. On some questions an additional handling is indicated after the question. Withholds are handled with Missed Withhold procedure, per HCOB 11 Aug. 78 I, RUDIMENTS, DEFINITIONS AND PATTERN.

00. Fly Ruds to F/N.

0. **R-Factor:** "We are going to do the Ethics Repair List. I'm here to help you. There isn't anything so bad that it can't be undone, or forgiven. Is there any reason not to begin?"

1. F1. HAS THE WORK YOU'VE DONE NOT BEEN APPRECIATED? \_\_\_\_\_  
F2. HAVE YOU BEEN UNAPPRECIATIVE OF THE WORK OF ANOTHER?  
F3. HAVE OTHERS BEEN UNAPPRECIATIVE OF THE WORK OF OTHERS?  
F0. HAVE YOU BEEN UNAPPRECIATIVE OF YOUR OWN WORK?
2. F1. HAS THE WORK YOU HAVE DONE BEEN INVALIDATED? \_\_\_\_\_  
F2. HAVE YOU INVALIDATED THE WORK OF ANOTHER?  
F3. HAVE OTHERS INVALIDATED THE WORK OF OTHERS?  
F0. HAVE YOU INVALIDATED YOUR OWN WORK?
3. F1. HAS THE WORK YOU HAVE DONE BEEN SUPPRESSED? \_\_\_\_\_  
F2. HAVE YOU SUPPRESSED THE WORK ANOTHER HAS DONE?  
F3. HAVE OTHERS SUPPRESSED THE WORK OTHERS HAVE DONE?  
F0. HAVE YOU SUPPRESSED THE WORK YOU HAVE DONE?
4. F1. HAVE YOU BEEN WRONGED? \_\_\_\_\_  
F2. HAVE YOU WRONGED ANOTHER?  
F3. HAVE OTHERS WRONGED OTHERS?  
F0. HAVE YOU WRONGED YOURSELF?
5. F1. HAS THERE BEEN AN INJUSTICE? \_\_\_\_\_  
F2. HAVE YOU CAUSED ANOTHER AN INJUSTICE?  
F3. HAVE OTHERS CAUSED OTHERS AN INJUSTICE?  
F0. HAVE YOU CAUSED YOURSELF AN INJUSTICE?
6. F1. HAVE YOU BEEN FALSELY ACCUSED? \_\_\_\_\_  
F2. HAVE YOU FALSELY ACCUSED ANOTHER?  
F3. HAVE OTHERS FALSELY ACCUSED OTHERS?  
F0. HAVE YOU FALSELY ACCUSED YOURSELF?
7. F1. HAS SOMEONE TREATED YOU UNFAIRLY? \_\_\_\_\_  
F2. HAVE YOU TREATED ANOTHER UNFAIRLY?  
F3. HAVE OTHERS TREATED OTHERS UNFAIRLY?  
F0. HAVE YOU TREATED YOURSELF UNFAIRLY?
8. F1. DO YOU KEEP GETTING BLAMED FOR THINGS? \_\_\_\_\_  
F2. HAVE YOU BLAMED ANOTHER FOR SOMETHING?  
F3. HAVE OTHERS BLAMED OTHERS FOR THINGS?  
F0. DO YOU BLAME YOURSELF FOR THINGS?
9. F1. DO YOU FEEL YOU ARE ALWAYS IN TROUBLE? \_\_\_\_\_  
F2. HAVE YOU CAUSED ANOTHER TO FEEL HE/SHE WAS ALWAYS IN TROUBLE?  
F3. HAVE OTHERS CAUSED OTHERS TO FEEL THEY WERE ALWAYS IN TROUBLE?  
F0. HAVE YOU MADE YOURSELF FEEL YOU WERE ALWAYS IN TROUBLE?
10. F1. HAVE YOUR INTENTIONS BEEN INVALIDATED? \_\_\_\_\_  
F2. HAVE YOU INVALIDATED ANOTHER'S INTENTIONS?  
F3. HAVE OTHERS INVALIDATED OTHERS' INTENTIONS?  
F0. HAVE YOU INVALIDATED YOUR OWN INTENTIONS?
11. F1. DO YOU FEEL THERE IS NO JUSTICE? \_\_\_\_\_  
F2. HAVE YOU CAUSED ANOTHER TO FEEL THERE IS NO JUSTICE?  
F3. HAVE OTHERS CAUSED OTHERS TO FEEL THERE IS NO JUSTICE?  
F0. HAVE YOU CAUSED YOURSELF TO FEEL THERE IS NO JUSTICE?

12. F1. ARE YOU CONCERNED ABOUT GETTING INTO TROUBLE? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU CAUSED ANOTHER TO BE CONCERNED ABOUT GETTING INTO TROUBLE?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS CAUSED OTHERS TO BE CONCERNED ABOUT GETTING INTO TROUBLE?  
 F0. HAVE YOU CAUSED YOURSELF TO BE CONCERNED ABOUT GETTING INTO TROUBLE?
13. F1. HAVE YOU BEEN THIRD PARTIED? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU THIRD PARTIED ANOTHER?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS THIRD PARTIED OTHERS?  
 F0. HAVE YOU CAUSED YOURSELF TO BE THIRD PARTIED?
14. F1. HAVE YOU BEEN PUNISHED FOR SOMETHING YOU DIDN'T DO? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU PUNISHED ANOTHER FOR SOMETHING HE DIDN'T DO?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS PUNISHED OTHERS FOR SOMETHING THEY DIDN'T DO?  
 F0. HAVE YOU PUNISHED YOURSELF FOR SOMETHING YOU DIDN'T DO?
15. F1. HAVE YOU BEEN HARRASSED BY SOMEONE? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU HARRASSED ANOTHER?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS HARRASSED OTHERS?  
 F0. HAVE YOU HARRASSED YOURSELF?
16. F1. HAVE YOU FELT BETRAYED BY SOMEONE? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAS SOMEONE FELT BETRAYED BY YOU?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS FELT BETRAYED BY OTHERS?  
 F0. HAVE YOU FELT YOU BETRAYED YOURSELF?
17. F1. DO YOU FEEL YOU'VE BEEN CRITICIZED? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU MADE ANOTHER FEEL CRITICIZED?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS MADE OTHERS FEEL CRITICIZED?  
 F0. HAVE YOU BEEN CRITICAL OF YOURSELF?
18. F1. HAS ANYONE REFUSED TO LET YOU GET A W/H OFF? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU REFUSED TO LET SOMEONE GET A W/H OFF?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS REFUSED TO LET OTHERS GET W/Hs OFF?  
 F0. HAVE YOU REFUSED TO LET YOURSELF GET A W/H OFF?
- 18A. F1. HAS ANYONE INSISTED YOU STILL HAD A W/H AFTER YOU HAD ALREADY GOTTEN IT OFF? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU INSISTED SOMEONE STILL HAD A W/H AFTER HE/SHE HAD GOTTEN IT OFF?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS INSISTED OTHERS STILL HAD W/Hs AFTER THEY HAD GOTTEN THEM OFF?  
 F0. HAVE YOU INSISTED THAT YOU STILL HAD A W/H AFTER YOU HAD GOTTEN IT OFF?
- 18B. F1. HAS SOMEBODY TOLD YOU NOT TO GET OFF YOUR WITHHOLDS? \_\_\_\_\_  
*(Pull the withholds he didn't or couldn't get off.)*  
 F2. HAVE YOU TOLD SOMEBODY NOT TO GET OFF HIS WITHHOLDS?  
*(Handle as a withhold.)*  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS TOLD OTHERS NOT TO GET OFF THEIR WITHHOLDS?  
*(E/S to F/N.)*  
 F0. HAVE YOU DECIDED NOT TO GET OFF YOUR WITHHOLDS?  
*(Pull any withholds he hasn't gotten off.)*

- 18C. F1. HAVE YOU AGREED NOT TO WRITE DOWN WITHHOLDS? \_\_\_\_\_  
*(Handle as a withhold.)*  
 F2. HAVE YOU MADE ANOTHER AGREE NOT TO WRITE DOWN YOUR WITHHOLDS?  
*(Pull the withhold he didn't want written down.)*  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS GOTTEN OTHERS TO AGREE NOT TO WRITE DOWN THEIR WITHHOLDS?  
*(E/S to F/N.)*  
 F0. HAVE YOU EVER NOT WRITTEN DOWN YOUR OWN WITHHOLDS?  
*(Pull the withholds he hasn't written down.)*
19. F1. HAS ANOTHER PRODUCED AN OVERT PRODUCT? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU PRODUCED ANY OVERT PRODUCT?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS PRODUCED OVERT PRODUCTS?  
 F0. HAVE YOU CAUSED YOURSELF TO PRODUCE ANY OVERT PRODUCT?
20. F1. HAVE YOU FELT DEGRADED BY AN ETHICS OR JUSTICE ACTION? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU CAUSED ANOTHER TO FEEL DEGRADED BY AN ETHICS OR JUSTICE ACTION?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS CAUSED OTHERS TO FEEL DEGRADED BY ETHICS OR JUSTICE ACTIONS?  
 F0. HAVE YOU CAUSED YOURSELF TO FEEL DEGRADED BY AN ETHICS OR JUSTICE ACTION?
21. F1. HAVE YOU BEEN ASSIGNED A WRONG CONDITION? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU ASSIGNED ANOTHER A WRONG CONDITION?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS ASSIGNED OTHERS A WRONG CONDITION?  
 F0. HAVE YOU ASSIGNED YOURSELF A WRONG CONDITION?
22. F1. WERE CONDITIONS FORMULAS NEVER COMPLETED? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU PREVENTED ANOTHER FROM COMPLETING A CONDITION FORMULA?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS PREVENTED OTHERS FROM COMPLETING CONDITIONS FORMULAS?  
 F0. HAVE YOU PREVENTED YOURSELF FROM COMPLETING A CONDITION FORMULA?
- 22A. F1. DID YOU NEVER TRY TO GET OUT OF THE CONDITION YOU WERE IN? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. DID ANOTHER NEVER TRY TO GET OUT OF THE CONDITION HE/SHE WAS IN?  
 F3. DID OTHERS NEVER TRY TO GET OUT OF THE CONDITION THEY WERE IN?  
 F0. DID YOU NEVER TRY TO GET YOURSELF OUT OF A CONDITION?
23. F1. HAS ANOTHER FALSELY REPORTED HIS CONDITION TO YOU? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU FALSELY REPORTED YOUR CONDITION?  
*(Handle as a withhold. E/S to F/N.)*  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS FALSELY REPORTED THEIR CONDITIONS TO OTHERS?  
 F0. DID YOU GIVE YOURSELF A FALSE REPORT ON YOUR CONDITION?
24. F1. HAS ANOTHER NOT REPORTED HIS STAT? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU NOT REPORTED YOUR STAT?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS NOT REPORTED THEIR STATS?  
 F0. HAVE YOU CAUSED YOURSELF NOT TO REPORT YOUR STAT?



25. F1. HAS ANOTHER FALSE REPORTED HIS STAT? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU FALSE REPORTED YOUR STAT?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS FALSE REPORTED THEIR STATS?  
 F0. HAVE YOU CAUSED YOURSELF TO FALSE REPORT YOUR STAT?
26. F1. HAS THERE BEEN AN OUT-GRADIENT ETHICS OR JUSTICE ACTION? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU TAKEN AN OUT-GRADIENT ETHICS OR JUSTICE ACTION ON ANOTHER?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS TAKEN OUT-GRADIENT ETHICS OR JUSTICE ACTIONS ON OTHERS?  
 F0. HAVE YOU TAKEN AN OUT-GRADIENT ETHICS OR JUSTICE ACTION ON YOURSELF?
27. F1. HAVE YOU HAD AN UNJUST COURT OF ETHICS? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU BEEN UNJUST TO ANOTHER REGARDING A COURT OF ETHICS?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS BEEN UNJUST TO OTHERS REGARDING COURTS OF ETHICS?  
 F0. HAVE YOU CAUSED YOURSELF AN INJUSTICE REGARDING A COURT OF ETHICS?
28. F1. HAVE YOU BEEN UNJUSTLY COMM EVED? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU UNJUSTLY COMM EVED ANOTHER?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS UNJUSTLY COMM EVED OTHERS?  
 F0. HAVE YOU CAUSED YOURSELF TO BE UNJUSTLY COMM EVED?
29. F1. HAVE YOU BEEN GIVEN AN UNFAIR TRIAL? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU GIVEN ANOTHER AN UNFAIR TRIAL?  
*(E/S to F/N. Handle as a W/H if applicable.)*  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS GIVEN OTHERS UNFAIR TRIALS?  
 F0. HAVE YOU CAUSED YOURSELF TO BE GIVEN AN UNFAIR TRIAL?
30. F1. "HAVE YOU BEEN THREATENED WITH PUNISHMENT OR JUSTICE ACTIONS?" \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU THREATENED ANOTHER WITH PUNISHMENT OR JUSTICE ACTIONS?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS THREATENED OTHERS WITH PUNISHMENT OR JUSTICE ACTIONS?  
 F0. HAVE YOU THREATENED YOURSELF WITH PUNISHMENT OR JUSTICE ACTIONS?
31. F1. HAS THERE BEEN UNJUST OR UNREASONABLE PUNISHMENT? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU UNJUSTLY OR UNREASONABLY PUNISHED ANOTHER?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS UNJUSTLY OR UNREASONABLY PUNISHED OTHERS?  
 F0. HAVE YOU UNJUSTLY OR UNREASONABLY PUNISHED YOURSELF?
32. F1. HAVE YOU WITHHELD ANYTHING FROM A COURT OR COMM EV? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAS ANOTHER WITHHELD ANYTHING FROM A COURT OR COMM EV?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS WITHHELD ANYTHING FROM A COURT OR COMM EV?  
 F0. HAVE YOU CAUSED YOURSELF TO WITHHOLD FROM A COURT OR COMM EV?

33. F1. HAVE YOU DONE SOMETHING FOR WHICH YOU COULD HAVE BEEN GIVEN A COURT OR COMM EV? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAS ANOTHER DONE SOMETHING FOR WHICH HE/SHE COULD HAVE BEEN GIVEN A COURT OR COMM EV?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS DONE SOMETHING FOR WHICH THEY COULD HAVE BEEN GIVEN A COURT OR COMM EV?  
 F0. HAVE YOU DONE SOMETHING TO YOURSELF FOR WHICH YOU COULD HAVE BEEN GIVEN A COURT OR COMM EV?
- 33A. F1. HAVE YOU WITHHELD ANYTHING FOR WHICH YOU COULD HAVE BEEN IMPRISONED? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAS ANOTHER WITHHELD ANYTHING FOR WHICH HE/SHE COULD HAVE BEEN IMPRISONED?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS WITHHELD THINGS FOR WHICH THEY COULD HAVE BEEN IMPRISONED?  
 F0. HAVE YOU CAUSED YOURSELF TO WITHHOLD SOMETHING FOR WHICH YOU THOUGHT YOU COULD BE IMPRISONED?
34. F1. ARE YOU CONCERNED OR WORRIED ABOUT RPF ASSIGNMENTS? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU CAUSED ANOTHER CONCERN OR WORRY ABOUT AN INCORRECT RPF ASSIGNMENT?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS CAUSED OTHERS CONCERN OR WORRY ABOUT AN INCORRECT RPF ASSIGNMENT?  
 F0. HAVE YOU CAUSED YOURSELF CONCERN OR WORRY ABOUT AN INCORRECT RPF ASSIGNMENT?
35. F1. HAVE YOU DONE SOMETHING FOR WHICH YOU COULD HAVE BEEN RPFed? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAS ANOTHER DONE SOMETHING FOR WHICH HE/SHE COULD HAVE BEEN RPFed?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS DONE SOMETHING FOR WHICH THEY COULD HAVE BEEN RPFed?  
 F0. HAVE YOU DONE SOMETHING TO YOURSELF FOR WHICH YOU COULD HAVE BEEN RPFed?
36. F1. HAS THERE BEEN AN UNNECESSARY ETHICS OR JUSTICE ACTION? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU TAKEN AN UNNECESSARY ETHICS OR JUSTICE ACTION ON ANOTHER?  
*(E/S to F/N. Handle as a W/H if applicable.)*  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS TAKEN UNNECESSARY ETHICS OR JUSTICE ACTIONS ON OTHERS?  
 F0. HAVE YOU TAKES AN UNNECESSARY ETHICS OR JUSTICE ACTION ON YOURSELF?
37. F1. HAVE YOU WITHHELD ANYTHING FROM AN ETHICS OFFICER? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAS ANOTHER WITHHELD ANYTHING FROM AN ETHICS OFFICER?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS WITHHELD ANYTHING FROM AN ETHICS OFFICER?  
 F0. HAVE YOU CAUSED YOURSELF TO WITHHOLD ANYTHING FROM AN ETHICS OFFICER?
38. F1. ARE YOU WITHHOLDING ANYTHING FOR WHICH YOU COULD BE PUNISHED? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. IS ANOTHER WITHHOLDING ANYTHING FOR WHICH HE/SHE COULD BE PUNISHED?  
 F3. ARE OTHERS WITHHOLDING ANYTHING FOR WHICH THEY COULD BE PUNISHED?  
 F0. ARE YOU CAUSING YOURSELF TO WITHHOLD ANYTHING BECAUSE YOU THINK YOU WOULD BE PUNISHED?

39. F1. HAS SOMEONE PREVENTED YOU FROM GETTING HATTED OR TRAINED? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU PREVENTED ANOTHER FROM GETTING HATTED OR TRAINED?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS PREVENTED OTHERS FROM GETTING HATTED OR TRAINED?  
 F0. HAVE YOU PREVENTED YOURSELF FROM GETTING HATTED OR TRAINED?
40. F1. HAVE YOU BEEN PREVENTED FROM DOING YOUR POST (OR JOB)? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU PREVENTED ANOTHER FROM DOING HIS POST (OR JOB)?  
*(Handle as a withhold, If applicable. E/S to F/N.)*  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS PREVENTED OTHERS FROM DOING THEIR POSTS (OR JOBS)?  
 F0. HAVE YOU PREVENTED YOURSELF FROM DOING YOUR POST (OR JOB)?
41. F1. HAS ANOTHER TRIED TO GRAB YOUR POST (OR JOB)? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU TRIED TO GRAB ANOTHER'S POST (OR JOB)?  
*(Handle as a withhold if applicable. E/S to F/N.)*  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS TRIED TO GRAB OTHERS' POSTS (OR JOBS)?  
 F0. HAVE YOU CAUSED YOUR POST (OR JOB) TO BE GRABBED BY ANOTHER?
42. F1. DO YOU WANT YOUR POST? \_\_\_\_\_  
*(If "Yes", acknowledge. If "No", find out if there was a time when he/she did want the post, and someone invalidated this and clean that up. Otherwise, ask "Why don't you want your post?" and 2 Way comm it to F/N.)*  
  
*(If "No" on F1, ask F2, F3, F0.)*  
 F2. HAVE YOU CAUSED ANOTHER NOT TO WANT HIS/HER POST?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS CAUSED OTHERS NOT TO WANT THEIR POSTS?  
 F0. HAVE YOU CAUSED YOURSELF NOT TO WANT YOUR POST?
43. F1. HAVE YOU FELT PTS TO YOUR AREA? \_\_\_\_\_  
*(2 Way comm and handle as needed.)*  
 F2. HAVE YOU MADE ANOTHER FEEL PTS TO HIS/HER AREA?  
*(E/S to F/N.)*  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS MADE OTHERS FEEL PTS TO THEIR AREAS?  
*(E/S to F/N.)*  
 F0. HAVE YOU MADE YOURSELF FEEL PTS TO YOUR AREA?  
*(E/S to F/N.)*
- 43A. F1. DO YOU HAVE ANY WITHHOLD ABOUT YOUR POST OR AREA? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. DOES ANOTHER HAVE ANY WITHHOLD ABOUT HIS POST OR AREA?  
 F3. DO OTHERS HAVE WITHHOLDS ABOUT THEIR POSTS OR AREAS?  
 F0. ARE YOU CAUSING YOURSELF TO HAVE WITHHOLDS ABOUT YOUR POST OR AREA?

44. (Assess both Flows 1 and 2.)
- F1. DID ANOTHER COMMIT OVERTS SO HE/SHE WOULD BE TAKEN OFF POST? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F2. DID YOU COMMIT OVERTS SO YOU WOULD BE TAKEN OFF POST? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F3. DID OTHERS COMMIT OVERTS SO THEY WOULD BE TAKEN OFF POST? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F0. DID YOU COMMIT OVERTS ON YOURSELF SO YOU WOULD BE TAKEN OFF POST? \_\_\_\_\_
- 45.
- F1. DO YOU HAVE TROUBLE COMPLETING CYCLES OF ACTION? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F2. HAVE YOU CAUSED ANOTHER TO HAVE TROUBLE COMPLETING CYCLES OF ACTION? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F3. HAVE OTHERS CAUSED OTHERS TO HAVE TROUBLE COMPLETING CYCLES OF ACTION? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F0. HAVE YOU PREVENTED YOURSELF FROM COMPLETING CYCLES OF ACTION? \_\_\_\_\_
- 46.
- F1. HAVE YOUR GAINS BEEN INVALIDATED? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F2. HAVE YOU INVALIDATED ANOTHER'S GAINS? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F3. HAVE OTHERS INVALIDATED OTHERS' GAINS? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F0. HAVE YOU INVALIDATED YOUR OWN GAINS? \_\_\_\_\_
- 47.
- F1. HAVE RESULTS YOU HAVE ACHIEVED BEEN INVALIDATED? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F2. HAVE YOU INVALIDATED THE RESULTS ANOTHER ACHIEVED? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F3. HAVE OTHERS INVALIDATED THE RESULTS OTHERS ACHIEVED? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F0. HAVE YOU INVALIDATED THE RESULTS YOU HAVE ACHIEVED? \_\_\_\_\_
- 48.
- F1. WAS SOMEONE UPSET WHEN YOU'D HAD A WIN? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F2. WERE YOU UPSET WHEN SOMEONE ELSE HAD A WIN? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F3. WERE OTHERS UPSET WHEN OTHERS HAD WINS? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F0. WERE YOU UPSET WITH A WIN YOU'D HAD? \_\_\_\_\_
- 49.
- F1. HAVE YOU BEEN MADE TO USE EQUIPMENT EVEN THOUGH YOU DIDN'T KNOW HOW IT WORKED?  
*(Indicate it. E/S to F/N. Handle any MUs.)* \_\_\_\_\_
  - F2. HAVE YOU MADE ANOTHER USE EQUIPMENT EVEN THOUGH HE DIDN'T KNOW HOW IT WORKED?  
*(E/S to F/N, or handle as a W/H if applicable.)* \_\_\_\_\_
  - F3. HAVE OTHERS MADE OTHERS USE EQUIPMENT EVEN THOUGH THEY DIDN'T KNOW HOW IT WORKED?  
*(E/S to F/N.)* \_\_\_\_\_
  - F0. HAVE YOU USED EQUIPMENT WHILE PREVENTING YOURSELF FROM FINDING OUT HOW IT WORKED?  
*(Handle as a withhold. Then handle any MUs.)* \_\_\_\_\_
- 50.
- F1. ARE YOU MIS-USING OR BREAKING EQUIPMENT BECAUSE YOU'VE BEEN PREVENTED FROM FINDING OUT HOW IT WORKS?  
*(E/S to F/N. Handle any MUs.)* \_\_\_\_\_
  - F2. IS ANOTHER MIS-USING OR BREAKING EQUIPMENT BECAUSE YOU'VE PREVENTED HIM FROM FINDING OUT HOW IT WORKS?  
*(E/S to F/N. Handle as a W/H If applicable.)* \_\_\_\_\_
  - F3. ARE OTHERS MIS-USING OR BREAKING EQUIPMENT BECAUSE OTHERS HAVE PREVENTED THEM FROM FINDING OUT HOW IT WORKS? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F0. HAVE YOU MIS-USED OR BROKEN YOUR OWN EQUIPMENT BECAUSE YOU PREVENTED YOURSELF FROM FINDING OUT HOW IT WORKS? \_\_\_\_\_

51. (Assess both Flows 1 and 2.)
- F1. HAS ANOTHER MIS-USED OR BROKEN EQUIPMENT BECAUSE HE DIDN'T LIKE IT? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F2. HAVE YOU MIS-USED OR BROKEN EQUIPMENT BECAUSE YOU DIDN'T LIKE IT? \_\_\_\_\_  
(Handle as a withhold.)
  - F3. HAVE OTHERS MIS-USED OR BROKEN EQUIPMENT BECAUSE THEY DIDN'T LIKE IT?
  - F0. HAVE YOU MIS-USED OR BROKEN YOUR OWN EQUIPMENT BECAUSE YOU DIDN'T LIKE IT?
- 52.
- F1. HAVE YOU BEEN ACCUSED OF STEALING? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F2. HAVE YOU ACCUSED ANOTHER OF STEALING?
  - F3. HAVE OTHERS ACCUSED OTHERS OF STEALING?
  - F0. HAVE YOU ACCUSED YOURSELF OF STEALING?
53. (Assess both Flows 1 and 2.)
- F1. HAS ANOTHER STOLEN FROM YOU? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F2. HAVE YOU STOLEN ANYTHING? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F3. HAVE OTHERS STOLEN FROM OTHERS?
  - F0. HAVE YOU STOLEN FROM YOURSELF?
- 54.
- F1. HAVE YOU BEEN ACCUSED OF GIVING FALSE INFORMATION? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F2. HAVE YOU ACCUSED ANOTHER OF GIVING FALSE INFORMATION?
  - F3. HAVE OTHERS ACCUSED OTHERS OF GIVING FALSE INFORMATION?
  - F0. HAVE YOU ACCUSED YOURSELF OF GIVING FALSE INFORMATION?
55. (Assess both Flows 1 and 2.)
- F1. HAS ANOTHER GIVEN YOU FALSE INFORMATION? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F2. HAVE YOU GIVEN ANOTHER FALSE INFORMATION? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F3. HAVE OTHERS GIVEN OTHERS FALSE INFORMATION?
  - F0. HAVE YOU GIVEN YOURSELF FALSE INFORMATION?
- 56.
- F1. HAVE YOU BEEN ACCUSED OF OUT-2D (SEXUAL MIS-PRACTICES)? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F2. HAVE YOU ACCUSED ANOTHER OF OUT-2D (SEXUAL MIS-PRACTICES)?
  - F3. HAVE OTHERS ACCUSED OTHERS OF OUT-2D (SEXUAL MIS-PRACTICES)?
  - F0. HAVE YOU CAUSED YOURSELF TO BE ACCUSED OF OUT-2D (SEXUAL MIS-PRACTICES)?  
(Handle as a W/H If applicable.)
57. (Assess both Flows 1 and 2.)
- F1. HAS ANOTHER ENGAGED YOU IN OUT-2D (SEXUAL MIS-PRACTICES)? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F2. HAVE YOU ENGAGED ANOTHER IN OUT-2D (SEXUAL MIS-PRACTICES)? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F3. HAVE OTHERS ENGAGED OTHERS IN OUT-2D (SEXUAL MIS-PRACTICES)?
  - F0. HAVE YOU CAUSED YOURSELF TO ENGAGE IN OUT-2D (SEXUAL MIS-PRACTICES)?
- 58.
- F1. HAVE YOU BEEN ACCUSED OF A CRIME? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F2. HAVE YOU ACCUSED ANOTHER OF A CRIME?
  - F3. HAVE OTHERS ACCUSED OTHERS OF CRIMES?
  - F0. HAVE YOU ACCUSED YOURSELF OF A CRIME?

59. (Assess both Flows 1 and 2.)  
 F1. HAS ANOTHER COMMITTED ANY CRIMES AGAINST YOU? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU COMMITTED ANY CRIMES?  
*(Handle as a withhold.)* \_\_\_\_\_  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS COMMITTED CRIMES AGAINST OTHERS?  
 F0. HAVE YOU COMMITTED CRIMES AGAINST YOURSELF?
60. (Assess both Flows 1 and 2.)  
 F1. HAS ANOTHER DONE SOMETHING TO YOU HE WAS AFRAID  
 THE POLICE OR AUTHORITIES WOULD FIND OUT? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU EVER DONE ANYTHING TO ANOTHER YOU WERE  
 AFRAID THE POLICE OR AUTHORITIES WOULD FIND OUT? \_\_\_\_\_  
*(Handle as a withhold.)*  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS DONE SOMETHING TO OTHERS THEY WERE  
 AFRAID THE POLICE OR AUTHORITIES WOULD FIND OUT?  
 F0. HAVE YOU DONE SOMETHING TO YOURSELF YOU WERE  
 AFRAID THE POLICE OR AUTHORITIES WOULD FIND OUT?  
*(Handle as a withhold.)*
61. F1. ARE YOU WANTED BY THE POLICE OR SOME  
 AUTHORITIES? \_\_\_\_\_  
*(Handle as a withhold.)*  
 F2. HAVE YOU CAUSED ANOTHER TO BE WANTED BY THE  
 POLICE OR SOME AUTHORITIES?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS CAUSED OTHERS TO BE WANTED BY THE  
 POLICE OR SOME AUTHORITIES?  
 F0. HAVE YOU CAUSED YOURSELF TO BE WANTED BY THE  
 POLICE OR SOME AUTHORITIES?
62. F1. HAVE YOU BEEN ACCUSED OF LYING ABOUT SOMETHING? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU ACCUSED ANOTHER OF LYING ABOUT  
 SOMETHING?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS ACCUSED OTHERS OF LYING ABOUT  
 SOMETHING?  
 F0. HAVE YOU ACCUSED YOURSELF OF LYING ABOUT  
 SOMETHING?
63. (Assess both Flows 1 and 2.)  
 F1. HAS ANOTHER LIED TO YOU? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU LIED TO ANOTHER? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS LIED TO OTHERS?  
 F0. HAVE YOU LIED TO YOURSELF?
64. F1. HAVE YOU BEEN ACCUSED OF CHEATING? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU ACCUSED ANOTHER OF CHEATING?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS ACCUSED OTHERS OF CHEATING?  
 F0. HAVE YOU ACCUSED YOURSELF OF CHEATING?
65. (Assess both Flows 1 and 2.)  
 F1. HAS ANOTHER EVER CHEATED YOU? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU EVER CHEATED ANOTHER? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS EVER CHEATED OTHERS?  
 F0. HAVE YOU EVER CHEATED YOURSELF?
66. (Assess both Flows 1 and 2.)  
 F1. HAVE YOU BEEN "CONNED" INTO SOMETHING? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU "CONNED" ANOTHER INTO SOMETHING?  
*(Handle as a withhold.)* \_\_\_\_\_  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS "CONNED" OTHERS INTO SOMETHING?  
 F0. HAVE YOU "CONNED" YOURSELF INTO SOMETHING?



67. F1. HAVE YOU BEEN ACCUSED OF HARMING OR INJURING SOMEONE? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU ACCUSED ANOTHER OF HARMING OR INJURING SOMEONE?  
*(E/S to F/N. Handle as a W/H if applicable.)*  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS ACCUSED OTHERS OF HARMING OR INJURING SOMEONE?  
 F0. HAVE YOU ACCUSED YOURSELF OF HARMING OR INJURING SOMEONE?
68. (Assess both Flows 1 and 2.)  
 F1. HAVE YOU BEEN HARMED OR INJURED BY SOMEONE? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU HARMED OR INJURED ANOTHER? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS HARMED OR INJURED OTHERS?  
 F0. HAVE YOU HARMED OR INJURED YOURSELF?
69. F1. HAVE YOU BEEN ACCUSED OF ATTACKING SOMEONE OR SOMETHING? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU ACCUSED ANOTHER OF ATTACKING SOMEONE OR SOMETHING?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS ACCUSED OTHERS OF ATTACKING SOMEONE OR SOMETHING?  
 F0. HAVE YOU ACCUSED YOURSELF OF ATTACKING SOMEONE OR SOMETHING?
70. (Assess both Flows 1 and 2.)  
 F1. HAS ANOTHER ATTACKED YOU? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU ATTACKED ANOTHER? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS ATTACKED OTHERS?  
 F0. HAVE YOU ATTACKED YOURSELF?
71. (Assess both Flows 1 and 2.)  
 F1. HAS ANYONE EVER BEEN DETERMINED TO DO YOU IN? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN DETERMINED TO DO ANOTHER IN? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS BEEN DETERMINED TO DO OTHERS IN?  
 F0. HAVE YOU BEEN DETERMINED TO DO YOURSELF IN?
72. F1. IS THERE ANY VENGEANCE YOU HAVE NOT FULLY ENDED CYCLE ON? \_\_\_\_\_  
*(Handle as a withhold.)*  
 F2. HAVE YOU CAUSED ANOTHER TO NOT FULLY END CYCLE ON A VENGEANCE?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS CAUSED OTHERS TO NOT FULLY END CYCLE ON A VENGEANCE?  
 F0. HAVE YOU DECIDED TO HOLD ONTO A VENGEANCE?  
*(Handle as a withhold. E/S to F/N.)*
73. (Assess both Flows 1 and 2.)  
 F1. HAS SOMEBODY ALLOWED YOU TO TAKE THE BLAME FOR SOMETHING THEY DID? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU ALLOWED SOMEBODY TO TAKE THE BLAME FOR SOMETHING YOU DID? \_\_\_\_\_  
*(Handle as a withhold.)*  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS ALLOWED OTHERS TO TAKE THE BLAME FOR SOMETHING THEY DID?  
 F0. HAVE YOU BLAMED YOURSELF FOR SOMETHING YOU DIDN'T DO?

74. (Assess both Flows 1 and 2.)
- F1. HAS ANOTHER BEEN BIASED OR PREJUDICED AGAINST YOU? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F2. HAVE YOU BEEN BIASED OR PREJUDICED AGAINST ANOTHER? \_\_\_\_\_  
(E/S to F/N. Or handle as a W/H if applicable.)
  - F3. HAVE OTHERS BEEN BIASED OR PREJUDICED AGAINST OTHERS?
  - F0. HAVE YOU CAUSED BIAS OR PREJUDICE AGAINST YOURSELF?
75. (Assess both Flows 1 and 2.)
- F1. HAVE YOU BEEN TREATED UNFAIRLY? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F2. HAVE YOU TREATED ANOTHER UNFAIRLY? \_\_\_\_\_  
(E/S to F/N. Or handle as a W/H if applicable.)
  - F3. HAVE OTHERS TREATED OTHERS UNFAIRLY?
  - F0. HAVE YOU TREATED YOURSELF UNFAIRLY?
- 76.
- F1. HAVE YOU BEEN CONVINCED YOU WERE NOT OUT-ETHICS? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F2. HAVE YOU CONVINCED ANOTHER HE/SHE WAS NOT OUT-ETHICS?
  - F3. HAVE OTHERS CONVINCED OTHERS THEY WERE NOT OUT-ETHICS?
  - F0. HAVE YOU CONVINCED YOURSELF YOU WERE NOT OUT-ETHICS?
- 77.
- F1. HAS SOMEBODY TOLD YOU ETHICS OR JUSTICE DIDN'T WORK? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F2. HAVE YOU TOLD SOMEONE ETHICS OR JUSTICE DIDN'T WORK?
  - F3. HAVE OTHERS TOLD OTHERS ETHICS OR JUSTICE DIDN'T WORK?
  - F0. HAVE YOU TOLD YOURSELF ETHICS OR JUSTICE DIDN'T WORK?
- 78.
- F1. HAS ETHICS OR JUSTICE BEEN A PROBLEM TO YOU? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F2. HAVE YOU MADE ETHICS OR JUSTICE A PROBLEM TO ANOTHER?
  - F3. HAVE OTHERS MADE ETHICS OR JUSTICE A PROBLEM TO OTHERS?
  - F0. HAVE YOU MADE ETHICS OR JUSTICE A PROBLEM TO YOURSELF?
- 79.
- F1. ON ETHICS OR JUSTICE, HAS SOMEBODY EVALUATED FOR YOU? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F2. ON ETHICS OR JUSTICE, HAVE YOU EVALUATED FOR ANOTHER?
  - F3. ON ETHICS OR JUSTICE, HAVE OTHERS EVALUATED FOR OTHERS?
  - F0. ON ETHICS OR JUSTICE, HAVE YOU EVALUATED FOR YOURSELF?
- 80.
- F1. HAD YOU ALREADY CORRECTED THE ETHICS OR JUSTICE SITUATION? \_\_\_\_\_  
(Indicate it. Rehab if needed.)
  - F2. HAVE YOU MADE ANOTHER APPLY ETHICS OR JUSTICE AFTER THE SITUATION WAS CORRECTED? \_\_\_\_\_
  - F3. HAVE OTHERS MADE OTHERS APPLY ETHICS OR JUSTICE AFTER THE SITUATION WAS CORRECTED?
  - F0. HAVE YOU MADE YOURSELF APPLY ETHICS OR JUSTICE AFTER THE SITUATION WAS CORRECTED?



81. F1. HAVE YOU BEEN CRITICIZED BECAUSE OF AN ETHICS OR JUSTICE ACTION? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU BEEN CRITICAL OF ANOTHER BECAUSE OF AN ETHICS OR JUSTICE ACTION?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS BEEN CRITICAL OF OTHERS BECAUSE OF AN ETHICS OR JUSTICE ACTION?  
 F0. HAVE YOU BEEN CRITICAL OF YOURSELF BECAUSE OF AN ETHICS OR JUSTICE ACTION?
82. F1. IS THERE SOMETHING YOU DID BECAUSE YOU HAD NO CHOICE? \_\_\_\_\_  
*(Get what. Handle as a W/H if applicable. E/S to F/N.)*  
 F2. DID YOU CAUSE ANOTHER TO DO SOMETHING WHEN HE/SHE HAD NO CHOICE?  
 F3. DID OTHERS CAUSE OTHERS TO DO SOMETHING WHEN THEY HAD NO CHOICE?  
 F0. DID YOU CAUSE YOURSELF TO DO SOMETHING WHEN YOU HAD NO CHOICE?
83. F1. IS THERE SOMETHING YOU DIDN'T WANT TO DO, BUT IT JUST HAPPENED? \_\_\_\_\_  
*(Handle as a W/H if applicable.)*  
 F2. IS THERE SOMETHING ANOTHER DIDN'T WANT TO DO, BUT IT JUST HAPPENED?  
 F3. IS THERE SOMETHING OTHERS DIDN'T WANT TO DO, BUT IT JUST HAPPENED?  
*(E/S to F/N.)*  
 F0. IS THERE SOMETHING YOU TRIED TO KEEP YOURSELF FROM DOING, BUT IT JUST HAPPENED?  
*(Handle as a W/H if applicable.)*
84. F1. IS THERE SOMETHING YOU KNEW WASN'T RIGHT, BUT SOMEONE MADE YOU DO IT? \_\_\_\_\_  
*(Handle as a withhold, if applicable. E/S to F/N.)*  
 F2. IS THERE SOMETHING SOMEONE ELSE KNEW WASN'T RIGHT, BUT YOU MADE HIM/HER DO IT?  
*(Handle as a withhold. E/S to F/N.)*  
 F3. IS THERE SOMETHING OTHERS KNEW WASN'T RIGHT, BUT OTHERS MADE THEM DO IT?  
 F0. IS THERE SOMETHING YOU KNEW WASN'T RIGHT, BUT YOU MADE YOURSELF DO IT?  
*(Handle as a withhold, if applicable. E/S to F/N.)*
85. F1. IS THERE SOMETHING ANOTHER WISHES HE HADN'T DONE? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. IS THERE SOMETHING YOU WISH YOU HADN'T DONE? \_\_\_\_\_  
*(Get what it is. Handle as a W/H if applicable, or E/S to F/N.)*  
 F3. IS THERE SOMETHING OTHERS WISH THEY HADN'T DONE?  
 F0. IS THERE SOMETHING YOU WISH YOU HADN'T DONE TO YOURSELF?
86. (Assess both Flows 1 and 2.)  
 F1. IS THERE SOMETHING ANOTHER HAS DONE HE HASN'T BEEN ABLE TO FORGET? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. IS THERE SOMETHING YOU'VE- DONE YOU HAVEN'T BEEN ABLE TO FORGET? \_\_\_\_\_  
*(Get what. Handle as W/H if applicable, E/S to F/N.)*  
 F3. IS THERE SOMETHING OTHERS HAVE DONE THEY HAVEN'T BEEN ABLE TO FORGET?  
 F0. IS THERE SOMETHING YOU'VE DONE TO YOURSELF YOU HAVEN'T BEEN ABLE TO FORGET?

87. (Assess both Flows 1 and 2.)  
 F1. DID ANOTHER EVER FEEL BAD ABOUT SOMETHING HE DID? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. DID YOU EVER FEEL BAD ABOUT SOMETHING YOU DID? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F3. DID OTHERS EVER FEEL BAD ABOUT SOMETHING THEY DID?  
 F0. DID YOU EVER FEEL BAD ABOUT SOMETHING YOU DID TO YOURSELF?
88. F1. DID YOU GET WHAT YOU DESERVED? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. DID ANOTHER GET WHAT HE DESERVED?  
 F3. DID OTHERS GET WHAT THEY DESERVED?  
 F0. DID YOU CAUSE YOURSELF TO GET WHAT YOU DESERVED?
89. F1. DID SOMETHING HAPPEN THAT WAS NOT YOUR FAULT? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. DID YOU CONVINC ANOTHER THAT SOMETHING THAT HAPPENED WAS NOT HIS/HER FAULT?  
 F3. DID OTHERS CONVINC OTHERS THAT SOMETHING THAT HAPPENED WAS NOT THEIR FAULT?  
 F0. DID YOU CONVINC YOURSELF THAT SOMETHING THAT HAPPENED WAS NOT YOUR FAULT?
90. F1. ARE YOU GUILTLESS? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. DO YOU FEEL ANOTHER IS GUILTLESS?  
 F3. DO YOU FEEL OTHERS ARE GUILTLESS?  
 F0. HAVE YOU CAUSED YOURSELF TO FEEL GUILTLESS?
91. IF YOU HAD A FRIEND THAT YOU KNEW WOULD NEVER TELL ANYBODY ABOUT IT, WHAT WOULD YOU TELL HIM?  
 (Get what. Handle as a withhold.)  
 F1. **CONDITIONAL**: Ask only If the above question reads:  
 HAVE YOU EVER BEEN BETRAYED BY SUCH A FRIEND? \_\_\_\_\_  
 (*Itsa E/S Itsa.*)  
 F2. HAVE YOU EVER BETRAYED SUCH A FRIEND?  
 (*E/S to F/N, or handle as a W/H if applicable.*)  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS EVER BETRAYED SUCH FRIENDS?  
 (*E/S to F/N.*)  
 F0. HAVE YOU EVER BETRAYED YOURSELF?  
 (*E/S to F/N.*)
92. (Assess both Flows 1 and 2.)  
 F1. HAS ANOTHER GIVEN FALSE OVERTS TO YOU? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. ARE YOU GIVING OFF FALSE OVERTS?  
 (Get what false data the pc has been giving. Then get the real overts off.)  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS GIVEN FALSE OVERTS TO OTHERS?  
 F0. HAVE YOU ASSIGNED FALSE OVERTS TO YOURSELF?
93. (Assess both Flows 1 and 2.)  
 F1. HAS SOMEONE COMMITTED OVERTS AGAINST YOU JUST TO "GET EVEN"? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU COMMITTED OVERTS AGAINST SOMEONE JUST TO "GET EVEN"? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F3. ARE OTHERS COMMITTING OVERTS JUST TO "GET EVEN" WITH OTHERS?  
 F0. ARE YOU COMMITTING OVERTS JUST TO "GET EVEN" WITH YOURSELF?
94. F1. HAS ANYTHING BEEN SUPPRESSED? \_\_\_\_\_  
 F2. HAVE YOU CAUSED ANOTHER TO SUPPRESS SOMETHING?  
 F3. HAVE OTHERS CAUSED OTHERS TO SUPPRESS SOMETHING?  
 F0. HAVE YOU CAUSED YOURSELF TO SUPPRESS SOMETHING?

95. F1. HAVE YOU TOLD ME SOMETHING THAT ISN'T QUITE THE TRUTH?  
*(Handle as a withhold.)* \_\_\_\_\_
- F2. HAVE YOU LET ANOTHER GET AWAY WITH AN UNTRUTH?
- F3. HAVE OTHERS LET OTHERS GET AWAY WITH UNTRUTHS?
- F0. HAVE YOU LET YOURSELF GET AWAY WITH AN UNTRUTH?
96. F1. IS THERE SOMETHING YOU'RE GLAD I DIDN'T ASK YOU?  
*(Get what. Handle as a withhold.)* \_\_\_\_\_
- F2. IS THERE SOMETHING ANOTHER WAS GLAD YOU DIDN'T ASK HIM?
- F3. IS THERE SOMETHING OTHERS WERE GLAD OTHERS DIDN'T ASK THEM?
- F0. HAVE YOU DECIDED TO GET AWAY WITH A WITHHOLD?  
*(Get what and handle the withhold. Then E/S on the question to F/N.)*
97. F1. SHOULD AN F/N HAVE BEEN CALLED?  
*(Find out when and rehab.)* \_\_\_\_\_
- F2. HAVE YOU FAILED TO CALL AN F/N ON ANOTHER
- F3. HAVE OTHERS FAILED TO CALL F/Ns ON OTHERS?
- F0. HAVE YOU FAILED TO CALL AN F/N ON YOURSELF?
98. HAVE I MISSED A WITHHOLD ON YOU?  
*(Handle as a withhold.)* \_\_\_\_\_
99. IS THERE ANY OVERT OR WITHHOLD I DIDN'T ASK YOU ABOUT?  
*(Handle as a withhold.)* \_\_\_\_\_
100. IS THERE SOMETHING YOU DECIDED NOT TO TELL ME?  
*(Handle as a withhold.)* \_\_\_\_\_
101. IS THERE ANY QUESTION ON THIS LIST THAT YOU EXPECTED TO READ?  
*(Handle as a withhold.)* \_\_\_\_\_
102. DID YOU REACH AN EP EARLIER?  
*(Indicate, rehab.)* \_\_\_\_\_
103. DID WE FAIL TO QUIT ON A WIN?  
*(Indicate, rehab.)* \_\_\_\_\_
104. IS THERE SOME OTHER KIND OF BY-PASSED CHARGE?  
*(Find out what and handle.)* \_\_\_\_\_
105. HAS ANYTHING BEEN MISSED?  
*(Get what. Handle as needed.)* \_\_\_\_\_
106. WAS THERE NOTHING WRONG IN THE FIRST PLACE?  
*(Indicate, E/S to F/N.)* \_\_\_\_\_
107. **END R-FACTOR:** "By the power invested in me, I hereby pronounce that all the overts and withholds you have told me are forgiven, and you are cleared of these sins of the past and free from them." \_\_\_\_\_
108. Ask the pc: **"DURING THIS LIST DID YOU GO EXTERIOR?"**  
*(If pc went exterior, acknowledge and gently end the session. The next action would be to check Int/Ext and handle if reading. But not in this session.)* \_\_\_\_\_

---

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder



**HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE**  
**Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex**

**HCO BULLETIN OF 24 MARCH 1960**

Mission Holders  
HCO Secs  
Assoc 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  
Surrounds  
Goals

(Note the rudiments are changed in order from HCO Bulletin of 25 Feb. 60, THE MODEL SESSION.)

**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 a 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 about 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 the 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  
Founder



**HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE**  
**Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex**

**HCO BULLETIN OF 6 JUNE 1969**

Remimeo  
Class II Checksheets  
Academy  
SHSBC

**PREDICTION AND CONSEQUENCES**

Probably the reason omissions of commission are done at all lies in man's inability or faulty ability to predict and to realize consequences.

Men are rather thoroughly stuck in the present and so involved with its confusions that they rarely foresee anything and are mainly oblivious to any consequences of their own actions or failures to act.

This gives them the appearance of being stupid.

When men become too confused to even stay in the present, they slide into the past and become "psychotic" or, at best, "neurotic."

The Russian psychologist Pavlov was acceptable in Western universities and governments mainly because he dealt only in stimulus and response mechanisms. Men in universities and governments and other places from which it is difficult to view life (since the situations are so lofty) took psychology and psychiatry at face value. Men were animals one trained like dancing bears. In other words, these subjects were political subjects aimed at *control*. There was no thought of *healing* anything. "Treatment" meant not heal or cure but *train* by punishing "bad" characteristics. It is interesting that neither subject ever listed any good characteristics. A typical "treatment" was to punish with electric shock a "bad habit." They would give an alcoholic a taste of liquor and shock him so that he would feel the shock each time he thought of liquor.

This is the Russian Pavlov at work in all American mental practice prior to Dianetics and Scientology. Needless to say a great many people were injured for life but no one was cured of anything.

The psychiatrist and psychologist who did these things were themselves of a criminal temperament and widely boasted they could not tell right from wrong. The ability to tell right from wrong is the legal definition of sanity.

The reason domineering politicians in government supported the psychologist and psychiatrist with billions in funds and helped them destroy any potential rival was that certain types in government conceive it their duty to control populations. In their view populations were merely a herd of animals to be managed and kept from committing antisocial acts as well as milked for tax money or slaughtered.

By making a totally confusing and violent environment and stripping the country of any constitutional safeguards, the security of the individual was undermined to a point where he had to be continually alert to immediate threat in his environment.

This tended to pin people in close to present time. It inhibited any future, planning for the future or any long-distance consequences in the future.

Thus Russian mental "treatment" imported into the West actually did prevent the people from being able to predict-as they were continuously battered by government.

Thus crime rose to a fantastic level. The citizen, pinned into insecurity in the present by outrageous economic, governmental and social duress, became much less able to predict and therefore became oblivious of the consequences of his own acts.

Most "criminal" types are completely unable to predict and thus have no fear of any consequences even when they are obvious to a more sane person.



The case that is very bad off therefore does not register on a meter. Having no awareness of good or evil due to his low case condition, there is no apparent charge on overt acts of omission or commission, regardless of who has been hurt.

Man is basically good.

When his level of awareness rises, he begins to be able to predict and see the consequences to himself or others of evil actions.

The more he is freed and the higher his intelligence and ability rise, the more "moral" he becomes.

Only when he is beaten down below awareness as a chronic condition does man commit evil actions.

It is not for nothing that soldiers have to be brutalized and stuck in the present by threat and duress to make them commit harmful actions.

When a person's awareness is improved, he is also able to predict and can foresee consequences on the eight dynamics.

Criminal governments and brutalizing societies are poor things to have around; they are not "clever" enough to forecast their own demise. They engage in cold or hot wars instead of working out their problems. They buy Pavlov and dog technology to crush "bad traits" rather than cure or heal anyone. They work to decrease all liberty or abolish constitutional safeguards.

True sanity is that condition wherein one is sufficiently intelligent to solve his problems without physical violence or destroying other beings and yet survive happily and prosperously.

The road from insanity to sanity is a road of recognition of the world around one, the future and consequences of one's own actions.

Thus, the principle of the overt-motivator sequence will be found to explain and its techniques remedy the brutality into which races fall.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

# Ability

The Magazine of  
DIANETICS and SCIENTOLOGY  
From  
Washington, DC

## BASIC PROCESSES

Rudiments: One: Awareness of the auditor, the auditing room, that an auditing session is in progress. Two: Two-way communication on a casual basis. Three: The delivery of the question. Four: Communication lag. Five: The acknowledgment of the question. Six: The duplication of that exact question.

### I

**I. FIND A PC.**

**II. ESTABLISH THE EXISTENCE OF THE AUDITOR.**

**III. ESTABLISH THE EXISTENCE OF A SESSION: LOCATIONAL PROCESSING.**

“Notice a chair in this room.”

“Notice the ceiling.”

“Notice the floor.”

“Notice \_\_\_\_\_, etc.”

**IV. TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION RECALLING PC’S SECRETS** (see Dianetics 55!)

**V. DISCUSS PRESENT TIME PROBLEM, IF ANY.**

**VI. HELLOs AND OKAYs TO PICTURES** (Article 5, *Ability* Major 4, “Straightwire – A Manual of Operation”):

“Recall a moment.”

Hellos and okays to and from any picture or blackness.

Bring back the picture.

“Recall a moment.”

Hellos and okays any pictures or blackness.

Bring back vanished pictures.

### (SPLITTING UNIVERSES)

**VII. PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS** (R2-20, *Creation of Human Ability*):

“What problem could you be to yourself?”

“Give me another problem you could be to yourself.”

“Another \_\_\_\_\_, etc.”

“What solution could you be to yourself?”

“Give me another solution you could be to yourself.”

“Another \_\_\_\_\_, etc.”

**VIII. THINK A THOUGHT:**

“Think a thought.”

“Think another thought.”

“. . . another thought, etc.”

“Receive a thought.”

“Receive another thought.”

“. . . another thought, etc.”

(ASSIGN, INVENT, MAKE TYPE PROCESSES)

**IX. CONSEQUENCES:**

“What would happen if you were apathetic?”

Repeat, etc.

“What would happen if you got angry?”

Repeat, etc.

APPLY TO TONE SCALE AND AWARENESS SCALE.

**II.**

**X. ELEMENTARY STRAIGHTWIRE (ABOVE 1.0):**

“Give me something you wouldn’t mind forgetting.”

Hellos and okays to any pictures.

Put back any pictures.

Repeat, etc.

“Give me something you wouldn’t mind remembering.”

Hellos and okays to any pictures.

Put back any pictures.

Repeat, etc.

(STRAIGHTWIRE ON SECRETS, KNOWINGNESS)

**III.**

**XI. OPENING PROCEDURE OF 8-C (A, B, C) (ABOVE 1.9):**

A. “Do you see that (large object or area such as a wall)?”

“Go over to it and touch it.”

“Now look at that (another large object or area).”

“Go over to it and touch it.”

Repeat, etc.

Exact spots.

“Do you see that black mark on the left arm of that chair?”

“Go over to it and put you finger on it.”

“Take your finger off of it.”

Do this with many precise spots.

B. “Find a spot in this room.”

“Go over to it and put your finder on it.”

“Now let go of it.”

“Find another spot.”

Over and over, etc.

C. “Find a spot in this room.”

“Decide when you are going to touch it and then touch it.”

“Decide when you are going to let go and let go.”

Repeat, many spots, etc.

#### IV.

#### XII. OPENING PROCEDURE BY DUPLICATION (ABOVE 2.6):

Have pc become familiar with two objects.

“Go over to the (book).”

“Look at it.”

“Pick it up.”

“What is its color?”

“What is its temperature?”

“What is its weight?”

“Put it down in the same place.”

“Go over to the (other object).”

“Look at it.”

“Pick it up.”

“What is its color?”

“What is its temperature?”

“What is its weight?”

“Put it down in the same place.”

“Go over to the (first object).”

Etc.

Repeat. Run for hours.

## V.

### XIII. REMEDY HAVINGNESS (ABOVE 3.1):

“Mock up a (planet, man, brick, boulder).”

“Make a copy of it.”

Explain “copy” if unknown by pc.

“Make another copy of the original.”

“Make another copy of it.”

“Make another copy of it.”

“Make another copy.”

“Another copy.”

“Another.”

“Another.”

Etc., as many as pc can comfortably make.

Now push them together and push them into the body.”

“Mock up a \_\_\_\_\_.”

“Copy it.”

Many copies, as above.

Have pc push them into the body.

Repeat many times.

Have pc mock up and copy as above and:

“Throw them away – have them disappear in the distance.”

Etc., many times.

## VI.

### XIV. SPOTTING SPOTS IN SPACE (ABOVE 3.6):

“Spot a spot in the space of this room.”

“Spot another spot.”

Etc., many spots

“Spot a spot in the space of this room.”

“Walk over to it.”

“Put you finger on it.”

“Let go.”

Etc., many times.

Intersperse:

“How big is the spot?”

“Does it have a color?”

“Does it have any mass?”

And similar questions until spots have no mass, simply locations.

## VII.

### XV. ROUTINE ONE: 5, 6, 7 (FOR EXERIORIZED PC):

5. “What are you looking at?”

“Make a copy of it.”

As many as pc can COMFORTABLY make.

“Push them into yourself.”

(Not the body) (Alternate with “Throw them away.”)

To do the, the pc will assume actually two or more locations at once.

“Can you find a nothingness somewhere around you?”

“Now make another one just like it.”

Have him make many like the first nothingness.

Have pc push them into himself and throw them away.

As many as the pc can comfortably make.

6. “Locate the two upper back corners of the room (those behind pc’s body).  
Hold on to them, and don’t think.”

Have pc do this for at least two minutes.

Alternate with:

“Find two nothingnesses.”

“Hold on to them and don’t think.”

At least two minutes by the clock.

7. “Let go.”

“Find a place where you’re not.”

Many places.

Repeat 5, 6, 7, many times.

**THE HAA SHOULD BE CONVERSANT WITH ALL THE FOLLOWING:**

ASSIGN some INTENTIONS.

Waste, accept, INVENT:

Wrongness

GAMES

Bad conditions

MAKE some TIME.

Three spots in your body.

Three spots in the room (will exteriorize pc).

INVENT a dangerous mock-up.

What kind of a mock-up SHOULD you put up?

What kind of a mock-up Could you put up?

What kind of a mock-up should you be able to DESTROY?

What kind of a mock-up could you DESTROY?

**RECALL SOME SPACE.**

All right. Is it TOO MUCH or TOO LITTLE? (Can be used with Hellos and Okays.)

Someone who doesn't think you're insane.

Someone you don't think is insane (eases pc found worried).

If pc fails R1-4:

What could you OCCUPY?

What could you BE?

In what could you PARTICIPATE?

WHO or what IS MAKING ALL THE SPACE?

What is EXTERIORIZATION?

What do you want CHANGED?

What do you want UNCHANGED?

**OTHER PEOPLE** (R2-46) to run ONLY in railroad terminals, large bus terminals and airports. Use live people.

Tell me something you REALLY KNOW about that person. What would you PERMIT THAT PERSON TO KNOW ABOUT YOU? (This process is known as "Union Station.")

What could you say to (Papa, Mama, wife, husband)?

What could (\_\_\_\_\_) say to you?

Find something COMFORTABLY REAL. (Eases pc found uncomfortable.)

Use Hellos and Okays to spots in Change of Space. (R1-9 Creation Human Ability)

See the space in that root? MAKE it.

See the space in that (another) room? MAKE it. Alternate.

WHAT ARE YOU DOING?

WHAT ARE YOU DOING THERE?

### **COGNITION**

COGNITION IS AWARENESS OF AWARENESS. Example: An individual has been studious since age five. Preclear is run on studiousness. Preclear says, "Well, I'll be darned!" Auditor says, "What happened?" Preclear says, "I have been studious since I was five years of age! This is remarkable in view of the fact that until this very moment I never had the slightest notion that I was being studious. Remarkable. "

This is an example of COGNITION. The awareness of awareness of a condition permits the lessening or vanishment of that condition. The awareness of awareness of a scarcity permits the lessening or vanishment of that scarcity.

Cognition is of the highest importance in processing. A process used, when it is the right process for the case, should normally bring about a cognition on the part of the preclear and when there has not been a cognition the process is not the correct process, or it has not been run fully.

The most important communication lag is the cognition lag. A process should not be left for the next higher process until there has been a cognition on the process or the considerations addressed in the process.

### **GRANTING OF BEINGNESS**

A process has not been the correct process or has not been run correctly, or has not been run long enough if there has not been in the preclear an increase in his ability to grant life to others and to his environment.

### **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

- A. The auditor must acknowledge every answer, every command carried out, every comment, every communication, every attempt to communicate on the part of the pc. He should further invite communication wherever the preclear desires or needs to communicate.
- B. The auditor must be willing to grant beingness (life) to the preclear.
- C. The auditor must be alert to the pc at all times.
- D. The auditor must be real to the pc at all times.
- E. Cognition (awareness of awareness) is the goal of any process. The pc must be invited to impart any new cognition which he has gained during a session, or between sessions.

A major cognition resulting from any process is generally a flattening of that process. The next process can then be delivered.

- F. Acknowledgment is given by the auditor by the use of: "Okay," "Good," "Fine," "All right," "Okay, good," "All right, fine," etc.
- G. The auditor does not use: "That's right, I agree," or "Yes, that's correct," or "Now you've got it," or any such phrases denoting validation. This is not acknowledgment, but is evaluation, either the auditor evaluating for the preclear or the preclear evaluating for the auditor, neither of which are auditing situations.

L. Ron Hubbard  
Founder



**HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE**  
**Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex**

**HCO BULLETIN OF 14 NOVEMBER 1987**  
Issue III

Remimeo  
Class I Auditors and above  
C/Ses

(This HCOB gives the full list of processes for Expanded Grade I, assembled per HCOB 24 Jan. 77, TECH CORRECTION ROUNDUP, It is to be run on all cases programmed for Expand Grade I, effective immediately.)

**EXPANDED GRADE I  
PROCESS CHECKLIST**

*Refs:*

CLASSIFICATION, GRADATION AND AWARENESS CHART OF  
LEVELS & CERTIFICATES

Tape: 6607C26 SH Spec 71 CLASSIFICATION CHART AND  
AUDITING

*Cancel:*

BTB 15 Nov. 76 III 0-IV EXPANDED GRAD PROCESS –  
QUADS PART C, GRADE I PROCESSES

PC: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

AUDITOR: \_\_\_\_\_

CASE SUPERVISOR: \_\_\_\_\_

NOTE: This HCOB is to be used ONE FOR EACH PC as a checklist for that pc and belongs in his/her folder. IT IS DONE DURING session, not filled in after.

Each process is run to F/N, cognition, VGIs and release per HCOB 20 Feb. 70, FLOATING NEEDLES AND END PHENOMENA. As each process or flow is run to EP (or found not to be reading, per HCOB 23 June 80RA, CHECKING QUESTIONS ON GRADES PROCESSES), it is clearly marked off with the date.

On any of these processes, if the pc answers only "yes" to the command, find out what it was by asking, "What was it?" (Ref: HCOB 30 June 62, ARC PROCESS)

Some of the processes on the checklist require that the auditor find terminals to use in the process commands. The following are references for use in finding terminals: HCOB 21 July 60, SOME HELP TERMINALS; HCOB 4 Aug. 60, REGIMEN I; HCOB 28 Sept. 71, C/S Series 62, KNOW BEFORE YOU GO; HCOB 30 June 67, EVIDENCES OF AN ABERRATED AREA; HCOB 27 May 70R, UNREADING QUESTIONS AND ITEMS; HCOB 19 Aug. 59, HAS CO-AUDIT – FINDING TERMINALS; and HCOB 10 Nov. 60, FORMULA 13.

All the reading processes and flows on this checklist are run on the pc, with the Quad Grade Process and its Havingness Process run last.

1. **OBJECTIVE ARC**  
(Ref: HCOB 19 June 78, OBJECTIVE ARC)

The auditor and pc are ambulant. Auditor runs the following commands:

1. **LOOK AROUND HERE AND FIND SOMETHING THAT IS REALLY REAL TO YOU.** \_\_\_\_\_
2. **LOOK AROUND HERE AND FIND SOMETHING YOU WOULDN'T MIND COMMUNICATING WITH.** \_\_\_\_\_

3. **LOOK AROUND HERE AND FIND SOMETHING YOU WOULDN'T MIND BEING AROUND.**

(Run consecutively, i.e., 1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 3, etc., to EP.)

2. **CCHs 1 TO 10**

(Ref: HCOB 5 Apr. 62, CCHs, AUDITING ATTITUDE  
HCOB 12 Apr. 62, CCHs PURPOSE  
HCOB 2 Apr. 62, CCH ANSWERS  
HCOB 7 Apr. 62, RUNNING CCHs  
HCOB 1 Dec. 65, CCHs  
HCOB 11 June 57, TRAINING AND CCH PROCESSES,  
Sections on CCHs 1 to 10  
PAB 87, SCIENTOLOGY PROCESSING)

**CCHs 1 – 4**

(Ref: HCOB 1 Dec. 65, CCHs)

NOTE: CCHs 1 – 4 are run per the instructions in HCOB 1 Dec. 65 as follows: CCH 1 to a flat point, then CCH 2 to a flat point, then CCH 3 to a flat point, then CCH 4 to a flat point, the CCH 1 to a flat point etc.

**CCH 1 (GIVE ME THAT HAND. Tone 40.)**

Auditor and pc seated in chairs without arms. Auditor's knees are on outside of both pc's knees. Auditor runs the following command:

**GIVE ME THAT HAND.**

(Run to a flat point.)

**CCH 2 (TONE 40 8-C.)**

Auditor and pc ambulant, auditor in physical contact with pc as needed. Auditor run the following commands:

1. **YOU LOOK AT THAT WALL. THANK YOU.**
2. **YOU WALK OVER TO THAT WALL. THANK YOU.**
3. **YOU TOUCH THAT WALL. THANK YOU.**
4. **TURN AROUND. THANK YOU.**

(Run 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, etc., to a flat point.)

**CCH 3 (HAND SPACE MIMICRY.)**

Auditor and pc seated, close together facing each other, pc's knees between auditor's knees. Auditor raises two hands, palms facing pc's about an equal distance between the auditor and pc, and says:

1. **PUT YOUR HANDS AGAINST MINE, FOLLOW THEM AND CONTRIBUTE TO THEIR MOTION.**

He then makes a simple motion with right hand, then left.

Auditor asks pc:

2. **DID YOU CONTRIBUTE TO THEIR MOTION?**

Auditor acknowledges answer.

(Run 1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2, etc., to a flat point.)

On succeeding run through CCHs 1 – 4, the auditor does this same thing with a half inch of space between his and the pc's palms. The command is:

1. **PUT YOUR HANDS FACING MINE ABOUT ½ INCH AWAY, FOLLOW THEM AND CONTRIBUTE TO THEIR MOTION.**

He then makes a simple motion with right hand, then left.

Auditor asks pc:

2. **DID YOU CONTRIBUTE TO THEIR MOTION?**

Auditor acknowledges answer.

When this is flat, auditor does it with a wider space on each succeeding run through CCHs 1-4 until pc is able to follow motions a yard away.

#### **CCH 4 (BOOK MIMICRY.)**

There are no set verbal commands to CCH 4. Auditor and pc are seated facing each other, a comfortable distance apart. Auditor makes simple motions with a book. Hands book to pc. Pc makes motion, duplicating auditor's motion mirror-imagewise. Auditor asks pc if he is satisfied that the pc duplicated the motion. If pc is and auditor is also fully satisfied, auditor takes back the book and goes to next command. If pc is not sure that he duplicated any command, auditor repeats it for him and gives him back the book.

(Run to a flat point.)

(Once CCH 4 has been run to a flat point, auditor starts back again with CCH 1. CCHs 1-4 are then run as follows: CCH 1 to a flat point, then CCH 2 to a flat point, then CCH 3 to a flat point, then CCH 4 to a flat point, then CCH 1 to a flat point, etc., to EP.)

---

#### **CCH 5 (LOCATION BY CONTACT.)**

(Ref: HCOB 11 June 57, TRAINING AND CCH PROCESSES)

Run per instructions in HCOB 11 June 57. Auditor and preclear may be seated where the preclear is very unable, in which case they are seated at a table which has a number of objects scattered on its surface. Or auditor and preclear may be ambulant, with the auditor in manual contact with the preclear as is necessary to face him toward and guide him to the indicated object. Stress is upon gentleness, ARC and the raising of the preclear's certainty that he has touched the indicated object. Auditor uses the following command, selecting different objects each time the command is repeated.

**TOUCH THAT** (indicated object). **THANK YOU.**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

---

#### **CCH 6 (BODY – ROOM CONTACT.)**

(Ref: HCOB 11 June 57, TRAINING AND CCH PROCESSES)

Run per instructions in HCOB 11 June 57. Auditor and preclear move about together as needed, the auditor enforcing the commands by manual contact using the preclear's hands to touch objects and touch body parts. Stress is upon using only those body parts which are not embarrassing to the preclear as it will be found that the preclear ordinarily has very little reality on various parts of his body. Impossible commands should not be given to the preclear in any case. Auditor selects a different body part and room object each time, using the

following commands:

1. **TOUCH YOUR** (body part). **THANK YOU.**
2. **TOUCH THAT** (indicated room object). **THANK YOU.**

(Run alternately, i.e., 1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2, etc., to EP.)

---

### **CCH 7 (CONTACT BY DUPLICATION.)**

(Ref: HCOB 11 June 57, TRAINING AND CCH PROCESSES)

Run per instructions in HCOB 11 June 57. Auditor may be seated. Preclear should be walking. Usually auditor standing by to manually enforce the commands. Maintain good ARC with the preclear, not picking one body part which is aberrated at first but flattening some nonaberrated body part before an aberrated body part is tackled. Auditor runs the following commands on a body part to no comm lag on that body part, then selects a different body part and runs it in the following commands:

1. **TOUCH THAT TABLE. THANK YOU.**
2. **TOUCH THAT** (body part). **THANK YOU.**
3. **TOUCH THAT TABLE. THANK YOU.**
4. **TOUCH THAT** (same body part). **THANK YOU.**

(Run alternately, i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, etc., to EP.)

---

### **CCH 8 (TRIO.)**

(Ref: PAB 87, SCIENTOLOGY PROCESSING  
HCOB 2 Nov. 57RA, AN OBJECTIVE RUNDOWN)

Run per instructions in HCOB 2 Nov. 57RA. Auditor and preclear seated at a comfortable distance apart, both facing toward majority of the room. The following three commands are run several times for the first command, fewer for the second command and fewer for the third command.

1. **LOOK AROUND HERE AND TELL ME WHAT YOU COULD HAVE.**
2. **LOOK AROUND HERE AND TELL ME WHAT YOU WOULD PERMIT TO REMAIN IN PLACE.**
3. **LOOK AROUND HERE AND TELL ME WITH WHAT YOU COULD DISPENSE.**

(Run several times for the first command, fewer for the second command, fewer for the third command, then run several times for the first command, fewer for the second command, fewer for the third command, etc., to EP.)

---

### **CCH 9 (TONE 40 "KEEP IT FROM GOING AWAY.")**

(Ref: HCOB 11 June 57, TRAINING AND CCH PROCESSES)

Auditor and preclear ambulant. Auditor assisting by manual contact. The auditor selects a different object each time he gives command 1.

1. **LOOK AT THAT** (indicated object). **THANK YOU.**
2. **WALK OVER TO THAT** (indicated object). **THANK YOU.**
3. **TOUCH THAT** (indicated object). **THANK YOU.**

4. **KEEP IT FROM GOING AWAY. THANK YOU.**
5. **DID YOU KEEP IT FROM GOING AWAY? THANK YOU.**

(Run alternately, i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 1, 2, etc., to EP.)

---

**CCH 10** (TONE 40 "HOLD IT STILL.")  
 (Ref: HCOB 11 June 57, TRAINING AND CCH PROCESSES)

Auditor and preclear ambulant. Auditor assisting by manual contact.  
 The auditor selects a different object each time he gives command 1.

1. **LOOK AT THAT** (indicated object). **THANK YOU.**
2. **WALK OVER TO THAT** (indicated object). **THANK YOU.**
3. **TOUCH THAT** (indicated object). **THANK YOU.**
4. **HOLD IT STILL. THANK YOU.**
5. **DID YOU HOLD IT STILL? THANK YOU.**

(Run alternately, i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 1, 2, etc., to EP.)

---

3. **START, CHANGE, STOP**

(Ref: Scientology: Clear Procedure, Issue 1, Dec. 57  
 HCOB 2 Feb. 61, UK CASES DIFFERENT  
 HCOB 18 May 80R, START-CHANGE-STOP COMMANDS)

Part One: **START-CHANGE-STOP ON AN OBJECT**

Run on a gradient by first using a small object, such as a paper clip.  
 Each stage – Start, Change and then Stop – is first run to a flat point.  
 When Start, Change and Stop are flat with the first object, the auditor  
 uses a larger object (such as a brick, a beach ball, etc.) until the  
 process is flat with that object. Auditor and pc may be either seated or  
 standing during the process, whichever is suitable for the object being  
 used in the process.

These are the commands for SCS ON AN OBJECT:

**START:**

1. **I AM GOING TO ASK YOU TO START THE** (indicated object)  
**AND WHEN I TELL YOU TO START, YOU START THE** \_\_\_\_\_  
**IN THAT DIRECTION.**

(Auditor indicates a direction with his hand.)

**DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?**

2. **START.**
3. **DID YOU START THAT** \_\_\_\_\_?

(Repeat commands 1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 3, etc., unit **START** on that object  
 has been run to a flat point. Then go on to **CHANGE** using the  
 same object.)

**CHANGE:**

1. **THIS SPOT WE ARE GOING TO CALL "A".**

(Auditor indicates spot "A" with a piece of marked tape on the

table or a marked piece of paper on the floor or a chalk mark or an imaginary spot as appropriate.)

2. **THIS SPOT WE ARE GOING TO CALL "B".**

(Auditor indicates spot "B" with a piece of marked tape on the table or a marked piece of paper on the floor or a chalk mark or an imaginary spot as appropriate.)

3. **THIS SPOT WE ARE GOING TO CALL "C".**

(Auditor indicates spot "C" with a piece of marked tape on the table or a marked piece of paper on the floor or a chalk mark or an imaginary spot as appropriate.)

4. **THIS SPOT WE ARE GOING TO CALL "D".**

(Auditor indicates spot "D" with a piece of marked tape on the table or a marked piece of paper on the floor or a chalk mark or an imaginary spot as appropriate.)

5. **WHEN I ASK YOU TO CHANGE THE (indicated object). I WANT YOU TO CHANGE THE \_\_\_\_\_'S POSITION FROM "A" TO "B." DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?**

6. **CHANGE.**

7. **DID YOU CHANGE THE \_\_\_\_\_?**

8. **WHEN I ASK YOU TO CHANGE THE \_\_\_\_\_. I WANT YOU TO CHANGE THE \_\_\_\_\_'S POSITION FROM "B" TO "C." DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?**

9. **CHANGE.**

10. **DID YOU CHANGE THE \_\_\_\_\_?**

11. **WHEN I ASK YOU TO CHANGE THE \_\_\_\_\_. I WANT YOU TO CHANGE THE \_\_\_\_\_'S POSITION FROM "C" TO "D." DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?**

12. **CHANGE.**

13. **DID YOU CHANGE THE \_\_\_\_\_?**

(Repeat commands 1-13, 1-13, etc., until **CHANGE** on that object has been run to a flat point. Then go on to **STOP** using the same object.)

(NOTE: When the commands 1-13 are repeated, the locations of the designated spots do not have to be the same each time as this can make the process too much like duplication and bring the preclear to predict the process too easily and do it machinewise.)

**STOP:**

1. **I AM GOING TO TELL YOU TO GET THE (indicated object) MOVING IN THAT DIRECTION.**

(Auditor indicates direction with his hand.)

**SOMEWHERE ALONG THE LINE I WILL TELL YOU TO STOP. THEN YOU STOP THE \_\_\_\_\_. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?**

2. **GET THE \_\_\_\_\_ MOVING.**

3. **STOP!**

4. **DID YOU STOP THE \_\_\_\_\_?**

(Repeat commands 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 3, 4, etc., until **STOP** on that object has been run to a flat point.)

(Start, Change, Stop are done in that order and then repeated on the object until the process is flat on that object. Then a larger object is selected and Start, Change, Stop are run on it as above until the process is flat on this object. Gradiently larger objects are selected and Start, Change, Stop are run to a flat point on each as above to EP for the process.)

---

#### Part Two: **START-CHANGE-STOP ON A BODY**

##### **START:**

1. **I AM GOING TO ASK YOU TO START THE BODY.  
I AM NOT GOING TO ASK YOU TO STOP.**

2. **WHEN I ASK YOU TO START THE BODY, START THE BODY.  
OKAY?**

3. **START.**

3. **DID YOU START THE BODY?**

(Repeat commands 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 3, 4, etc., until **START** has been run to a flat point.)

##### **CHANGE:**

1. **THIS SPOT WE ARE GOING TO CALL "A".**

(Auditor indicates spot "A" with a marked piece of paper on the floor or a chalk mark or an imaginary spot as appropriate.)

2. **THIS SPOT WE ARE GOING TO CALL "B".**

(Auditor indicates spot "B" with a marked piece of paper on the floor or a chalk mark or an imaginary spot as appropriate.)

3. **THIS SPOT WE ARE GOING TO CALL "C".**

(Auditor indicates spot "C" with a marked piece of paper on the floor or a chalk mark or an imaginary spot as appropriate.)

4. **THIS SPOT WE ARE GOING TO CALL "D".**

(Auditor indicates spot "D" with a marked piece of paper on the floor or a chalk mark or an imaginary spot as appropriate.)

5. **WHEN I ASK YOU TO CHANGE THE BODY, I WANT YOU TO  
CHANGE THE BODY'S POSITION FROM "A" TO "B." DO YOU  
UNDERSTAND THAT?**

6. **CHANGE.**

7. **DID YOU CHANGE THE BODY?**

8. **WHEN I ASK YOU TO CHANGE THE BODY, I WANT YOU TO  
CHANGE THE BODY'S POSITION FROM "B" TO "C." DO YOU  
UNDERSTAND THAT?**



9. **CHANGE.**
10. **DID YOU CHANGE THE BODY?**
11. **WHEN I ASK YOU TO CHANGE THE BODY, I WANT YOU TO CHANGE THE BODY'S POSITION FROM "C" TO "D." DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?**
12. **CHANGE.**
13. **DID YOU CHANGE THE BODY?**

(Repeat commands 1-13, 1-13, etc., until **CHANGE** has been run to a flat point.)

(NOTE: When the commands 1-13 are repeated, the locations of the designated spots do not have to be the same each time as this can make the process too much like duplication and bring the preclear to predict the process too easily and do it machinewise.)

**STOP:**

1. **I AM GOING TO TELL YOU TO GET THE BODY MOVING IN THAT DIRECTION.**

(Auditor indicates direction with his hand.)

**THEN AT SOME POINT ALONG THE LINE I WILL TELL YOU TO STOP. WHEN I DO, I WANT YOU TO STOP THE BODY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND?**

2. **GET THE BODY MOVING IN THAT DIRECTION.**
3. **STOP!**
4. **DID YOU STOP THE BODY?**

(Repeat commands 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 3, 4, etc., until **STOP** has been run to a flat point.)

One should not then suppose that the whole of Start-Change-Stop is flat since he still has **STOP SUPREME** to run.

**STOP SUPREME:**

1. **I AM GOING TO TELL YOU TO GET THE BODY MOVING, AND AT SOME POINT I AM GOING TO TELL YOU TO STOP, AND WHEN I DO, I WANT YOU TO STOP THE BODY AS FAST AS YOU CAN AND HOLD IT AS STILL AS YOU CAN. OKAY?**
2. **GET THE BODY MOVING.**
3. **STOP!**
4. **DID YOU DO IT?**

(Repeat commands 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 3, 4, etc., until **STOP SUPREME** has been run to a flat point.)

(Start, Change, Stop and Stop Supreme are done in that order and then repeated. One runs Start and one runs Change and one runs Stop and then one runs Stop Supreme, in that order, over and over and over again to EP)



4. **R2-17: OPENING PROCEDURE BY DUPLICATION**

(Ref: HCOB 4 Feb. 59, OP PRO BY DUP

Book: Creation of Human Ability, Section on Route 2, R2-17

Book: The Phoenix Lectures, Chapters "Opening Procedure by Duplication" and "The Importance of Two-Way Communication During Opening Procedure by Duplication")

This process is run with auditor and pc ambulant. Use two objects – a book and a bottle. Have the pc look them over and handle them to his satisfaction. Then have him place them at some walking distance apart in the room, on a couple of tables or similar locations.

The commands used are as follows:

1. **LOOK AT THAT BOOK. THANK YOU.**
2. **WALK OVER TO IT. THANK YOU.**
3. **PICK IT UP. THANK YOU.**
4. **WHAT IS ITS COLOR? THANK YOU.**
5. **WHAT IS ITS TEMPERATURE? THANK YOU.**
6. **WHAT IS ITS WEIGHT? THANK YOU.**
7. **PUT IT DOWN IN EXACTLY THE SAME PLACE. THANK YOU.**
8. **LOOK AT THAT BOTTLE. THANK YOU.**
9. **WALK OVER TO IT. THANK YOU.**
10. **PICK IT UP. THANK YOU.**
11. **WHAT IS ITS COLOR? THANK YOU.**
12. **WHAT IS ITS TEMPERATURE? THANK YOU.**
13. **WHAT IS ITS WEIGHT? THANK YOU.**
14. **PUT IT DOWN IN EXACTLY THE SAME PLACE. THANK YOU.**

(Run alternately, i.e., 1 – 14, 1 – 14, 1 – 14, etc., over and over, to EP.)

---

5. **OPENING PROCEDURE SOP 8-C**

(Ref: PAB 34, OPENING PROCEDURE SOP 8-C

Book: *Creation of Human Ability*, Section on Route 2, R2-16)

Auditor and pc are ambulant during the process.

Part A:

1. **DO YOU SEE THAT CHAIR?**
2. **GO OVER TO IT AND PUT YOUR HAND ON IT.**
3. **NOW LOOK AT THAT LAMP.**
4. **NOW WALK OVER TO IT AND PUT YOUR HAND ON IT.**

This is done with various objects, without specifically designating spots of a more precise nature than an object, until the preclear is very certain that he is in good communication with these objects and walls

and other parts of the room.

The above is run until the following manifestations of communication lag (and any others you may encounter) are well erased: the preclear just brushing the object he is told to touch, looking away from it very quickly, not looking at it at all, looking at the auditor instead of the object he was told to touch, carrying out the command before it is given, such as going over to touch the lamp when all the auditor has said is "Do you see that lamp?" complaining about the process in any way, objecting to being ordered to do the actions, unwillingness to touch the items designated, putting all his attention on creating an effect on the auditor, and apathy, grief, anger, fear and boredom turned on by this process.

Then the auditor can become very *specific* about the selection of spots for the preclear to touch. For example:

1. **DO YOU SEE THAT BLACK MARK ON THE LEFT ARM OF THAT CHAIR?**
2. **GO OVER AND TOUCH IT WITH YOUR RIGHT INDEX FINGER.**
3. **NOW TAKE YOUR FINGER OFF IT.**
4. **DO YOU SEE THE LOWER BOLT ON THE LIGHT SWITCH PLATE?**
5. **NOW GO OVER TO IT AND TOUCH IT WITH YOUR LEFT RING FINGER.**
6. **NOW TAKE YOUR FINGER OFF IT.**

This step can be kept up for a long time. It has an infinity of variations. But it is not the variations that work, it is the making and breaking of communication with the actual designated spots. You can do the following at this point: make certain the preclear is doing the process by asking questions such as, "Are you touching the doorknob?" "Where is the doorknob?" "What is its shape?" "What is its color?" "What sort of texture does it have?" "Are you sure you are touching it?" "Can you feel it?" "Look at it." "Who is touching it?" "Whose hand is on that doorknob?" "Who is holding your hand there?" "Where is that doorknob?" "When is it there?" You can badger the preclear in the above fashion until his actions show that he is in communication with the object and until he is not angered by your questioning and directions.

Run 1,2,3,4,5,6,1,2,3,4,5,6,1,2, etc., until the preclear has a uniform perception of any and all objects in the room including the walls, the floor and the ceiling. At that point, go on to Part B.

Part B:

1. **FIND A SPOT IN THIS ROOM.**
2. **GO OVER TO IT AND PUT YOUR FINGER ON IT.**
3. **NOW LET GO OF IT.**

It must be emphasized that the preclear is not to act upon a command until the command is given and must not let go until told to let go.

This is run 1,2,3,1,2,3,1,2,3, etc., permitting the preclear to select spots until such time as all communication lag is flat and until he is freely selecting spots on the walls, objects, chairs, etc., with no specialization

whatsoever – which means that his perception of the room has become uniform. At that point, go on to Part C.

Part C:

1. **FIND A SPOT IN THE ROOM.**
2. **MAKE UP YOUR MIND WHEN YOU ARE GOING TO TOUCH IT AND THEN TOUCH IT.**
3. **MAKE UP YOUR MIND WHEN YOU ARE GOING TO LET GO OF IT, AND LET GO.**

(Run consecutively, i.e., 1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 3, etc., to EP.)

---

6. **R2-69: PLEASE PASS THE OBJECT**

(Ref: Book: *Creation of Human Ability*, Section on Route 2, R2-69)

This process is run silently, no verbal commands. Run the process per the following instructions:

Step Ia:

The auditor stands in front of the preclear, holding out a small object to him, until the preclear takes it from his hand. As soon as the preclear takes the object, the auditor holds out his hand, palm up, until the preclear places the object in his palm. The auditor immediately then offers it to the preclear again. This is continued until there is no comm. lag. The object should be offered to the preclear from a variety of positions once he has gotten the idea: from down near the floor, far off to either side, over the preclear's head. Likewise, the palm should be held in a variety of positions for the return of the object. Both hands may be used. Get the preclear doing it really fast.

Step Ib:

When Step Ia is going swiftly and easily, the auditor introduces a switch. After the preclear has just accepted the article, the auditor, instead of extending his palm for its return, places his hands behind his back briefly, then conveys by gestures that the preclear is to offer the object to him. When the preclear does so, the auditor takes the object from his hand, but does not return it until the preclear holds out his own hand, palm up, to receive it. This exchange is continued until the preclear is offering and accepting the object from as wide a variety of positions as the auditor used, and all other comm lags are flat. Then go to Step II.

Step II:

The auditor, just having accepted the object, makes a gesture that this part is over, then deliberately puts the object down where the preclear can see it, stands back and indicates that the preclear is to pick it up. When the preclear picks it up, the auditor gestures that he is to put it down again anywhere he likes in the room. The instant the preclear does so, the auditor snatches it up and puts it someplace else. You keep this up, till auditor and preclear are racing around the room, seizing the object as soon as the other's fingers have let go of it. The object isn't necessarily placed in a different spot each time. It may be picked up and put down again in the same place, but it must be handled each time. All sorts of tacit rules and understandings will probably develop while this is being run.

(Continue running Step II as above, to EP.)

---

7. **R2-35: LOCATION PROCESS**

(Ref: Book: *Creation of Human Ability*, Section on Route 2, R2-35)

**WHERE ARE YOU NOW?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

---

8. **R2-36: SELF-DETERMINISM**

(Ref: Book: *Creation of Human Ability*, Section on Route 2, R2-36)

1. **INDICATE SOMETHING WHICH IS NOT MAKING SPACE FOR YOU.**

2. **INDICATE SOMETHING ELSE WHICH IS NOT MAKING SPACE FOR YOU.**

(Give the first command, then run the second command repetitively to EP.)

---

9. **R2-67: OBJECTS**

(Ref: Book: *Creation of Human Ability*, Section on Route 2, R2-67)

**LOCATE SOME OBJECTS.**

(Pc looks at them and notes what they are. Run repetitively to EP.)

---

10. **3-PART LOCATIONAL PROCESS**

(Ref: PAB 153, CCH)

Part One: **Locational Processing**

This is a command-of-attention process. The auditor points to an object as he gives the command, and the preclear merely turns his head. The stress is on the auditor getting the preclear's attention to go smoothly to the object indicated.

Auditor selects a new object each time the command is repeated.

**NOTICE THAT \_\_\_\_\_ . THANK YOU.**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

---

Part Two: **Locational, Body and Room**

Auditor selects a different object and body part each time the commands are repeated.

1. **LOOK AT THAT \_\_\_\_\_ (Auditor point to an object.) THANK YOU.**

2. **LOOK AT YOUR (foot, hand or knee). THANK YOU.**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

---

Part Three: **Objective Show Me**

Auditor selects a different object each time the command is repeated.

1. **SHOW ME THAT \_\_\_\_\_ (Auditor point to an object.) THANK YOU.**

When that is running fairly well, change to the following pair of commands. Auditor selects a different object and body part each time the commands are repeated.

1. **SHOW ME THAT \_\_\_\_\_** (Auditor point to an object.) **THANK YOU.**
2. **SHOW ME YOUR** (foot, hand or knee). **THANK YOU.**

(Continue running these two commands alternately to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

11. **CONNECTEDNESS**

(Ref: Scientology: Clear Procedure, Issue I, Dec. 57, Section "STEP FIVE, Pc Versus Mest")

Auditor selects a different object each time the command is repeated.

**YOU GET THE IDEA OF MAKING THAT** (indicated object) **CONNECT WITH YOU. DID YOU? THANK YOU.**

(Run repetitively to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

12. **CONTROL TRIO**

(Ref: PAB 137, SOME MORE CCH PROCESSES, Section on Control Trio  
PAB 146, PROCEDURE CCH)

Auditor selects a different object each time the command is repeated.

1. **GET THE IDEA OF HAVING THAT** (indicated object).

(Run repetitively to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

Auditor selects a different object each time the command is repeated.

2. **GET THE IDEA THAT IT IS ALL RIGHT TO PERMIT THAT** (indicated object) **TO CONTINUE.**

(Run repetitively to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

Auditor selects a different object each time the command is repeated.

3. **GET THE IDEA OF MAKING THAT** (indicated object) **DISAPPEAR.**

(Run repetitively to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

13. **GOALS**

(Ref: PAB 137, SOME MORE CCH PROCESSES, Section on Goals  
PAB 146, PROCEDURE CCH)

**Part One:**

1. **WHAT ARE YOU ABSOLUTELY SURE WILL HAPPEN IN THE NEXT TWO MINUTES?** (one hour, three days, one week, three months, one year, etc.)

Discuss it to complete pc certainty on each time span before continuing to the next one, i.e., one hour, three days, one week, three months, one year, etc. The auditor must all the time be sure that the preclear is certain that these things are going to happen in the next two minutes (or whatever the time span is) to ensure that the process really bites.

(Run to EP per instructions above.) \_\_\_\_\_

2. **TELL ME SOMETHING THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO DO IN THE NEXT TWO MINUTES** (one hour, etc., increasing span of time.)

(Run to EP per instructions above.)

---

**Part Two:**

1. **TELL ME SOMETHING YOU ARE SURE WILL BE THERE IN TWO MINUTES, etc.)**

(Run to EP per instructions above.)

---

2. **TELL ME SOMETHING YOU WOULD LIKE TO HAVE IN TWO MINUTES, etc.)**

(Run to EP per instructions above.)

---

14. **HELP PROCESS**  
(Ref: HCOB 5 May 60, HELP)

**Part One:**

Auditor does a two-way comm on the subject of help. One discusses the preclear helping others and others helping the preclear. One gets the preclear's views on the subject of help and, without evaluating for the preclear, lets the preclear express these views.

**Part Two:**

1. **HOW COULD YOU HELP ANOTHER PERSON?**
2. **HOW COULD ANOTHER PERSON HELP ANOTHER PERSON?**
3. **HOW COULD ANOTHER PERSON HELP YOU?**
4. **HOW COULD YOU HELP ME?**
5. **HOW COULD I HELP YOU?**

(Run consecutively, i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 1, 2, etc., to EP.)

---

**Part Three:**

- F1 **WHAT PROBLEM COULD ANOTHER'S HELP BE TO YOU?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

---

- F2 **WHAT PROBLEM COULD YOUR HELP BE TO ANOTHER?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

---

- F3 **WHAT PROBLEM COULD OTHERS' HELP BE TO OTHERS?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

---

- F0 **WHAT PROBLEM COULD HELPING YOURSELF BE TO YOU?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

---

**Part Three – A:**

- F1 **WHAT PROBLEM HAS ANOTHER'S HELP BEEN TO YOU?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

---

- F2 **WHAT PROBLEM HAS YOUR HELP BEEN TO ANOTHER?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

---

F3 **WHAT PROBLEM HAS OTHERS' HELP BEEN TO OTHERS?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

F0 **WHAT PROBLEM HAS HELPING YOURSELF BEEN TO YOU?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

**Part Three – B:**

F1 1. **WHAT HELP OF ANOTHER COULD YOU CONFRONT?**

2. **WHAT HELP OF ANOTHER WOULD YOU RATHER NOT CONFRONT?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

F2 1. **WHAT HELP OF YOURS COULD ANOTHER CONFRONT?**

2. **WHAT HELP OF YOURS WOULD ANOTHER RATHER NOT CONFRONT?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

F3 1. **WHAT HELP OF OTHERS COULD OTHERS CONFRONT?**

2. **WHAT HELP OF OTHERS WOULD OTHERS RATHER NOT CONFRONT?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

F0 1. **WHAT HELP OF YOURS COULD YOU CONFRONT?**

2. **WHAT HELP OF YOURS WOULD YOU RATHER NOT CONFRONT?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

15. **CONCEPT HELP O/W**

(Ref: HCOB 14 July 60, CURRENT RUNDOWN, CONCEPT HELP  
HCOB 21 July 60, SOME HELP TERMINALS)

Assess the following terminal on the meter:

- a. a confusion
- b. an unconscious person
- c. a responsible person
- d. a creative person
- e. a victim
- f. a practioner

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

On any terminals that are not reading, put in the Suppress and Invalidate buttons.

Run each reading terminal in the following process, in order of largest read.

F1 1. **THINK OF A \_\_\_\_\_ HELPING YOU.**

2. **THINK OF A \_\_\_\_\_ NOT HELPING YOU.**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

F2 1. **THINK OF HELPING A \_\_\_\_\_.**

2. **THINK OF NOT HELPING A \_\_\_\_\_.**

(Run alternately to EP.)

F3 1. **THINK OF A \_\_\_\_\_ HELPING OTHERS.**

2. **THINK OF A \_\_\_\_\_ NOT HELPING OTHERS.**

(Run alternately to EP.)

F0 1. **THINK OF HELPING YOURSELF BECAUSE OF A \_\_\_\_\_.**

2. **THINK OF NOT HELPING YOURSELF BECAUSE OF A \_\_\_\_\_.**

(Run alternately to EP.)

16. **FAILED HELP PROCESSES**

(Ref: HCOB 3 Nov. 60, FAILED HELP)

**Part One:**

F1 1. **WHO HAS FAILED TO HELP YOU?**

2. **WHAT HAS FAILED TO HELP YOU?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

F2 1. **WHO HAVE YOU FAILED TO HELP?**

2. **WHAT HAVE YOU FAILED TO HELP?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

F3 1. **WHO HAVE OTHERS FAILED TO HELP?**

2. **WHAT HAVE OTHERS FAILED TO HELP?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

F0 1. **HOW HAVE YOU FAILED TO HELP YOURSELF?**

2. **WHAT ABOUT YOURSELF HAVE YOU FAILED TO HELP?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

**Part Two:**

F1 1. **HOW COULD ANOTHER PREVENT YOUR HELP?**

2. **HOW COULD ANOTHER FAIL TO HELP YOU?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

F2 1. **WHOM HAVE YOU INTENDED NOT TO HELP?**

2. **WHOM HAVE YOU HELPED?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

F3 1. **WHO HAS INTENDED NOT TO HELP OTHERS?**

2. **WHO HAS HELPED OTHERS?**



(Run alternately to EP.)

- F0 1. **HOW HAVE YOU INTENDED NOT TO HELP YOURSELF?**  
2. **HOW HAVE YOU HELPED YOURSELF?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

17. **FORMULA 16**

(Ref: HCOB 15 Dec. 60, PRESESSION 37)

- F1 1. **WHO HAS INTENDED NOT TO HELP YOU?**  
2. **WHO HAS HELPED YOU?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

- F2 1. **WHOM HAVE YOU INTENDED NOT TO HELP?**  
2. **WHOM HAVE YOU HELPED?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

- F3 1. **WHO HAS INTENDED NOT TO HELP OTHERS?**  
2. **WHO HAS HELPED OTHERS?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

- F0 1. **HOW HAVE YOU INTENDED NOT TO HELP YOURSELF?**  
2. **HOW HAVE YOU HELPED YOURSELF?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

18. **FORMULA 19**

(Ref: HCOB 16 Feb. 61, FORMULA 19)

1. **WHO HAS FAILED TO HELP YOU?**  
2. **WHO HAVE YOU FAILED TO HELP?**  
3. **WHAT HAS FAILED TO HELP YOU?**  
4. **WHAT HAVE YOU FAILED TO HELP?**

(Run consecutively, i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, etc., to EP.)

19. **FORMULA 20**

(Ref: HCOB 2 Mar. 61, FORMULA 20)

**Part One:**

1. **WHO HAS FAILED TO CONTROL YOU?**  
2. **WHO HAVE YOU FAILED TO CONTROL?**  
3. **WHAT HAS FAILED TO CONTROL YOU?**  
4. **WHAT HAVE YOU FAILED TO CONTROL?**

(Run consecutively, i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, etc., to EP.)

**Part Two:**

1. **WHO HAVE YOU HELPED?**

2. **WHO HAS HELPED YOU?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

20. **HELP O/W FOR PROBLEMS**

(Ref: HCOB 12 May 60, HELP PROCESSING  
HCOB 10 June 60, HGC PRECLEAR ASSESSMENT  
HCOB 16 June 60, HINTS ON RUNNING CASES WITH HELP  
HCOB 21 July 60, SOME HELP TERMINALS)

**Part One:**

Part One of this process is run on either general or specific terminals.

Ask the pc, "In your first contact with Dianetics and Scientology, was there anything you were trying to help?" Write down the pc's answers and note any reads. (This is not listing and nulling.) It will often be found that the pc was trying to help his eyes or his wife or himself. Any specific or general terminals (e.g., "eyes" or "an arm" or "a wife" or "Joe" or "my friends" or "myself") the pc gives can be run in the process. On any terminals that are not reading, put in the Suppress and Invalidate buttons.

If the pc answers with a condition (e.g., "headache" or "arthritis" or "unhappiness"), ask for any terminals that are connected with it. Write these down, noting their reads.

Run each reading terminal in the following process, in order of largest read.

F1 1. **HOW HAS \_\_\_\_\_ HELPED YOU?**

2. **HOW HAS \_\_\_\_\_ NOT HELPED YOU?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

F2 1. **HOW HAVE YOU HELPED \_\_\_\_\_?**

2. **HOW HAVE YOU NOT HELPED \_\_\_\_\_?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

F3 1. **HOW HAS \_\_\_\_\_ HELPED OTHERS?**

2. **HOW HAS \_\_\_\_\_ NOT HELPED OTHERS?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

F0 1. **HOW HAVE YOU HELPED YOURSELF BECAUSE OF \_\_\_\_\_?**

2. **HOW HAVE YOU NOT HELPED YOURSELF BECAUSE OF \_\_\_\_\_?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

**Part Two:**

Part Two of this process is run *general* terminals only.

Ask the pc, "Tell me some things you think are wrong with you." (This is not listing and nulling.) Then find the general terminal connected with each thing pc gave, as in the following examples:

Example:

Auditor: "Tell me some things you think are wrong with you."  
Pc: "My wife." (F)  
(Auditor would run "a wife.")

Example:

Auditor: "Tell me some things you think are wrong with you."  
Pc: "I'm impatient."  
Auditor: "Can you think of somebody who was impatient?"  
Pc: "My father." (sF)  
(Auditor would run "a father.")

Example:

Auditor: "Tell me some things you think are wrong with you."  
Pc: "I think I'm attenuated."  
Auditor: "Did you ever know an attenuated person?"  
Pc: "Yes, George James."  
Auditor: (since this is a specific terminal and we want a general one) "What was George James?"  
Pc: "A loafer!" (LF)  
(Auditor would run "a loafer.")

On any terminals that are not reading, put in the Suppress and Invalidate buttons.

Run each reading general terminal in the following process, in order of largest read.

- F1 1. **HOW HAS \_\_\_\_\_ HELPED YOU?**  
2. **HOW HAS \_\_\_\_\_ NOT HELPED YOU?**  
(Run alternately to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_
- F2 1. **HOW HAVE YOU HELPED \_\_\_\_\_?**  
2. **HOW HAVE YOU NOT HELPED \_\_\_\_\_?**  
(Run alternately to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_
- F3 1. **HOW HAS \_\_\_\_\_ HELPED OTERS?**  
2. **HOW HAS \_\_\_\_\_ NOT HELPED OTHERS?**  
(Run alternately to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_
- F0 1. **HOW HAVE YOU HELPED YOURSELF BECAUSE OF \_\_\_\_\_?**  
2. **HOW HAVE YOU NOT HELPED YOURSELF BECAUSE OF \_\_\_\_\_?**  
(Run alternately to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

**Part Three:**

Part Two of this process is run *general* terminals only.

Ask the pc, "Tell me what professions you have had in this lifetime."  
(This is not listing and nulling.) Note all reads as pc gives the professions.

Take each of these professions and ask the pc, "Tell me any persons or things that profession helped." Write these terminals down, noting any reads.

If any of the terminals pc gives are specific terminals (e.g., "Bill"), convert each one to a generalized form.

Right: "a husband"  
Wrong: "Bill"  
Wrong: "your husband"

Right: "an aunt"  
Wrong: "Aunt Agatha"

For example, if the pc was a doctor by profession and says that the medical profession helped "Mrs. Wilson," find out what "Mrs. Wilson" is to the pc. Use what the pc describes "Mrs. Wilson" to be, e.g., "a hospital patient" or "a patient." The less adjectives the better. Watch the meter while doing this and note any read as pc gives the generalized form of the terminal.

On any terminals that are not reading, put in the Suppress and Invalidate buttons.

Run each reading general terminal in the following process, in order of largest read.

F1 1. **HOW HAS \_\_\_\_\_ HELPED YOU?**

2. **HOW HAS \_\_\_\_\_ NOT HELPED YOU?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

F2 1. **HOW HAVE YOU HELPED \_\_\_\_\_?**

2. **HOW HAVE YOU NOT HELPED \_\_\_\_\_?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

F3 1. **HOW HAS \_\_\_\_\_ HELPED OTERS?**

2. **HOW HAS \_\_\_\_\_ NOT HELPED OTHERS?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

F0 1. **HOW HAVE YOU HELPED YOURSELF BECAUSE OF \_\_\_\_\_?**

2. **HOW HAVE YOU NOT HELPED YOURSELF BECAUSE OF \_\_\_\_\_?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

#### **Part Four:**

Take the list of reading professions or beingnesses that the pc gave in Part Three above.

On any that did not read, put in the Suppress and Invalidate buttons.

Run each reading general terminal in the following process, in order of largest read.

F1 1. **HOW HAS \_\_\_\_\_ HELPED YOU?**  
2. **HOW HAS \_\_\_\_\_ NOT HELPED YOU?**  
(Run alternately to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

F2 1. **HOW HAVE YOU HELPED \_\_\_\_\_?**  
2. **HOW HAVE YOU NOT HELPED \_\_\_\_\_?**  
(Run alternately to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

F3 1. **HOW HAS \_\_\_\_\_ HELPED OTHERS?**  
2. **HOW HAS \_\_\_\_\_ NOT HELPED OTHERS?**  
(Run alternately to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

F0 1. **HOW HAVE YOU HELPED YOURSELF BECAUSE OF \_\_\_\_\_?**  
2. **HOW HAVE YOU NOT HELPED YOURSELF BECAUSE OF \_\_\_\_\_?**  
(Run alternately to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

**Part Five:**

Part Five of this process is run on *general* terminals only.

Ask the pc, "Tell me any beingnesses you have tried to be or hope to be or once hoped to be, in this lifetime." (This is not listing and nulling.) Write these terminals down, noting any reads.

For instance, the pc wants to be a painter or wishes he were a painter or wishes he could be a painter again. The process would be run on "a painter," providing it reads on the meter.

If the pc says, "I wanted to be a singer" (F), run the process on "a singer."

If any of the terminals pc gives are specific terminals (e.g., "Bill"), convert each one to a generalized form.

On any terminals that are not reading, put in the Suppress and Invalidate buttons.

Run each reading general terminal in the following process, in order of largest read.

F1 1. **HOW HAS \_\_\_\_\_ HELPED YOU?**  
2. **HOW HAS \_\_\_\_\_ NOT HELPED YOU?**  
(Run alternately to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

F2 1. **HOW HAVE YOU HELPED \_\_\_\_\_?**  
2. **HOW HAVE YOU NOT HELPED \_\_\_\_\_?**  
(Run alternately to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

F3 1. **HOW HAS \_\_\_\_\_ HELPED OTHERS?**  
2. **HOW HAS \_\_\_\_\_ NOT HELPED OTHERS?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

---

- F0 1. **HOW HAVE YOU HELPED YOURSELF BECAUSE OF \_\_\_\_\_?**
2. **HOW HAVE YOU NOT HELPED YOURSELF BECAUSE OF \_\_\_\_\_?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

---

21. **FIVE-WAY CONCEPT HELP**

(Ref: HCOB 14 July 60, CURRENT RUNDOWN CONCEPT HELP)

Write down a list of terminals found by folder study.

If any of these are specific terminals (e.g., "Bill"), convert each one to a generalized form.

For example, if the terminal is worded as "Bill," find out what Bill is to the pc. Use what the pc describes Bill to be. Bill will turn out to be "a husband" or "a mechanic" or some generalized terminal. Not "the works mechanic at Pulman" but "a works mechanic" or "a mechanic." The less adjectives the better. Watch the meter while doing this and note any read as pc gives the generalized form of the terminal.

Any terminals found by folder study that are already in generalized form should simply be written down as they are and assessed on the meter.

On any terminals that are not reading, put in the Suppress and invalidate buttons.

Run each reading general terminal in the following process, in order of largest read.

1. **THINK OF \_\_\_\_\_ HELPING YOU.**
2. **THINK OF YOU HELPING \_\_\_\_\_.**
3. **THINK OF A \_\_\_\_\_ HELPING OTHERS.**
4. **THINK OF OTHERS HELPING A \_\_\_\_\_.**
5. **THINK OF A \_\_\_\_\_ HELPING A \_\_\_\_\_.**

(Run consecutively, i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 1, 2, 3, etc., to EP.)

---

22. **KNOW-TO-MYSTERY 5-WAY CONCEPT HELP**

(Ref: HCOB 16 June 60, HINTS ON RUNNING CASES WITH HELP  
HCOB 14 July 60, CURRENT RUNDOWN CONCEPT HELP)

- A. Using the Know-to-Mystery Scale as given in HCOB 25 Sep. 71RB, TONE SCALE IN FULL, assess the levels of the scale on a meter.

KNOW  
NOT KNOW  
KNOW ABOUT  
LOOK  
PLUS EMOTION  
MINUS EMOTION  
EFFORT  
THINK  
SYMBOLS  
EAT

SEX  
MYSTERY  
WAIT  
UNCONSCIOUS  
UNKNOWABLE

B. Take the largest reading level and ask the pc, "Tell me some terminals that could represent \_\_\_\_." (This is not listing and nulling.) Note down the answers and the reads. If the pc gives any specific terminals (e.g., "Bill"), convert each one to a generalized form.

C. Run the largest reading general terminal in the following process:

1. **THINK OF A \_\_\_\_\_ HELPING YOU.**
2. **THINK OF YOU HELPING A \_\_\_\_\_.**
3. **THINK OF A \_\_\_\_\_ HELPING OTHERS.**
4. **THINK OF OTHERS HELPING A \_\_\_\_\_.**
5. **THINK OF A \_\_\_\_\_ HELPING A \_\_\_\_\_.**

(Run consecutively, i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 1, 2, 3, etc., to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

D. Run all reading terminals per step C, in order of largest read.

On any terminals that are not reading, put in the Suppress and Invalidate buttons.

E. When all reading terminals have been run from the first level of the Know-to-Mystery Scale, repeat steps B, C and D until all reading levels of the Know-to-Mystery Scale have been handled. On any levels of the scale that are not reading put in the Suppress and Invalidate buttons.

23. **HELP ON AUDITORS AND PCs**

(Ref: HCOB 14 July 58, 20<sup>TH</sup> ACC TRAINING PROCEDURE  
HCOB 14 July 60, CURRENT RUNDOWN, CONCEPT HELP  
Tape: 6108C04 SHSBC-34, METHODOLOGY OF AUDITING –  
AUDITING – NOT-DOINGNESS AND OCCLUSION)

1. **THINK OF AN AUDITOR HELPING YOU.**
2. **THINK OF YOU HELPING AN AUDITOR.**
3. **THINK OF AN AUDITOR HELPING OTHERS.**
4. **THINK OF OTHERS HELPING AN AUDITOR.**
5. **THINK OF AN AUDITOR HELPING AN AUDITOR.**
6. **THINK OF YOURSELF AS AN AUDITOR HELPING YOURSELF.**
7. **THINK OF A PRECLEAR HELPING YOU.**
8. **THINK OF YOU HELPING A PRECLEAR.**
9. **THINK OF A PRECLEAR HELPING OTHERS.**
10. **THINK OF OTHERS HELPING A PRECLEAR.**
11. **THINK OF A PRECLEAR HELPING A PRECLEAR.**

12. **THINK OF YOURSELF AS A PRECLEAR HELPING YOUSELF.**

(Run consecutively, i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 1, 2, 3, etc., to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

24. **FORMULA 17**

(Ref: HCOB 15 Dec. 60, PRESESSION 37)

Part One:

Assess the following list of terminals on the meter:

- a. a healer
- b. a hypnotist
- c. a spiritualist
- d. a psychologist
- e. a minister
- f. a religious family member
- g. a psychoanalyst
- h. a doctor

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Add to the above list of terminals by asking the pc for any healing, religious or mystic type persons that he has been to or has been connected with. These can be either general terminals (e.g., "a priest") or specific persons (e.g., "Dr. Smith"). Write down any terminals pc gives, noting their reads.

On any terminals that are not reading, put in the Suppress and Invalidate buttons.

Run each reading terminal in the following process. In order of largest read.

F1 1. **HOW COULD YOU FAIL TO HELP \_\_\_\_\_?**

2. **HOW COULD \_\_\_\_\_ FAIL TO HELP YOU?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

F2 1. **HOW COULD ANOTHER FAIL TO HELP \_\_\_\_\_?**

2. **HOW COULD \_\_\_\_\_ FAIL TO HELP ANOTHER?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

F3 1. **HOW COULD OTHERS FAIL TO HELP \_\_\_\_\_?**

2. **HOW COULD \_\_\_\_\_ FAIL TO HELP OTHERS?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

F0 1. **HOW COULD YOU FAIL TO HELP YOURSELF BECAUSE OF \_\_\_\_\_?**

2. **HOW COULD \_\_\_\_\_ FAIL TO HELP YOU BECAUSE OF YOURSELF?**



(Run alternately to EP.)

Part Two:

On any terminals that were run on the process in Part One, if the pc insisted that they *helped*, run each of those same terminals in the following process. There is no need to reassess those terminals for new meter reads, just run them in the same order that they were run in Part One.

F1 1. **HOW COULD YOU HELP \_\_\_\_\_?**

2. **HOW COULD \_\_\_\_\_ HELP YOU?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

F2 1. **HOW COULD ANOTHER HELP \_\_\_\_\_?**

2. **HOW COULD \_\_\_\_\_ HELP ANOTHER?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

F3 1. **HOW COULD OTHERS HELP \_\_\_\_\_?**

2. **HOW COULD \_\_\_\_\_ HELP OTHERS?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

F0 1. **HOW COULD YOU HELP YOURSELF BECAUSE OF \_\_\_\_\_?**

2. **HOW COULD \_\_\_\_\_ HELP YOU BECAUSE OF YOURSELF?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

25. **HELP O/W**

(Ref: HCOB 12 May 60, HELP PROCESSING)

F1 1. **WHAT HELP HAS ANOTHER GIVEN YOU?**

2. **WHAT HELP HAS ANOTHER NOT GIVEN YOU?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

F2 1. **WHAT HELP HAVE YOU GIVEN ANOTHER?**

2. **WHAT HELP HAVE YOU NOT GIVEN ANOTHER?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

F3 1. **WHAT HELP HAVE OTHERS GIVEN OTHERS?**

2. **WHAT HELP HAVE OTHERS NOT GIVEN OTHERS?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

F0 1. **WHAT HELP HAVE YOU GIVEN YOURSELF?**

2. **WHAT HELP HAVE YOU NOT GIVEN YOURSELF?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

26. **HELP BRACKETS**

(Ref: HCOB 28 July 58, CLEAR PROCEDURE)

**Part One:**

1. **HOW COULD YOU HELP YOURSELF?**
2. **HOW COULD YOU HELP ME?**
3. **HOW COULD I HELP YOU?**
4. **HOW COULD I HELP MYSELF?**
5. **HOW COULD YOU HELP ANOTHER PERSON?**
6. **HOW COULD I HELP ANOTHER PERSON?**
7. **HOW COULD ANOTHER PERSON HELP YOU?**
8. **HOW COULD ANOTHER PERSON HELP ME?**
9. **HOW COULD ANOTHER PERSON HELP ANOTHER PERSON?**

(Run consecutively, i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 1, 2, 3, etc., to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

**Part Two:**

Part Two is run on generalized terminals.

Write down a list of terminals culled from the pc's folder.

If any of these are specific terminals (e.g., "Bill"), convert each one to a generalized form. For example, if the terminal is worded as "Bill," find out what Bill is to the pc. Use what the pc describes Bill to be. Bill will turn out to be "a husband" or "a salesman" or some generalized terminal. Watch the meter while doing this and note any read as pc gives the generalized form of the terminal.

Any terminals found by folder study that are already in generalized form should simply be written down as they are and assessed on the meter.

On any terminals that are not reading, put in the Suppress and Invalidate buttons.

Run each reading general terminal in the following process, in order of largest read.

1. **HOW COULD YOU HELP A \_\_\_\_\_?**
2. **HOW COULD A \_\_\_\_\_ HELP YOU?**
3. **HOW COULD ANOTHER PERSON HELP A \_\_\_\_\_?**
4. **HOW COULD A \_\_\_\_\_ HELP ANOTHER PERSON?**
5. **HOW COULD A \_\_\_\_\_ HELP ITSELF?**
6. **HOW COULD YOU HELP YOURSELF?**
7. **HOW COULD I HELP YOU?**
8. **HOW COULD YOU HELP ME?**

(Run consecutively, i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 1, 2, 3, etc., to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

27. **REGIMEN TWO**  
(Ref: HCOB 26 Aug. 60, REGIMEN TWO)

F1 1. **WHAT MOTION HAS HELPED YOU?**  
2. **WHAT MOTION HAS NOT HELPED YOU?**  
(Run alternately to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

F2 1. **WHAT MOTION HAVE YOU HELPED?**  
2. **WHAT MOTION HAVE YOU NOT HELPED?**  
(Run alternately to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

F3 1. **WHAT MOTION HAS HELPED OTHERS?**  
2. **WHAT MOTION HAS NOT HELPED OTHERS?**  
(Run alternately to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

F0 1. **WHAT MOTION OF YOURS HAS HELPED YOU?**  
2. **WHAT MOTION OF YOURS HAS NOT HELPED YOU?**  
(Run alternately to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

28. **RECALL A PROBLEM**  
(Ref: HCOB 6 July 61, ROUTINE 1A)

F1 **RECALL A PROBLEM YOU HAVE HAD WITH ANOTHER.**  
(Run repetitively to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

F2 **RECALL A PROBLEM ANOTHER HAS HAD WITH YOU.**  
(Run repetitively to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

F3 **RECALL A PROBLEM OTHERS HAVE HAD WITH OTHERS.**  
(Run repetitively to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

F0 **RECALL A PROBLEM YOU HAVE HAD WITH YOURSELF.**  
(Run repetitively to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

29. **R2-34: DESCRIPTION PROCESSING**  
(Ref: Book: Creation of Human Ability, Section on Route 2, R2-34)

1. **CAN YOU RECALL A PROBLEM WHICH CONCERNED YOU?**  
(When the preclear does:) \_\_\_\_\_

2. **HOW DID IT SEEM TO YOU THEN?**  
(When preclear describes this:) \_\_\_\_\_

3. **HOW DOES IT SEEM TO YOU NOW?**  
(Run 1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 3, 1, etc., to EP.) \_\_\_\_\_

30. **31 MAR. 60 PROBLEMS PROCESSES**  
(Ref: HCOB 31 Mar. 60, THE PRESENT TIME PROBLEM)

**Part One:**

F1 1. **TELL ME YOUR PROBLEM.**

2. **WHAT PART OF THAT PROBLEM COULD YOU CONFRONT?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

F2 1. **TELL ME ANOTHER'S PROBLEM.**

2. **WHAT PART OF THAT PROBLEM COULD HE/SHE CONFRONT?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

F3 1. **TELL ME A PROBLEM OF OTHERS.**

2. **WHAT PART OF THAT PROBLEM COULD THEY CONFRONT?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

F0 1. **TELL ME YOUR PROBLEM WITH YOURSELF.**

2. **WHAT PART OF THAT PROBLEM COULD YOU CONFRONT?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

**Part Two:**

F1 **WHAT PROBLEM COULD YOU CONFRONT?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

F2 **WHAT PROBLEM COULD ANOTHER CONFRONT?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

F3 **WHAT PROBLEM COULD OTHERS CONFRONT?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

F0 **WHAT PROBLEM IN OR ON YOURSELF COULD YOU CONFRONT?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

**Part Three:**

F1 1. **TELL ME YOUR PROBLEM.**

2. **WHAT PART OF THAT PROBLEM HAVE YOU BEEN RESPONSIBLE FOR?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

F2 1. **TELL ME ANOTHER'S PROBLEM.**

2. **WHAT PART OF THAT PROBLEM HAS HE/SHE BEEN RESPONSIBLE FOR?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

F3 1. **TELL ME A PROBLEM OF OTHERS.**

2. **WHAT PART OF THAT PROBLEM HAVE THEY**

**BEEN RESPONSIBLE FOR?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

- F0 1. **TELL ME YOUR PROBLEM WITH YOURSELF.**
- 2. **WHAT PART OF THAT PROBLEM HAVE YOU BEEN RESPONSIBLE FOR?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

**Part Four:**

NOTE: Clear the command for F1 of this process with both “have you been” and “might you have been” and run whichever reads best. Then use the same version (either “have you been” or “might you have been”) in clearing and running the remaining flows.

- F1 **WHAT PROBLEM HAVE YOU BEEN (MIGHT YOU HAVE BEEN) RESPONSIBLE FOR?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

- F2 **WHAT PROBLEM HAS ANOTHER BEEN (MIGHT ANOTHER HAVE BEEN) RESPONSIBLE FOR?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

- F3 **WHAT PROBLEM HAVE OTHERS BEEN (MIGHT OTHERS HAVE BEEN) RESPONSIBLE FOR?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

- F0 **WHAT PROBLEM WITH YOURSELF HAVE YOU BEEN (MIGHT YOU HAVE BEEN) RESPONSIBLE FOR?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

**Part Five:**

- F1 **WHAT MOTION HAVE YOU BEEN RESPONSIBLE FOR?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

- F2 **WHAT MOTION HAS ANOTHER BEEN RESPONSIBLE FOR?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

- F3 **WHAT MOTION HAVE OTHERS BEEN RESPONSIBLE FOR?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

- F0 **WHAT MOTION OF YOURS HAVE YOU BEEN RESPONSIBLE FOR?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

**Part Six:**

- F1 **WHAT TWO THINGS CAN YOU CONFRONT?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

- F2 **WHAT TWO THINGS CAN ANOTHER CONFRONT?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

**F3 WHAT TWO THINGS CAN OTHERS CONFRONT?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

**F0 WHAT TWO THINGS ABOUT YOURSELF CAN YOU CONFRONT?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

**31. A CONFRONT PROCESS**

(Ref: Tape: 6109C19 SHSBC-55, Q&A PERIOD – PREHAV, SEC CHECKS, ARC BREAK PROCESS, SEC CHECK AND WITHHOLDS)

Assess the following on a meter:

- a. confusion
- b. problem
- c. motion

On any item that is not reading, put in the Suppress and Invalidate buttons.

Run each reading item in the following process, in order of largest read.

**F1 1. WHAT \_\_\_\_\_ COULD YOU CONFRONT?**

**2. WHAT \_\_\_\_\_ WOULD YOU RATHER NOT CONFRONT?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

**F2 1. WHAT \_\_\_\_\_ COULD ANOTHER CONFRONT?**

**2. WHAT \_\_\_\_\_ WOULD ANOTHER RATHER NOT CONFRONT?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

**F3 1. WHAT \_\_\_\_\_ COULD OTHERS CONFRONT?**

**2. WHAT \_\_\_\_\_ WOULD OTHERS RATHER NOT CONFRONT?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

**F0 1. WHAT \_\_\_\_\_ ABOUT YOURSELF COULD YOU CONFRONT?**

**2. WHAT \_\_\_\_\_ ABOUT YOURSELF WOULD YOU RATHER NOT CONFRONT?**

(Run alternately to EP.)

**32. ROUTINE 1A PROBLEMS PROCESS**

(Ref: HCOB 6 July 61, ROUTINE 1A)

NOTE: The third question may be "What problem could another confront?" also, whichever checks out on meter. Establish this while clearing the commands.

**1. WHAT PROBLEM COULD YOU CONFRONT?**

2. **WHAT PROMBLEM DON'T YOU HAVE TO CONFRONT?**
3. **WHAT PROBLEM SHOULD (COULD) ANOTHER CONFRONT?**
4. **WHAT PROBLEM WOULDN'T ANOTHER CONFRONT?**
5. **WHAT PROBLEM WOULD BE CONFRONTED BY OTHERS?**
6. **WHAT PROBLEM WOULDN'T OTHERS CONFRONT?**

(Run consecutively, i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 1, 2, etc., to EP.)

---

33. **CONFRONT OF PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEMS**  
(Ref: HCOB 17 Mar. 60, STANDARDIZED SESSIONS)

**Part One:**

**TELL ME A PROBLEM THAT AUDITING WOULD BE A SOLUTION TO.**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

---

**Part Two:**

Ask pc if he has any chronic somatics with the question "Tell me any chronic somatics or psychosomatic illnesses you have." (This is not listing and nulling.) Write these down, noting any reads as the pc answers.

For example, if pc says "a bad leg," the auditor would run, "Tell me a problem a bad leg would be a solution to."

On any chronic somatics or psychosomatic illnesses that are not reading, put in the Suppress and Invalidate buttons.

Run each reading chronic somatic and psychosomatic illness in the following process, in order of largest read.

**TELL ME A PROBLEM THAT A \_\_\_\_\_ WOULD BE A SOLUTION TO.**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

---

**Part Three:**

Using the assessment list of chronic somatics and psychosomatic illnesses made in Part Two above, take each one and ask the pc what body pans are involved. (This is not listing and nulling.) Write these body parts down, noting the read on each.

For example, if pc gave "an ulcer" as a psychosomatic illness and then said that the body part was "my stomach" (F), the auditor would run "a stomach" in the command. The command would be "What problem about a stomach could you confront?"

Do not attempt to run a condition (e.g., "arthritis") in this Part Three process, only a body part.

On any body parts that are not reading, put in the Suppress and Invalidate buttons.

Run each reading body part in the following process, in order of largest read.

F1 **WHAT PROBLEM ABOUT A \_\_\_\_\_ COULD YOU CONFRONT?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

---

F2 **WHAT PROBLEM ABOUT A \_\_\_\_\_ COULD ANOTHER CONFRONT?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

---

F3 **WHAT PROBLEM ABOUT A \_\_\_\_\_ COULD OTHERS CONFRONT?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

---

F0 **WHAT PROBLEM WITH YOURSELF ABOUT A \_\_\_\_\_ COULD YOU CONFRONT?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

---

34. **WHO HAS PROBLEMS**

(Ref: Tape: 6108C22 SHSBC-43, PTPs – UNKNOWNNESSES)

Run the following command repetitively (*not* as a listing and nulling process):

**WHO HAS PROBLEMS?**

---

(Run repetitively to EP.)

35. **PROBLEMS – UNKNOWINGNESS**

(Ref: Tape: 6108C22 SHSBC-43, PTPs – UNKNOWNNESSES)

Run the following command repetitively (*not* as a listing and nulling process):

**WHAT UNKNOWINGNESS EXISTS ABOUT PROBLEMS?**

---

(Run repetitively to EP.)

36. **PROBLEM NOT PRESENT**

(Ref: Tape: 6108C22 SHSBC-43, PTPs – UNKNOWNNESSES)

Run the following command repetitively (*not* as a listing and nulling process):

**WHAT PROBLEM ISN'T PRESENT?**

---

(Run repetitively to EP.)

37. **HAS V**

(Ref: HCOB 19 Jan. 61, ADDITIONAL HAS PROCESSES)

**Part One:**

F1 1. **GET THE IDEA OF SOLVING A PROBLEM.**

2. **GET THE IDEA OF NOT SOLVING A PROBLEM.**

(Run alternately to EP.)

---

F2 1. **GET THE IDEA OF ANOTHER SOLVING A PROBLEM.**

2. **GET THE IDEA OF ANOTHER NOT SOLVING A PROBLEM.**



(Run alternately to EP.)

- F3 1. **GET THE IDEA OF OTHERS SOLVING A PROBLEM.**  
2. **GET THE IDEA OF OTHERS NOT SOLVING A PROBLEM.**

(Run alternately to EP.)

- F0 1. **GET THE IDEA OF SOLVING A PROBLEM WITH YOURSELF.**  
2. **GET THE IDEA OF NOT SOVING A PROBLEM WITH YOURSELF.**

(Run alternately to EP.)

### Part Two:

- A. Look through the pc's folder for any terminals that the pc complains about having lots of problems with. Write these down.

These may be either specific terminals (e.g., "Bill") or general terminals (e.g., "a teacher"). Either form can be run in this process.

Assess the list of terminals on the meter. On any terminals that are not reading, put in the Suppress and Invalidate buttons.

- B. Ask the pc, "Tell me some people that you have had lots of problems with." (This is not listing and nulling.) Write down any terminals that the pc gives, noting their reads. These may be either specific or general terminals. On any terminals that are not reading, put in the Suppress and Invalidate buttons.
- C. Run each reading terminal from steps A and B in the following process, in order of largest read.

- F1 1. **GET THE IDEA OF SOLVING A PROBLEM WITH \_\_\_\_\_.**  
2. **GET THE IDEA OF NOT SOLVING A PROBLEM WITH \_\_\_\_\_.**

(Run alternately to EP.)

- F2 1. **GET THE IDEA OF \_\_\_\_\_ SOLVING A PROBLEM WITH YOU.**  
2. **GET THE IDEA OF \_\_\_\_\_ NOT SOLVING A PROBLEM WITH YOU.**

(Run alternately to EP.)

- F3 1. **GET THE IDEA OF \_\_\_\_\_ SOLVING A PROBLEM WITH OTHERS.**  
2. **GET THE IDEA OF \_\_\_\_\_ NOT SOLVING A PROBLEM WITH OTHERS.**

(Run alternately to EP.)

- F0 1. **GET THE IDEA OF SOLVING A PROBLEM WITH YOURSELF ABOUT \_\_\_\_\_.**  
2. **GET THE IDEA OF NOT SOLVING A PROBLEM WITH**

**YOURSELF ABOUT \_\_\_\_\_.**

(Run alternately to EP.)

**38. SOLUTIONS TO SOLUTIONS**

(Ref: HCOB 3 May 59, SOLUTIONS TO SOLUTIONS)

**F1 WHAT SOLUTION COULD YOU MAKE STICK?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

**F2 WHAT SOLUTION COULD ANOTHER MAKE STICK?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

**F3 WHAT SOLUTION COULD OTHERS MAKE STICK?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

**F0 WHAT SOLUTION CONCERNING YOURSELF COULD YOU MAKE STICK?**

(Run repetitively to EP.)

**39. PROBLEMS INTENSIVE**

(Ref: HCOB 27 Sep. 62, PROBLEMS INTENSIVE USE  
HCOB 30 July 62, A SMOOTH HGC 25-HOUR INTENSIVE  
HCOB 7 Sep. 78R, MODERN REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING  
Tape: 6110C11 SHSBC-65, PROBLEMS INTENSIVE  
ASSESSMENT)

1. Get the pc to tell you any self-determined changes he has made this lifetime (only self-determined major changes). Write them down, with their reads. (This is not listing and nulling.) The question may be varied in order to get all different angles of changes as per tape 61 IOC 11, PROBLEMS INTENSIVE ASSESSMENT.
2. Take the biggest reading change and locate the prior confusion to that change.
3. Having located the time of the prior confusion, predate it by a month.
4. Prepcheck "SINCE (date from step 3). (button)?" to EP
5. Take the next largest reading change off the list made in step 1. Run it using steps 2-4 to EP.
6. Repeat step 5 until all reading changes are handled.

On any changes that are not reading, put in the Suppress and Invalidate buttons.

**40. GRADE I QUAD**

(Ref: HCOB 19 Nov. 65, PROBLEMS PROCESS)

**F1 1. WHAT PROBLEM HAVE YOU HAD WITH SOMEONE?**

**2. WHAT SOLUTIONS HAVE YOU HAD FOR THAT PROBLEM?**

(Get the pc to give the problem, then run TA off solutions. Then a new statement of the problem and more questions about solutions. Run it 1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 1, 2, 2, 2, etc., to EP.)

- F2 1. **WHAT PROBLEM HAS ANOTHER HAD WITH YOU?**  
2. **WHAT SOLUTIONS HAS ANOTHER HAD FOR THAT PROBLEM?**

(Run as above in F1, to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

- F3 1. **WHAT PROBLEM HAVE OTHERS HAD WITH OTHERS?**  
2. **WHAT SOLUTIONS HAVE THEY HAD FOR THAT PROBLEM?**

(Run as above in F1, to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

- F0 1. **WHAT PROBLEM HAVE YOU HAD WITH YOURSELF?**  
2. **WHAT SOLUTIONS HAVE YOU HAD FOR THAT PROBLEM?**

(Run as above in F1, to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

41. **GRADE I HAVINGNESS**

- F1 1. **THINK OF A SPACE.**  
2. **NOTE TWO OBJECTS.**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

- F2 1. **THINK OF ANOTHER'S SPACE.**  
2. **NOTE TWO OBJECTS.**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

- F3 1. **THINK OF THE SPACE OF OTHERS.**  
2. **NOTE TWO OBJECTS.**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

- F0 1. **THINK OF YOUR OWN SPACE.**  
2. **NOTE TWO OBJECTS.**

(Run alternately to EP.)

\_\_\_\_\_

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

Revision assisted by  
LRH Technical Research  
and Compilations

LRH:RTRC:rw.gm

Via Hubbard Communications Office  
35/37 Fitzroy Street, London W1

---

1 June 1958

## **SOME MORE CCH PROCESSES**

(Compiled from L. Ron Hubbard's research writings and taped lectures to the 18<sup>th</sup> American Advanced Clinical course.)

### **CONTROL TRIO:**

After one has run CCH 0 to 5 and has brought the preclear's body and attention under control, there are various ways of handling the case from there on. Here is a series of processes which undercuts Trio and is called "Control Trio."

The commands for Control Trio are:

1. "Notice that (auditor indicates object) and get the idea of having it."
2. "Notice that (auditor indicates object) and get the idea of permitting it to continue."
3. "Notice that (auditor indicates object) and get the idea of making it disappear."

The processes should be run in that order and each one must be run flat before the next one is attempted. It is very necessary to clear the command before embarking upon the process. Preclears simply understand that "having" means that they must possess something, carry it with them wherever they go – without just leaving the mountain, chair or whatever it is, in its own space-time continuum. He gets it confused with ownership and so forth.

In *Fundamentals of Thought* there is an excellent definition of havingness: "*The essential definition of having is to be able to touch or permeate or to direct the disposition of.*"

During the running of the first command the preclear will come up with cognitions regarding the necessity of having or not having things, its goodness or badness, and will in general run out his earlier training regarding this point. It will change his conceptions which earlier religions may have implanted, such as it is "bad to have," and run out the compulsions of "must, must not, got to, can't-have," etc.

Find out what the preclear is doing and how he is doing this, for he should get havingness from this process and his tone should rise considerably. A change should take place within a very short period, otherwise (a) his body and attention are not under control or (b) he doesn't understand the command and is running a different process than that which you intended.

There should be no qualifications or conditions such as "If I had the money I could buy that object and then have it," or "I don't like it and thus don't want it," or "What shall I do with it once I have got it?" It is just the ability to have without other considerations of goodness, badness, ownership or beauty going with it and the auditor and preclear should clear such conceptions through good but nonevaluating two-way communication.

The second part of this trio brings the preclear's sense of active participation of creativity and responsibility out, for he must grant that particular object sufficient life and beingness to allow it to "continue within its own space and time." Preclears come up with the considerations that they have either tried to not-is objects and/or people or "withheld" something from them or tried to push them out of their environments because they didn't like them or agree with them. This is an interesting process to put their ideas

about what they should have around them back into proper perspective. They will find that there is no harm in permitting the sixth dynamic to continue in present time right where it is.

The third part of the trio is the most effective and more will be said about it in a following PAB. It is a very good exteriorizing process and the preclear will come up with many cognitions on his own and the rest of the dynamics. Here the idea is just to "get the idea of making the object disappear" instead of to dispense with it or not-know or not-is it.

This cycle can be run over and over again until it is flat, within a few minutes after the command has again given the preclear some gains.

After this, Trio (old-time Terrible Trio) can then be run with great advantage on a case who couldn't do it before. Control Trio, which undercuts Trio, will bring out its reality level.

### **GOALS:**

With every preclear it is most necessary to establish goals that are REAL for the PRECLEAR. You want him to have some goals which are HIS and not what Grandma, Father or school teacher desires for him. Preclears who have no real goals are working on other people's determinism and we have to (a) establish the certainty of a future for the preclear, and (b) get him to put things in that future that he WANTS, so that he can have a future.

There is a gradient scale of processes which will establish goals which are REAL to the preclear by casual two-way communication, using the following questions:

1. "What are you absolutely sure will happen in the next two minutes?" one hour, three days, one week, three months, one year, etc.

Complete certainty on each time span is necessary before the auditor continues to the next time span. This is done by two-way communication and the auditor must all the time be sure that the preclear is certain that these things are going to happen in the next two minutes (or whatever the time span is) to ensure that the process really bites.

2. "Tell me something that you would like to do in the next two minutes," one hour, etc., is the next process that would put doingness and more time into that future.

On some preclears the following questions may be realer and bite faster. This is putting the accent on have instead of do, since we work from the bottom up on the Be, Do, Have triangle. They are:

3. "Tell me something you are sure will be there in two minutes, etc. ," and
4. "Tell me something you would like to have in two minutes, etc ."

The last two processes really undercut the above and are thus lower-level processes and it is advisable to run them on preclears whose ability to communicate and reality level are low.

Watch out for the preclear attaching all sorts of conditions to his answers. Also work towards positive goals of "things" and not conditions such as "I want to get rid of my fears and somatics." The latter type of preclear is working towards nothing rather than towards something. (A more positive goal of something would be "I want a stick of candy or a glass of water.") Check for certainty at all times, for certainty strengthens reality and the reality of a future for the preclear is most essential if auditing is to succeed all the way.

### **LOSSES:**

Why doesn't a preclear exteriorize easily and stay exteriorized? And "Why does he get sick when one asks him to conceive a static?" is the accompanying question. The

answer to this is "Losses." The preclear associates a static with loss and he says, "All right, if there is nothing there I've lost it."

Conceiving a static is therefore painful and whenever he lost anything, something disappeared. An individual cannot conceive a static if he associates static with a loss – if it is painful. So we have to cure him of the painfulness of loss, consideration of, before we can exteriorize him easily.

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

This is done with the process "Recall a moment of loss," sandwiched with havingness (Control Trio, Trio or Locational Processing). This gets the preclear to take over the automaticity of all of the losses which he has experienced unwillingly.

When an individual has no visio, has never seen anything, couldn't see anything, the only thing that he is looking at is a "stuck" loss.

Recall a Moment of Loss and Goals are a lower harmonic of running Then and Now Solids and are at the moment making a bid for our chief exteriorization processes. Recall a Moment of Loss should be run with two-way communication, but not too much outflow of the preclear. Communication must at all times remain two-way. Ask the preclear "when" this happened now and again, unless, of course, he told you when he recalled the loss.

Control Trio, Goals and Recall a Moment of Loss are a combination of processes and should be run as a combination to secure the best gain for the preclear.

---

A Scientologist is one who controls persons, environments and situations.

Scientology means knowing in the fullest sense of the word.

Scientology is used on life and its forms and products.

A Scientologist operates within the boundaries of the Auditor's Code and the Code of a Scientologist.

The chief uses of Scientology are in the fields of education, organization, mental disability and religion. Scientology is the first to give scientific meaning to these.

A Scientologist is considered a professional if he uses Scientology in any of these fields and has been thoroughly trained in Scientology.

A Scientologist is a first cousin of the Buddhist, a distant relative to the Taoist, a feudal enemy to the enslaving priest and a bitter foe of the German, Viennese and Russian defamers of man.

The religion of the Scientologist is freedom for all things spiritual on all dynamics which means adequate discipline and knowledge to keep that freedom guaranteed.

We are the people who are ending the cycle of Homo sapiens and starting the cycle of a good Earth.

There is no barrier on our path except those we make ourselves.

Our ability belongs to all worlds everywhere.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

**PAB 146**  
**PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN**  
The Oldest Continuous Publication in Dianetics and Scientology

Via Hubbard Communications Office  
37 Fitzroy Street, London W1

---

15 October 1958

**PROCEDURE CCH**

(This lecture is a final summing up of the previous CCH PABs interrupted a PAB 138 and should be read after those have been digested. It was given by L. Ron Hubbard to the HGC Staff Auditors in Washington, DC on 23 Aug. 57.)

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

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

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

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

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

The second version is: "Get the idea that it is all right to permit that (indicated object) to continue." It is also just an indicating process. The third section of this Trio is the clincher: "Get the idea of making that (indicated object) disappear." One runs "disappear" instead of "dispense with" or "not-know."

Small objects are much easier for the preclear to make disappear than large ones. You have not told him to make it disappear but only to "get the idea of making it disappear." Preclears usually literally interpret you and try like mad to make it disappear-and it usually does for a short time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now here is a process which is based on our old "Recall a secret." The version is entirely straightwire. The auditor explains to the preclear that he is not looking for hidden data to evaluate it. He is only asking the preclear to look at the data. He then makes a list of valences, paying great attention to those the preclear considers "unimportant" or is very slow to divulge. Then the auditor takes this list and runs



Repetitive Straightwire (1951) as follows: "Think of something you might withhold from (valence)."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I was running over a phrenological questionnaire and it said people are never permitted to do anything they want to do and this is the best goal of discipline. I got this tangled out in one way or the other. I got thinking about it from the standpoint-this was about 20 years ago-of "I wonder if there is anybody around that could articulate with

great conciseness what he would like to do?" And I have found on all hands a failure to articulate was the main difficulty. A person had the feeling that he wanted to do something and that it would be wonderful, but it was all in a sensory capacity. If he could have been made to articulate this it would really have been something. And I experimented on it a little bit and we see that today in the Handbook for Preclears.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This case was an isolated one as we have had occasionally. Now and then an inspirational sort of process cracked them through. Well, now we see this process of Goals on the basis of futures and a person without futures cannot have a fancy future called a goal and all a goal is is a fancy future determined by the person. If he has no future at all determined by anybody, then he isn't going to go anywhere from that point and any goal he has is totally unreal.

The best way that I know of to clear up a goal is as follows (with two-way comm): "Is there anything that is going to happen in the next couple of minutes?" We get this thrashed out until he has got some great big certainty that there will be something a

couple of minutes from now. Then we gradiently move it up and we get certainties at each one of these stages and levels-regardless of on what.

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

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

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

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

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

**HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE**  
**Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex**

**HCO BULLETIN OF 1 OCTOBER 1978**  
Reissued 11 October 1978

C/Ses  
Tech/Qual  
Class V Grad Auditors

**THE BRIGHT THINK RUNDOWN**

*A Process to Handle Disassociation*

Apparently, during the last decade, a new factor has entered into the culture that was previously only rare, possibly due to lowered educational standards or the declining nature of the culture itself, but most probably due to one of the common drugs or medicines or even food deficiencies. A percentage which was only one or two has jumped up to eighty or ninety.

This factor is visible in a decline in the ability to tell differences, similarities and identities.

In trying to train a person or get him to live a more survival type life, the establishment officer is encountering this factor.

There is a similar instance of this when drugs first moved into the scene. Before the mid-60's drugs were never much of a factor in processing and such cases were considered rare and then only as a result of medical treatments.

Suddenly I has on my hands a case that did not behave like a case. The TA went out the roof unexpectedly, with no apparent cause and the case wouldn't EP. I went into a sort out on what was different on this case from other cases. It was marijuana. Once we had run out the marijuana the case behaved like a normal case. I was suddenly looking at a rising percentage of such cases, which to date, through the kindness of psychology and psychiatry, had risen to a majority of cases in society.

So here we go again. Some new factor apparently has entered into the society and has risen in a percent which is so high that it will get in the road of anyone trying to get the show on the road.

The factor can be called "Disassociation".

We have here a marvellous new process – The Bright Think Rundown. Powerfully simple, it requires and auditor who is well-steeled against the temptation to Q and A and who is able to run a process through whatever it turns on.

It was originally designed as a remedy for Theetie Weetie cases, but has proven enormously successful as well with cases who disassociate.

This is the person who associates not A and B, but A and O. Not apples and bananas but apples and typewriters. You make a statement and he bends it over to something that has nothing to do with the price of fish.

He is very hard to direct because alter-is enters into it. In fact, an alter-is could be a manifestation of being disassociated.

Things which are different, he conceives to be identical. Things which are similar he conceives to be widely different. Things which are identical he conceives to be only similar.

This case will mess up or complicate just about any order or communication by bringing in carloads of data which have absolutley nothing to do with it. This is because he mis-identifies and cannot evaluate differences in time, location, form, composition, or

importance. He is lost in his own figure-figure and facsimilies, sometimes universes away.

The new discovery is that he is back on the time track in locations very remote from where he is. It is not that he is stuck on the track where he is, but is stuck on the track elsewhere, often eons ago.

This is the reason Date/Locate works. It has to be in that order. You have to date it and then locate it because the location is never in now.

The auditor who runs it and the C/S who C/S's it have to have a full command of the subject of "revivication".

Revivication is the bringing back to life of a engram in which a preclear is stuck. The engram or some portion thereof is being acted out in present time by the preclear. It is called revivication because the engram is suddenly more real to the preclear than present time has ever been. He re-live that moment briefly. He does not merely recall or remember it.

This means that the person moves into a back point of time totally. He gives certain manifestations when he does this, these can be various. They always are visible to the auditor. The trick in processing is to keep running the process until the pc comes out of it just as though nothing had happened.

As the process is run expect the pc to answer from points down the track where he has been stuck. These are the points he operates from while apparently in PT. Expect engrams to appear, with revivication occurring as they are contacted and blown. As the pc re-lives these incidents, he will come out of them, newly, and this time truly in present time. And with a new viewpoint.

Anaten, somatics, abrupt shifts of tone level, heat, agitated physical motion are all quite likely to occur as these points are run off, as the pc is actually revivifying at each heavy point. You just keep running the process with good TRs and metering.

The auditor must ensure the pc is fully sessionable before starting the Rundown, and once started, must get the pc through the phenomena which occur as the pc revivifies and blows through the stuck points on his track. The pc's answers will signify to the auditor precisely what is occurring.

It is vital not to Q and A with these "symptoms" as they come up.

## THE C/S

Here is your C/S for the Bright Think Rundown.

Run:

**"Where would you be safe?"**

Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs (and pc in PT of course).

The end phenomena of the process is a realisation by the pc that he's really in present time. This EP is normally expressed with some variation of the statement "I'm Here!" This EP must not be coaxed by the auditor asking "Are you here yet?" and the pc must not be fed the cognition.

As the process is run the pc will spot places that are nearby and then places that are far away. The spots he'd spot are near, then far, then near, then far, sometimes a few near and then a few far and then a few near. If the pc does not do this then you know he is not doing the process.

You will find up to 20% of your pc's give simply glib answers and experience no change. This pc is answering the question in some particular and outrageous way. If you give him a D of P Interview on exactly how he was answering the question, you will find he was using some oddball system disassociated from the process. (The fourth

American ACC tapes discuss this.) The way to handle this pc is objectives as he is too far out of it to handle a concept and is basically operating off a system.

Before you can spot places in the universe you have to have a universe, right?

The main errors an auditor can make are a failure to carry on the process when something peculiar happens and failure to notice a true EP has been reached.

On the failed case (the 20% noted above), when objectives have honestly been completed, you can then run the process with great benefits, but be sure the pc is up to answering the question.

You will get some remarkable changes. Some major wins.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:dm.kjm

**HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE**  
**Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex**

**HCO BULLETIN OF 6 DECEMBER 1978**

C/Ses  
Tech/Qual  
Class V Grad Auditors

**REVIVIFICATION**

Revivification is the bringing back to life of an engram in which a preclear is stuck. The engram or some portion thereof is being acted out in present time by the preclear. It is called a revivification because the engram is suddenly more real to the preclear than present time has ever been. He relives that moment briefly. He does not merely recall or remember it.

This is not the same thing as the "returning" to an incident or engram that is employed in Dianetic auditing. *Return* is the method of retaining the body and the awareness of the subject in present time while he is told to go back to a certain incident. *Revivification* is the reliving of an incident or a portion of it as if it were happening *now*.

This phenomenon can occur in a pc during the End of Endless Int Repair Rundown. (Ref: HCOB 24 Sept. 78RA I, Int RD Series 4RA, THE END OF ENDLESS INT REPAIR RUNDOWN)

The pc, being run on Recalls on Int, will often begin by recalling locks, but these can trigger into full play an engram in which he may be stuck and the pc may go into a revivification of it. He will actually be answering and acting from the point or points down the track where he has been stuck.

Should this happen, the auditor simply continues to run the process and get the pc through it. As the pc revivifies, he blows through these stuck points on his track and comes out of them, newly, and is now truly in present time.

As revivification is apt to occur on the End of Endless Int Repair, auditors must understand and be able to recognize the phenomena and handle it routinely with excellent TRs when it does.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

**HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE**  
**Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex**

**HCO BULLETIN OF 4 MAY 1981RA**  
Revised 27 June 1988

Remimeo  
Class V Grad Auditor Checksheets  
C/Ses  
Class V Grad and above Auditors  
Class V Grad and above C/Ses  
Tech/Qual

*Study Series 10RA*

**STUDY GREEN FORM**

*Refs:*  
HCOB 2 July 78 NED Series 11  
DIANETICS STUDENT RESCUE INTENSIVE  
HCOB 23 Nov. 69RB III STUDENT RESCUE INTENSIVE  
Rev. 4.9.78

The Study Green Form is an analysis list which locates and indicates the handling of troubles with the subject of study, largely independent of or in addition to misunderstood words.

This list is used when a person cannot be hatted or trained. It is a major action that is programed for by the C/S in order to find and handle what is wrong with a person's case studywise. It can also be used to cure the rebel or revolutionary student.

It will be found, on some pcs, that the subject of study has become so charged that the very idea of study itself has become traumatic. When a person becomes very misemotional about study, has persisting study troubles that do not clean up or when there are other indicators of study-connected engrams, the person should be given a Study Green Form followed by a Student Rescue Intensive.

The end phenomena of the Study Green Form is a person who knows he can study.

(*Note:* The Study Green Form should not be confused with the Word Clearing Correction List or other student lists such as the Student Correction List or the Student Rehabilitation List. Each of these lists has a distinct purpose as covered in HCOB 24 Oct. 76RA, CIS Series 96RA, DELIVERY REPAIR LISTS.)

Assess this list Method 3 or 5. (Refs: HCOB 28 May 70, CORRECTION LISTS, USE OF; HCOB 20 Dec. 71, CIS Series 72, USE OF CORRECTION LISTS; HCOB 10 June 71 I, CIS Series 44R, PROGRAMING FROM PREPARED LISTS)

If the pc has a big win, end off the session and let him have his win. When he is off his win, the list is then resumed and completed through to the end unless the EP of "person knows he can study" has been reached. Otherwise, it is completed all the way through to the end, in all cases. It is reassessed if necessary.

---

1. **HAVE YOU GONE EXTERIOR IN AUDITING?**

---

(Check to make sure the read is a valid read and not a protest or false read. If it is valid, indicate it. If the pc is not Clear or OT, give him a standard Int RD per Int RD Series 2. If he is Clear or OT and has not had an Int RD, give him the End of Endless Int Repair RD per Int Series 4RA. If the pc has had an Int RD or End of Endless Int Repair RD, do an Int RD Correction List [HCOB 29 Oct. 71RAI. If Int correction has already been done on the pc, get an FES of the Int RD and its corrections. If you are not qualified to audit or repair Int, turn the pc over to a qualified auditor. When all errors are corrected, the CIS may order the End of Endless Int Repair RD per Int Series 4RA, as applicable.)



2. **HAS YOUR INT HANDLING BEEN MESSED UP?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Assess and handle an Int RD Correction List. If Int correction has already been done on the pc, get an FES of the Int RD and its corrections. When all errors are corrected, the CIS may order the End of Endless Int Repair RD per Int Series 4RA.)
3. **HAS THERE BEEN A LIST ERROR?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Find out which list and handle with an LABRA.)
4. **ON STUDY HAVE YOU BEEN GIVEN A WRONG WHY?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (L4BRA and handle.)
5. **ON STUDY DO YOU HAVE AN ARC BREAK?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (ARCU CDEINR E/S to F/N.)
6. **ON STUDY DO YOU HAVE AN ARC BREAK OF LONG DURATION?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (ARCU CDEINR E/S to F/N.)
7. **ON STUDY DO YOU HAVE A PROBLEM?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
8. **ON STUDY ARE YOU WITHHOLDING ANYTHING?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what, if discreditable find out who missed it. E/S to F/N.)
9. **DID YOU EVER KNOWINGLY GO BY MISUNDERSTOOD WORDS?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Handle as a withhold E/S to F/N. Clear any misunderstands found, each to F/N.)
10. **DO YOU HAVE A MISSED WITHHOLD OF GOING PAST MISUNDERSTOODS?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Pull the missed withhold E/S to F/N. Then clear each misunderstood he went past, each word to F/N.)
11. **HAVE YOU HAD EARLY BAD AUDITING?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (L1C Method 3 on early auditing.)
12. **WAS WORD CLEARING DONE IN THE MIDDLE OF ANOTHER INCOMPLETE AUDITING CYCLE?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2WC to F/N. Get which cycle pc is on and by folder inspection evaluate which one needs to be completed first – make sure it is fully noted on the pc's program to complete word clearing if the other action is handled first.)
13. **DO YOU HAVE AN INCOMPLETE TRs COURSE?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2WC to F/N. Pgm to complete TRs course.)
14. **ON STUDY HAVE YOU HAD TROUBLE WITH CLEARING WORDS?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N. WCCL if needed. Pgm for Method 1 W/C or repair/flattening of it if already done.)

15. **ON STUDY IS THERE BYPASSED CHARGE ON WORD CLEARING?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (WCCL and handle.)
16. **DO YOU HAVE TROUBLE WITH WORDS?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N. WCCL if needed. Pgm for Method 1 W/C or repair/Flattening of it if already done.)
17. **DO YOU HAVE MISUNDERSTOODS FROM YOUR EARLIER SCHOOLING?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N. WCCL if needed. Pgm for Method 1 W/C or repair/Flattening of it if already done.)
18. **ON STUDY HAS YOUR WORD CLEARING BEEN MESSED UP?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (WCCL and handle.)
19. **DON'T YOU WANT TO STUDY?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Find out if there was a time when he did want to study and someone invalidated this and clean it up. Otherwise ask, "Tell me about why you don't want to study," and 2WC to F/N.)
20. **HAS THERE BEEN NO AUDITING ON THE SUBJECT OF STUDY?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
21. **HAVE YOU BEEN MADE TO STUDY BECAUSE SOMEONE ELSE DEMANDED IT?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
22. **HAVE YOU HAD TO STUDY WHEN YOU DIDN'T WANT TO?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
23. **ON STUDY HAS THERE BEEN AN INJUSTICE?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
24. **HAS ETHICS ACTION EVER BEEN TAKEN ON YOU FOR NOT APPLYING STUDY TECH?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
25. **SHOULD ETHICS ACTION HAVE BEEN TAKEN ON YOU FOR FAILING TO APPLY STUDY TECH?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
26. **HAVE YOU BEEN THREATENED INTO STUDYING?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Triple or Quad Recalls on being threatened into studying.  
 F1: Recall a time you were threatened into studying.  
 F2: Recall a time you threatened another into studying  
 F3: Recall a time others threatened others into studying.  
 F0: Recall a time you threatened yourself into studying.)
27. **HAVE YOU BEEN PUNISHED INTO STUDYING?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Triple or Quad Recalls on being punished into studying.)

- F1: Recall a time you were punished into studying.
- F2: Recall a time you punished another into studying
- F3: Recall a time others punished others into studying.
- F0: Recall a time you punished yourself into studying.)

28. **IS THERE PAIN CONNECTED WITH STUDY?** \_\_\_\_\_

(Triple or Quad Recalls on pain connected to study.

- F1: Recall a time pain was connected to study.
- F2: Recall a time you caused another to have pain connected with study.
- F3: Recall a time others caused others to have pain connected with study.
- F0: Recall a time you caused yourself to have pain connected with study.)

29. **HAVE YOU BEEN MADE TO STUDY WHEN YOU HAD NO WILLINGNESS TO KNOW?** \_\_\_\_\_

(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)

30. **HAVE YOU BEEN MADE TO FEEL BAD ABOUT DOING POORLY IN STUDY?** \_\_\_\_\_

(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)

31. **HAVE YOU BEEN ASHAMED OF YOUR SCHOOL GRADES?** \_\_\_\_\_

(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)

32. **HAVE YOU BEEN MADE TO FEEL LIKE A SOCIAL OUTCAST BECAUSE YOU DIDN'T DO WELL IN SCHOOL?** \_\_\_\_\_

(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)

33. **HAVE YOU BEEN PUSHED TO GET GOOD GRADES?** \_\_\_\_\_

(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)

34. **HAVE YOU BEEN ASHAMED OF NOT FINISHING HIGH SCHOOL?** \_\_\_\_\_

(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)

35. **WERE YOU MADE TO THINK YOU'D FAILED BECAUSE YOU DIDN'T GO TO COLLEGE (UNIVERSITY)?** \_\_\_\_\_

(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)

36. **HAS SOMEONE TOLD YOU YOU WERE A BAD STUDENT?** \_\_\_\_\_

(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)

37. **HAVE YOU BEEN RIDICULED IN FRONT OF OTHER STUDENTS?** \_\_\_\_\_

(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)

38. **HAS THERE BEEN NO ONE TO SUPERVISE YOUR STUDY?** \_\_\_\_\_

(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)

39. **ON STUDY HAS NO ONE SHOWN ANY INTEREST IN YOUR PROGRESS?** \_\_\_\_\_

(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)

40. **HAVE YOU HAD BAD STUDY SUPERVISION?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
41. **ON STUDY HAVE YOU HAD BAD COACHING?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
42. **ON STUDY HAVE YOU BEEN INVALIDATED?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
43. **HAVE YOU KNOWN IT WOULD NEVER DO ANY GOOD TO STUDY?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Find out if there was a time when he felt it did matter if he studied and someone invalidated this. If so, clean it up. Otherwise ask, "Tell me about why it would never do any good to study," and 2WC to F/N.)
44. **ON STUDY HAVE YOU INVALIDATED YOURSELF?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
45. **HAS SOMEONE TOLD YOU THAT YOU DON'T KNOW HOW TO STUDY?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
46. **HAVE YOU BEEN FLUNKED WHEN YOU SHOULDN'T HAVE BEEN?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Indicate. Rehab the point when he knew he had it.)
47. **ON STUDY HAD YOU MADE IT AND SOMEONE SAID YOU HADN'T?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Indicate. Rehab the point when he made it.)
48. **HAS SOMEONE INVALIDATED WHAT YOU STUDIED?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
49. **ON STUDY HAVE YOU BEEN MADE TO FEEL STUPID ABOUT A SUBJECT?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
50. **HAVE YOU BEEN MADE WRONG BY A TEACHER?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
51. **ON STUDY HAS SOMEONE TRIED TO CORRECT YOU WHEN THERE WAS NOTHING WRONG?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
52. **HAVE YOU BEEN PREVENTED FROM STUDYING?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
53. **HAVE OTHERS PREVENTED YOU FROM KNOWING?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
54. **HAVE YOU BEEN REPRIMANDED FOR WANTING TO KNOW?** \_\_\_\_\_

- (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
55. **WERE YOU NOT ALLOWED TO OBSERVE, UNDERSTAND AND DO?** \_\_\_\_\_
- (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
56. **COULDN'T YOU STUDY BECAUSE OF THE DEMANDS OF A JOB OR POST?** \_\_\_\_\_
- (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
57. **WAS THERE NO TIME TO STUDY?** \_\_\_\_\_
- (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
58. **HAS THERE BEEN SOMETHING WRONG WITH THE STUDY ENVIRONMENT?** \_\_\_\_\_
- (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
59. **HAVE YOU BEEN DISTURBED WHILE STUDYING?** \_\_\_\_\_
- (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
60. **ON STUDY WAS SOMEONE MAD AT YOU?** \_\_\_\_\_
- (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
61. **ON STUDY IS THERE AN ENGRAM IN RESTIMULATION?** \_\_\_\_\_
- (Indicate. Assess an L3RH and handle.)
- (On Clears or above, simply indicate the item. If no F/N, assess an L3RH but do no more than indicate the reading item[s]. Do NOT run any Dianetics.)
62. **DO YOU HAVE AN ENGRAM MATCHING PRESENT TIME STUDY?** \_\_\_\_\_
- (If so, run it out Narrative R3RA Triple or Quad.)
- (On Clears or above, simply indicate the item. If no F/N, assess an L3RH but do no more than indicate the reading item[s]. Do NOT run any Dianetics.)
63. **HAVE YOU BEEN OVERWHELMED ON STUDY?** \_\_\_\_\_
- (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
64. **HAVE YOU BEEN CONNECTED TO SOMEONE WHO DIDN'T WANT YOU TO LEARN?** \_\_\_\_\_
- (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
65. **HAVE YOU BEEN MADE TO FEEL A SUBJECT WAS DANGEROUS?** \_\_\_\_\_
- (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
66. **DOESN'T STUDY TECH WORK ON YOU?** \_\_\_\_\_
- (Find out what didn't work and correct it to F/N VGIs and a win.)
67. **ON STUDY IS THERE SOMETHING YOU'RE CONFUSED ABOUT?** \_\_\_\_\_

(Find out what it is and clear it up to F/N and VGIs.)

68. **ON STUDY HAVE YOU GONE PAST MISUNDERSTOODS?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Assess a WCCL and handle.)
69. **HAVE YOU FAILED TO USE STUDY TECH?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(2WC to find out what he hasn't used. Itsa E/S itsa to F/N, then clear up any misunderstands that have come up.)
70. **ON STUDY WERE THERE NO DICTIONARIES?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
71. **ON STUDY WERE THE DICTIONARIES INADEQUATE?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
72. **ON STUDY WERE THE DICTIONARIES INCOMPREHENSIBLE?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
73. **ON STUDY HAVE MATERIALS CONTAINED INCORRECT DATA?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
74. **DID MATERIALS YOU TRIED TO STUDY CONTAIN OMITTED DATA?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
75. **ON STUDY WERE YOU GIVEN NO TEXT?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
76. **ON STUDY WERE YOU GIVEN A FALSE TEXT?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
77. **HAVE YOU BEEN UNABLE TO FIND THE DATA YOU WANTED IN TEXTBOOKS?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
78. **HAS THE DATA IN BOOKS BEEN INCOMPREHENSIBLE?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
79. **HAVE YOU WANTED TO LEARN SOMETHING BUT YOU COULDN'T GET IT OUT OF A TEXTBOOK?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
80. **HAVE YOU STUDIED SOMETHING THAT WAS FALSE?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
81. **HAVE THERE BEEN DISAGREEMENTS WITH DATA?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
82. **ON STUDY HAS ANYONE TAUGHT OR GIVEN YOU FALSE DATA?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)

83. **ON STUDY HAVE YOU RECEIVED VERBAL DATA?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
84. **HAS SOMEONE MADE YOU STUDY IMPROPERLY?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
85. **ON STUDY HAVE YOU BEEN MADE TO DO THINGS WRONG?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
86. **ON STUDY HAVE YOU BEEN PREVENTED FROM USING YOUR OWN JUDGMENT?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
87. **HAVE THERE BEEN ARBITRARY RULES ABOUT HOW YOU STUDY?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
88. **WAS THERE NO REASON FOR LEARNING SOMETHING?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
89. **IS THERE ANY REASON YOU SHOULD REMAIN IGNORANT?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(2WC E/S to F/N.)
90. **IS KNOWLEDGE OF NO VALUE?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(2WC E/S to F/N.)
91. **IS THERE SOMETHING OTHERS SHOULDN'T KNOW?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(2WC E/S to F/N.)
92. **HAVE YOU EVER WILLFULLY KEPT YOURSELF FROM BEING INFORMED?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(2WC E/S to F/N.)
93. **HAVE YOU HAD TO STUDY SOMETHING YOU WOULD NEVER NEED TO APPLY?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
94. **COULDN'T YOU GET RESULTS WITH WHAT YOU LEARNED?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
95. **HAVE YOU STUDIED ONLY TO PASS AN EXAM?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
96. **HAVE YOU NEVER APPLIED WHAT YOU LEARNED?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
97. **HAVE YOU STUDIED FOR SOME OTHER REASON?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)

98. **WAS THERE NO CHOICE ABOUT WHAT YOU STUDIED?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
99. **DID YOU HAVE TO STUDY WHEN YOU WANTED TO DO SOMETHING ELSE?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
100. **HAVE YOU HAD TO STUDY SOMETHING YOU HAD NO INTEREST IN?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
101. **HAVE YOU HAD TO STUDY A SUBJECT THAT WAS OF NO USE?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
102. **DO YOU GET ANGRY AT THINGS YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
103. **HAVE YOU HAD TO LEARN TOO MANY THINGS BEFORE YOU COULD LEARN WHAT YOU WANTED TO?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
104. **DID SOMETHING SEEM TOO DIFFICULT TO LEARN?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
105. **HAVE YOU HAD TO STUDY TOO MUCH TOO FAST?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
106. **WERE YOU ASKED TO DO THINGS YOU COULDN'T STUDY?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
107. **WERE YOU ASKED TO LEARN THE WHOLE SUBJECT AT ONCE?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
108. **DID SOMEONE EXPECT YOU TO KNOW IT ALL AT ONCE?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
109. **DO YOU LEARN SLOWLY BUT YOU'VE BEEN MADE TO STUDY FAST?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
110. **DO YOU LEARN FAST BUT YOU'VE BEEN MADE TO STUDY SLOWLY?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
111. **WERE YOU A FAST STUDY AND PEOPLE SAID YOU WERE SLOW?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
112. **HAVE THE BASICS OF A SUBJECT BEEN OMITTED?** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)



113. **HAVE STUDY MATERIALS BEEN UNAVAILABLE?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
114. **WAS IT ALL DOINGNESS AND NO REASON WHY?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
115. **HAS IT BEEN ALL SIGNIFICANCE AND NO DOINGNESS?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
116. **ON STUDY WAS A GRADIENT TOO STEEP?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
117. **ON STUDY DID YOU SKIP A GRADIENT?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
118. **HAVE YOU HAD TO CONTINUE STUDYING WHEN YOU ALREADY KNEW IT?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Indicate. Rehab the point where he knew it.)
119. **ON STUDY HAS THERE BEEN A WRONG EMPHASIS?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Itsa E/S itsa to F/N.)
120. **DO YOU HAVE OVERTS AGAINST STUDY?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
121. **HAVE YOU COMMITTED OVERTS BY REASON OF STUDY?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
122. **HAVE YOU COMMITTED CRIMES IN SCHOOL?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
123. **DID YOU EVER DO ANYTHING IN STUDY THAT YOU FELT BAD ABOUT?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
124. **ON STUDY DID YOU EVER DO ANYTHING BAD WHICH YOU JUSTIFIED?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
125. **HAVE YOU VIOLATED STUDENT RULES?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
126. **HAVE YOU GIVEN VERBAL DATA OR DEFINITIONS TO OTHERS?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
127. **HAVE YOU COMMITTED OVERTS ON A TEACHER OR SUPERVISOR?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)

128. **HAVE YOU BEEN CRITICAL OF STUDY OR TEACHERS BEHIND THEIR BACKS?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
129. **HAVE YOU CAUSED AN UPSET IN A COURSE ROOM?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
130. **HAVE YOU LIED TO A TEACHER OR SUPERVISOR?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
131. **HAVE YOU MADE TROUBLE FOR A TEACHER OR SUPERVISOR?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
132. **HAVE YOU REFUSED TO LET OTHERS HELP YOU LEARN?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
133. **HAVE YOU COMMITTED OVERTS ON STUDENTS?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
134. **HAVE YOU MADE ANOTHER FEEL STUPID?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
135. **HAVE YOU MADE OTHERS FEEL ASHAMED OF THEIR SCHOOL GRADES** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
136. **HAVE YOU DAMAGED STUDY MATERIALS OR BOOKS?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
137. **HAVE YOU STOLEN STUDY MATERIALS OR BOOKS?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
138. **DO YOU HAVE UNPAID DEBTS FOR COURSES YOU'VE TAKEN?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
139. **HAVE YOU OMITTED DOING PARTS OF A CHECKSHEET OR COURSE?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
140. **HAVE YOU PASSED A CHECKSHEET, TEST OR EXAM FALSELY?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
141. **DID YOU BRIBE ANYONE IN ANY WAY TO PASS YOU?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
142. **ON STUDY HAVE YOU CHEATED?** \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
143. **ON STUDY HAVE YOU TAKEN CREDIT FOR SOMETHING YOU DIDN'T DO?** \_\_\_\_\_

- (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
144. **ON STUDY HAVE YOU FAILED TO DO HOMEWORK OR ASSIGNMENTS?** \_\_\_\_\_
- (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
145. **HAVE YOU FALSIFIED YOUR STUDY STATS** \_\_\_\_\_
- (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
146. **HAVE YOU FALSELY ATTESTED TO COURSE COMPLETIONS?** \_\_\_\_\_
- (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
147. **HAVE YOU PRETENDED YOU'VE STUDIED WHEN YOU HAVEN'T?**
- (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
148. **HAVE YOU STUDIED BUT NOT INTENDED TO LEARN?**
- (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
149. **WHILE ON STUDY HAVE YOU DONE SOMETHING ELSE INSTEAD?**
- (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
150. **DID YOU STUDY OR STAY IN SCHOOL TO AVOID HAVING TO DO SOMETHING ELSE?**
- (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
151. **ON STUDY HAVE YOU NOT PAID ATTENTION?**
- (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
152. **HAVE YOU SKIPPED GOING TO STUDY?**
- (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
153. **HAVE YOU NOT GONE TO SCHOOL WHEN YOU WERE SUPPOSED TO?**
- (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
154. **HAVE YOU FALSELY ATTESTED TO COURSE PREREQUISITES?**
- (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
155. **HAVE YOU PRETENDED TO HAVE STUDIED THINGS YOU HADN'T?**
- (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
156. **HAVE YOU DONE SOMETHING THAT MAKES YOU NOT DESERVE STUDY?**
- (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
157. **HAVE YOU STUDIED SOMETHING SO THAT YOU COULD DO HARM?**
- (Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)

158. **HAVE YOU PRETENDED TO KNOW A SUBJECT?**  
(Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
159. **HAVE YOU ALTERED STUDY TECH?**  
(Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
160. **HAVE YOU CONVINCED OTHERS IT WAS USELESS TO STUDY?**  
(Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
161. **HAVE YOU TURNED STUDENTS AGAINST THEIR TEACHERS?**  
(Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
162. **DID YOU EVER THINK OF STARTING A STUDENT REVOLT?**  
(Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
163. **HAVE YOU TRIED TO GET OTHER STUDENTS TO REVOLT?**  
(Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
164. **HAVE YOU GONE TO SCHOOL JUST TO MAKE TROUBLE?**  
(Get what he did, who missed it, E/S to F/N.)
165. **DO YOU HAVE EYESTRAIN OR BAD EYESIGHT?**  
(2WC to F/N. Note for C/S.)
166. **ON STUDY DO YOU HAVE TROUBLE WITH YOUR HEARING?**  
(2WC to F/N. Note for C/S.)
167. **IN STUDY HAS SOMETHING BEEN OVERRUN?**  
(Find out what and rehab.)
168. **WAS THERE NOTHING WRONG WITH STUDY IN THE FIRST PLACE?**  
(Indicate. If no F/N, rehab or date/locate.)
169. **IS THIS LIST AN UNNECESSARY ACTION?**  
(Indicate. If no F/N, rehab or date/locate.)
170. **HAVE YOU EVER FELT YOU COULD STUDY?**  
(Rehab this point.)

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

Revision Assisted by  
LRH Technical Research  
and Compilations

**HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE**  
**Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex**

**HCO BULLETIN OF 28 AUGUST 1970RB**  
Revised and Reinstated 27 January 1981

Remimeo  
Tech/Qual  
C/Ses  
HGCs  
Cramming Officers

**HC OUTPOINT-PLUSPOINT LISTS RB**

(Reference Data Series HCO PLs)

Because of the fantastic workability of the HC Outpoint-Pluspoint Lists I am happy to announce their reinstatement for general use.

The Outpoint-Pluspoint Lists were originally issued in August of 1970 and since then Data Series which contain additional outpoints and pluspoints have been released. So I am taking this opportunity to expand and update the Outpoint-Pluspoint Lists.

These lists are not restricted to any one particular rundown. Such is their power that auditors, CISes and Qua1 terminals should put them to use wherever applicable.

The HC Lists are capable of straightening out someone's thinking as many will attest – and in a drugged, illiterate culture such as ours, this makes these lists a valuable tool indeed!

---

The following lists are used:

- a. To assess for a read.
- b. Clear up with two-way comm.

**PROCEDURE**

One assesses the Outpoint List and goes as far as a good read. One clears that up to F/N VGIs (very good indicators). He then leaves off that list for now.

One then takes up the Pluspoint List. One assesses it as far as one needs to go to get a good read. One then takes that up with the preclear with Two-way Comm until there is an F/N and VGIs.

One now resumes where he left off on the Outpoint List and assesses until he gets a new good read. He takes that up with Two-way Comm until he gets an F/N VGIs.

One now takes up the Pluspoint List where he left off until he gets a good read. He takes that up with Two-way Comm until he gets an F/N VGIs. In this way the lists are alternated.

They can be done over and over.

---

These are the elements of illogic and insanity on the Outpoint List. They are the elements of logic and sanity on the Pluspoint List.

---

The list may be done on Clears and OTs following the rules given in HCOB 23 Dec. 71RA, C/S Series 73RA, THE NO-INTERFERENCE AREA CLARIFIED AND RE-ENFORCED

A meter must be used.

\_\_\_\_\_

It is done exactly by the Auditor's Code. Never tell the person what he thinks. Never invalidate what he has said. Just acknowledge and let him/her tell you about it.

\_\_\_\_\_

The reads, of course, disclose things which have charge on them.

\_\_\_\_\_

Take a good read.

Two-way Comm on "Any example of \_\_\_\_\_ in your life?" to F/N.

Assess again.

Same process.

Continue as long as you have TA on it.

Stop with any win.

Can be done to full F/Ning assessment on both lists.

\_\_\_\_\_

The list items can be used in two ways.

A. They can be called off straight.

B. They can be given a prior statement.

In A one would say, "Knowing something is right \_\_\_\_\_?" noting read or lack of it .  
"Knowing a datum is correct \_\_\_\_\_?" noting read.

In B one would be directing the person's attention to some sphere of action, like "In you work knowing something is right?" noting read, etc. One would go on using this sme prior statement on all the assessment until the whole subject, "work," was cleaned up. That would be a work consultation. Or one could say, for marriage problems, "In marriage, knowing something is right," "In marriage, knowing a datum is correct \_\_\_\_\_?"

One uses the same subject for both Outpoint and Pluspoint Lists until that one subject is cleaned up.

ALWAYS FINISH OFF WITH THE PLUSPOINT LIST.

\_\_\_\_\_

**OUTPOINT LIST**

- 1. **OMITTED FACT?** \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. **OMITTED TERMINAL?** \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. **OMITTED DATA?** \_\_\_\_\_
- 4. **OMITTED LOCATION?** \_\_\_\_\_
- 5. **OMITTED MATTER?** \_\_\_\_\_
- 6. **OMITTED ENERGY?** \_\_\_\_\_
- 7. **OMITTED SPACE?** \_\_\_\_\_
- 8. **OMITTED FORM?** \_\_\_\_\_

9. MISSING SCENE? \_\_\_\_\_
10. MISSING PERSON? \_\_\_\_\_
11. CHANGED SEQUENCE OF FACTS? \_\_\_\_\_
12. CHANGED SEQUENCE OF DATA? \_\_\_\_\_
13. CHANGED SEQUENCE OF PARTICLES? \_\_\_\_\_
14. CHANGED SEQUENCE OF LOCATIONS? \_\_\_\_\_
15. CHANGED SEQUENCE OF OBJECTS? \_\_\_\_\_
16. CHANGED SEQUENCE OF SPACES? \_\_\_\_\_
17. CHANGED SEQUENCE OF FORMS? \_\_\_\_\_
18. TWISTED IDEAS? \_\_\_\_\_
19. DROPPED-OUT TIME? \_\_\_\_\_
20. INCORRECT TIME? \_\_\_\_\_
21. FALSE TIME? \_\_\_\_\_
22. INVENTED TIME? \_\_\_\_\_
23. CONDENSED TIME? \_\_\_\_\_
24. RUSHED TIME? \_\_\_\_\_
25. ENDLESS TIME? \_\_\_\_\_
26. WAITING TIME? \_\_\_\_\_
- 26A. ADDED TIME? \_\_\_\_\_
- 26B. UNEXPECTED TIME? \_\_\_\_\_
27. DELUSION? \_\_\_\_\_
28. HALLUCINATION? \_\_\_\_\_
29. FALSE FACT? \_\_\_\_\_
30. FALSE TERMINAL? \_\_\_\_\_
31. FALSE BEING? \_\_\_\_\_
32. FALSE DATUM? \_\_\_\_\_
33. FALSE LOCATION? \_\_\_\_\_
34. FALSE MATTER? \_\_\_\_\_
35. FALSE ENERGY? \_\_\_\_\_
36. FALSE SPACE? \_\_\_\_\_
37. FIXED IDEA? \_\_\_\_\_
38. ALTERED IMPORTANCE? \_\_\_\_\_
39. ALTERED VALUE? \_\_\_\_\_

40. **DECREASED IMPORTANCE?** \_\_\_\_\_
41. **DECREASED VALUE?** \_\_\_\_\_
42. **OVERVALUED?** \_\_\_\_\_
43. **TOO IMPORTANT?** \_\_\_\_\_
44. **TOO INSIGNIFICANT?** \_\_\_\_\_
45. **THINGS ALL THE SAME?** \_\_\_\_\_
46. **NOT ASSOCIATED?** \_\_\_\_\_
47. **EVERYTHING DIFFERENT?** \_\_\_\_\_
48. **WRONG TERMINAL?** \_\_\_\_\_
49. **WRONG LOCATION?** \_\_\_\_\_
50. **WRONG TIME?** \_\_\_\_\_
51. **WRONG EVENT?** \_\_\_\_\_
52. **WRONG TARGET?** \_\_\_\_\_
53. **WRONG OBJECTIVE?** \_\_\_\_\_
54. **WRONG GOAL?** \_\_\_\_\_
55. **WRONG SPACE?** \_\_\_\_\_
56. **WRONG FORM?** \_\_\_\_\_
57. **IMPOSSIBLE OCCURANCE?** \_\_\_\_\_
58. **IMPOSSIBLE TERMINAL?** \_\_\_\_\_
59. **IMPOSSIBLE TIME?** \_\_\_\_\_
60. **IMPOSSIBLE EVENT?** \_\_\_\_\_
61. **UNBELIEVABLE IDEA?** \_\_\_\_\_
62. **UNBELIEVABLE ACTION?** \_\_\_\_\_
63. **UNBELIEVABLE EVENT?** \_\_\_\_\_
64. **UNBELIEVABLE CIRCUMSTANCE?** \_\_\_\_\_
65. **UNBELIEVABLE BEING?** \_\_\_\_\_
66. **WRONG SOURCE?** \_\_\_\_\_
67. **INCORRECT ORIGIN?** \_\_\_\_\_
68. **FROM WRONG PLACE?** \_\_\_\_\_
69. **FROM WRONG PERSON?** \_\_\_\_\_
70. **WRONG AUTHORITY?** \_\_\_\_\_
71. **FALSE SOURCE?** \_\_\_\_\_



- 72. **CONFLICTING DATA?** \_\_\_\_\_
- 73. **CONTRARY FACTS?** \_\_\_\_\_
- 74. **IMPOSSIBLE SITUATION?** \_\_\_\_\_
- 75. **NOT MATCHING REALITY?** \_\_\_\_\_
- 76. **ADDED INAPPLICABLE DATA?** \_\_\_\_\_
- 77. **ADDED INAPPLICABLE FACTS?** \_\_\_\_\_
- 78. **ADDED INAPPLICABLE TERMINALS?** \_\_\_\_\_
- 79. **ADDED INAPPLICABLE MATTER?** \_\_\_\_\_
- 80. **ADDED INAPPLICABLE ENERGY?**
- 81. **ADDED INAPPLICABLE SPACE?**
- 82. **ADDED INAPPLICABLE FORM?**
- 83. **ADDED INAPPLICABLE EVENT?**
- 84. **ASSUMED IDENTITIES NOT IDENTICAL?**
- 85. **FACTS ASSUMED TO BE IDENTICAL NOT IDENTICAL?**
- 86. **DATA ASSUMED TO BE IDENTICAL NOT IDENTICAL?**
- 87. **THINGS ASSUMED TO BE IDENTICAL NOT IDENTICAL?**
- 88. **ACTIONS ASSUMED TO BE IDENTICAL NOT IDENTICAL?**
- 89. **EVENTS ASSUMED TO BE IDENTICAL NOT IDENTICAL?**
- 90. **CIRCUMSTANCES ASSUMED TO BE IDENTICAL NOT IDENTICAL?**
- 91. **ASSUMED SIMILARITIES NOT SIMILAR?**
- 92. **FACTS ASSUMED TO BE SIMILAR ARE NOT SIMILAR?**
- 93. **DATA ASSUMED TO BE SIMILAR NOT SIMILAR?**
- 94. **THINGS ASSUMED TO BE SIMILAR NOT SIMILAR?**
- 95.
- 96.
- 97.
- 98.
- 99.
- 100.
- 101.
- 102.
- 103.
- 104.

105.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

**HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE**  
**Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex**

**HCO BULLETIN OF 4 FEBRUARY 1960**

Mission Holders  
HCO Secs  
Assoc 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 the 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 remove from the case the unwillingness to have done certain things and 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 Straightwire 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 had survived the first explosions and gotten them gone.

Then in searching out areas to run as a case, care should be taken not to overrun a terminal or underrun 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  
Founder

**HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE**  
**Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex**

**HCO BULLETIN OF 23 MAY 1971R**

Issue VIII

Revised 4 December 1974

Remimeo  
Auditors  
Students  
Tech/Qual

*Basic Auditing Series 10R*

**RECOGNITION OF RIGHTNESS OF THE BEING**

(Taken from the LRH Tape  
"Good Indicators," 7 January 1964)

An auditor's tendency is to look for wrongnesses. He is always trying to find something wrong with the pc. That's the nature of Scientology; we assume that there is something wrong with somebody otherwise he wouldn't be here and be dead in his head, and he would be capable of doing a great deal more than he is doing at the particular moment.

An individual is basically and routinely good, capable of many actions and considerable power.

In the state of a Free Thetan or Native State he is a far more powerful individual than when he's been complicated up.

It's the idea of the additive data to the thetan. Try to give somebody something he doesn't want and you are going to overthrow his power of choice. His power of choice is the only thing that he had to begin with, which gave him power, capability and anything else and that power of choice has been consistently and continuously overthrown by giving him things he didn't want and taking away from him things he didn't want to get rid of back and forth. You get the individual pretty overwhelmed and he goes down in power.

What happened to him actually is he solved something that didn't need solving. There was something he couldn't confront so he solved it and he fixed the solution.

Anytime you fix these solutions, for ever and ever you put the individual down grade. An individual becomes aberrated by additives. His experiences in this universe are usually calculated to degrade and depower him. Now all you have to do is pick up all of these crisscrosses and you return him to power.

Man is an added-to being and everything that has been added to him has decreased his ability to cope. When you add something to the being, he gets worse.

We are in the business of deleting wrongnesses from the individual.

Even the Freudian analyst realized that some additive had been added that should be deleted. So the idea of deleting something to bring about a recovery is not new with us.

Because we are in the business of deleting wrongnesses from the individual, we seldom look at rightnesses and that's what's wrong with most auditors. They are so anxious to find the wrongness – and quite properly – and they never really look at the rightness. If they don't look at the rightnesses that are present, then they aren't appreciating the degrees of truth that are present that can be promoted into more truth.

In other words they are starting at a level of no truth present all the time so of course they never make any forward progress.

You must realize that there must be truth present and that this truth must be recognized and that this is hand-in-glove a part of auditing – *the recognition of the fact that truth is present*.

If you only look for wrongnesses and only recognize wrongnesses then you will never be able to pull anything up a gradient because you won't think you have any rightnesses to work with. It just all looks wrong to you.

You have to be *able* to look at the wrongnesses in order to right them but we also have to be able to look at the rightnesses in order to increase them.

We are only trying to find wrongnesses in order to increase rightnesses, and that's very important. If you have *no* rightnesses present in a session, you will never be able to make any progress of any kind. Progress is built on a gradient scale of rightnesses by which you delete wrongnesses and they drop and fall away.

Therefore, processing is an action by which wrongnesses can be deleted from the case to the degree that rightnesses are present in the session. You cannot take a case that doesn't have any rightness present and delete a wrongness. So you have to realize that there are rightnesses present and then you increase those rightnesses. That makes it possible for you to pick up the wrongnesses and that's what auditing consists of.

Auditing is a contest of *maintaining* rightnesses so that we can delete wrongnesses. If you keep on deleting wrongnesses, all the while *maintaining* and *increasing* the rightnesses, you eventually wind up with a very right being. You are trying to get a *right being*, therefore if you don't continually encourage right beingness you never wind up with a right being.

You must learn to observe an auditing session. You want your pc to wind up in a right state – in a more native, more capable, less overwhelmed, higher power of choice sort of state. You want him to wind up with more rightnesses.

Therefore, if you audit so that you do not encourage and increase rightnesses then you won't wind up with a right pc.

The degree of rightness you have present must *exceed* the wrongness you are going to pick up. It's a proportional action. If you've got as much wrongness in a session as you've got rightness, you're not riding on any cushion. It makes a very difficult job of auditing. If you want to pick up this little wrongness, you have to have rightnesses present which are big enough to engulf it. That makes easy auditing.

If the rightnesses in the session are very minor and the problem is a tiny one, there isn't enough rightness in the session to handle the problem and the pc cannot erase it.

THE PC'S ABILITY TO AS-IS OR ERASE IN A SESSION IS DIRECTLY PROPORTIONAL TO THE NUMBER OF GOOD INDICATORS PRESENT IN THE SESSION.

And his inability to cope in a session rises proportionally to the number of bad indicators present in a session.

Any process has its own series of bad indicators. And the bad indicator moves in when the good indicator moves out. So you have to have a primary knowledge of good indicators.

Don't look for bad indicators on and on and on; you'll drive the pc around the bend and suppress the good indicators. What you want to do is know your good indicators for the level you are running so well that when one of them disappears out of the session, your ears go up and you instantly look for the bad indicator. Don't look for the bad indicator until you see the vanishment of the good indicator. Otherwise you're continually prowling around looking for wrongnesses in a session and you keep a pc very upset and you get no auditing done of any kind whatsoever.

Remember this next time you see a pc start to bog down and drag and flounder one way or the other. You've got to get the pc's good indicators back in before you can get the pc to handle what you want him to handle.

What influences the attitude of the pc is an ARC break (that of course is influenced earlier by the *auditor's* behavior), or the pc has an overt on the auditor or the pc has a missed withhold.

An auditor who never gets in and finds out what is wrong in the session – the reasonable auditor – messes up pcs like mad.

If all the good indicators are present, the auditor knows he is doing a good job of auditing.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder



**HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE**  
**Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex**

**HCO BULLETIN OF 23 JULY 1978**

Remimeo  
All Dianetics Auditors  
All C/Ses  
All Supervisors

*C/S Series 101*

**LIST OF PERCEPTICS**

This was researched and dates of 1951.

It's the 57 human perceptions.

1. Time
2. Sight
3. Taste
4. Color
5. Depth
6. Solidity (barriers)
7. Relative Sizes (external)
8. Sound
9. Pitch
10. Tone
11. Volume
12. Rhythm
13. Smell (The sense of smell has four subdivisions which are categories of the type of odor.)
14. Touch
  - a. Pressure
  - b. Friction
  - c. Heat or Cold
  - d. Oiliness
15. Personal Emotion
16. Endocrine States
17. Awareness of Awareness
18. Personal Size
19. Organic Sensation (including hunger)

20. Heartbeat
21. Blood Circulation
22. Cellular and Bacterial Position
23. Gravitic (self and other weights)
24. Motion of Self
25. Motion (exterior)
26. Body Position
27. Joint Position
28. Internal Temperature
29. External Temperature
30. Balance
31. Muscular Tension
32. Saline Content of Self (body)
33. Fields/Magnetic
34. Time Track Motion
35. Physical Energy (personal weariness, etc.)
36. Self-determinism (relative on each dynamic)
37. Moisture (self)
38. Sound Direction
39. Emotional State of Other Organs
40. Personal Position on the Tone Scale
41. Affinity (self and others)
42. Communication (self and others)
43. Reality (self and others)
44. Emotional State of Groups
45. Compass Direction
46. Level of Consciousness
47. Pain
48. Perception of Conclusions (past and present)
49. Perception of Computation (past and present)
50. Perception of Imagination (past and present)
51. Perception of Having Perceived (past and present)
52. Awareness of Not Knowing

53. Awareness of Importance, Unimportance
54. Awareness of Others
55. Awareness of Location and Placement
  - a. Masses
  - b. Spaces
  - c. Location Itself
56. Perception of Appetite
57. Kinesthesia

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

**PAB 110**  
**PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN**  
The Oldest Continuous Publication in Dianetics and Scientology

Via Hubbard Communications Office  
35/37 Fitzroy Street, London W1

---

15 April 1957

## EDUCATION

Education – point of agreement.

The learning processes are all of them extremely interesting to the auditor because they bring to his attention at once that the common denominator of communication and aberration is at once "telling somebody something." You say to somebody "hello" – you mean in essence "I am here, you are there and I recognize it." It's the relay of an idea. Well, now, learning itself has been, for I don't know how long, very compartmented, it's been very carefully grooved, so that learning as we speak of it then prior to 1956 meant what they meant in school – and that was "the inflow of ideas."

Now, when you speak to somebody out in the public about learning he thinks you're talking about inflow of ideas from some source or another – either from a book or a teacher. That is a very narrow look, and when I talked to you about this before I was using learning in that definition – an inflow of ideas.

It is not true that learning rate or the rate one will permit ideas to inflow is the common denominator of aberration or anything else, but it looks like it. The truth of the matter is, if you only considered inflow it would be like considering the motivator without the overt act. Now you know as an auditor how important it is to look at the overt act rather than the motivator. Don't look at these inflows all the time. If you continue to look at these inflows and nothing but these inflows you will make as many mistakes as have been made in the past umpteen thousands of years in the field of education; and let's not make these mistakes all over again.

Education could have been defined this way: "Education is the process of placing data in the recalls of another." Do you see that? That's what education thought it was doing. It thought it was placing ideas in the recalls of another and making a recall possible by somebody else of data related to him. Now that's not very complicated, and that is the trouble with it: it is not complicated enough for educators. Now we deal with simplicities and this is the first time we really find fault on the line of simplicity – it's an idiot's definition – and that's the process that is being carried on at this moment at Yale, Princeton, Harvard and Columbia; down here at George Washington, at Oxford, Cambridge and the Sorbonne – any place across the world at which they consider themselves tops in education – they are placing ideas in the recall of others.

A few schools departed from this from time to time, almost by accident, and usually under duress from their student bodies. Heidelberg is an example of this. Heidelberg never considered the relay of ideas important; it considered having been to Heidelberg important, and that was quite different.

As long as we maintain this idea of "inflow only" we are in trouble. Education does not happen. If education means inflowing ideas then you are also talking about hypnotism. You see, there's no differentiation there; we are talking about beating somebody up and laying in an engram. This too would be education, wouldn't it? So we have education and aberration very, very closely associated.

In fact, education WAS aberration. Life was busy teaching somebody a lesson and the lesson it succeeded in teaching him was not to do any more living. And that little lesson, then, was always at the base of education and it was done so that education itself could be considered aberration. In other words educational systems did the lazy thing, they did the easy thing: they simply paralleled the game of the MEST universe in teaching somebody not to live, and living paralleled it. Why, they then thought they were

doing a good job. But let's look at education as it was done. You taught somebody something by saying "Pigs have snouts." They're not supposed to say "Yes", the classroom is supposed to be quiet. Later on you put an examination in front of them and it says: "What do \_\_\_\_\_ have?" and they're supposed to immediately answer and write: "\_\_\_\_\_ have snouts." You're supposed to be able to associate this completely. So it's just a test of recall.

Now as you know, therapeutically, recalls – and by the way, if you don't know this try it some time: just sit and ask somebody to recall something about some person and do nothing but that and notice that you get a decline of case. That's an interesting thing. You had to use the whole of the ARC formula, something really real, some time you were in communication with, and the reverse side of it too – in other words, the entirety of the straightwire formula, inflow and outflow – to get away with it. But if you just asked somebody to remember something about George, remember something else about George, remember something else about George – if you asked him what he was doing, he's picking up every moment he ever saw George motionless. This erases, you see, all the rest points of George and leaves nothing but the confusions and the halfway feeling that George is there, so we sort of move George as a disembodied entity into present time and confirm the valence. Now this is quite a trick, but you just knock these rest points out and George becomes a confusion. Therefore, nothing but recall used therapeutically and educationally would wind somebody up in rather a confused state. He would be sort of half hypnotized, just nothing but recalls. So if you give people data like "Pigs have snouts" and then ask them "What \_\_\_\_\_ has a snout?" or "What \_\_\_\_\_ has a \_\_\_\_\_?" you have given them a stable datum and now you're taking it away from them.

You might look up some time a university record as to suicide and nervous breakdown; such a record is honestly kept, I know. I did this once and I had a lot of trouble. I wanted to know how many students had committed suicide in that university and they wouldn't own up to it, but I found out there had been quite a few and there'd been a great many nervous breakdowns, all at examination time. They spend the whole semester giving somebody some stable data and then at examination time they take that all away suddenly. In other words, simply implanting the recall and then pulling it back out again has been defined as education; but it is nothing but a black operation – nothing but. To do this to little kids is to do away with their initiative; therefore a time for revolution in the field of education is definitely at hand.

Education would have to be defined much more broadly. But remember in the old Logics about action definitions. Well, you'd have to give it an action definition; it would have to be a real definition that gave its use and a purpose for it, to be of any kind of a game itself. The reason why teachers go into a no-game condition is because teaching itself is not really a game. It is putting a bunch of other people in a no-game condition, and of course that's only part of a game. To teach a subject it would be necessary for the person being taught to be able to receive a nonsignificant, disrelated idea from another person. You see, that would be a necessity in order to teach somebody something.

The next condition that we would have to meet would be making certain that person could maintain his power of choice over the data given to him. So we would give him some data which were incorrect, and giving him these incorrect data we would find out if he could remember them and if he could reject them. The idea of being able to reject a datum and still remember it, to know that it's untrue and nonfactual and still be able to recall it, is of course bettered by a further action: being able to wipe it out completely or not even recall it – and that is a skill.

The next thing would be to feed him a datum, have him give objective examples and active examples of this datum so that it's not then just a string of words, and then ascertain whether or not he could still reject it or accept it and then ask him to rephrase it, and eventually he will form something which will to him be an agreeable stable datum, and having done this we would then have accomplished power of choice over a datum. To get him to remember or repeat a nonsignificant datum would be the longest haul at first, and you may find people who have a terribly long haul on the subject of incorrect data. You give him an incorrect datum and he can't reject it, but when you have made that possible you can then give him a datum, have him give objective examples of the datum, have him rephrase it, give objective examples of his datum,

accept it, reject it, handle it, throw it around and the next thing you know he has something which will buff the entirety of confusion surrounding that subject. You have created there something which is armor plate as far as he is concerned. He KNOWS a datum. Now he doesn't KNOW it as recall; that's the trick, you see. This is entirely different. Now it's hard to describe how he knows it, because there's nothing there to describe except the datum itself, so to write long chapters on this new type of knowingness would be an impossibility. It's something that is experienced; it easily goes on beyond the field of description.

All right, let's take a look then at education and find out why you would do this that way – rather than to just place something in somebody's recalls, to have him really know it as a datum. Why would you do this? Would there be any sense in this at all? Well, yes, there certainly would be. The individual would be able to USE that datum. He would be able to evaluate its importance, he would be able to handle it and handle with it many other things. In other words you have given him something for his utilization.

Now I want to tell you a little difference in the field of education itself. The stress of "teaching" in a modern school today is this: "How to occupy the child's

time." That's right – that's what they teach in modern training schools. Great stress is put on this; you have a child just so long, he has to be taken out of his home for that length of time, you have to keep him occupied in school and that's just about it. And you wonder why a child of twelve or thirteen doesn't really know how to spell, his penmanship is poor, his reading is worse, and so on – that's because a different thing has come into view. Now this is not the tradition of the little red schoolhouse of song and storybook through the generations. There was another tradition in this country, and I don't know where the tradition I have just described came from, but this other tradition was the American tradition and it went like this: You had to get 'em and put some shoes on 'em in a hurry and teach 'em readin', writin' and 'rithmetic as fast as you could because they weren't going to be in school very long – and the teacher who was put through normal school, so called, a hundred years ago was taught that. You have got to be fast – you never know when Papa's going to take him out and put him behind the plow. Give him some education before it happens to him. You probably will get them in the winter months when there's not much work to do, but in the summer you're never going to get them. Hence the summer vacation.

Of course, the child loves this idea; he doesn't have too much sympathy with education in the most part, as it is performed; but if school really educated him I'm afraid you'd have an entirely different attitude on the part of the child. Now I have been very fortunate to know in my life quite a few real geniuses – fellows that really wrote their name fairly large in the world of literature and science – and I consider myself very fortunate to have known them because they are so rare. Why are they so rare? I found something peculiar about these fellows – they were for the most part taught in peculiar schools! They were taught in some YMCA school or they were taught by some Englishman who ran a little college for difficult children in the street; they were all taught, it seems, in some kind of off-breed school. Now this is peculiar, because the school existed to a large measure to take care of people who were slop-overs from the usual educational system – there wasn't very much education involved. The fellow would come in and he'd be interested in something and therefore they had the master give him his head. One chap, by the way, who gave us solid fuel, rockets and assist take-offs for airplanes too heavily loaded on aircraft carriers, and all the rest of this rocketry panorama, and who formed Aerojet in California and so on – the late Jack Parsons – by the way, was not a chemist the way we think of chemists. He was not taught in the field of chemistry beyond this fact: There was a little professor who opened up a school. Nobody could do anything with Jack so they sent him over to this school and the professor found out he was interested in chemical experiments and turned him loose in the laboratory and gave him a lot of encouragement. He eventually became quite a man. It is interesting that this completely sloppy type of education is apparently quite workable.

Here are some LEARNING PROCESSES. Try them out and see the difference between KNOWING a datum and knowing it as a recall.

1. Learning Process No. 1:

(Flatten each part thoroughly before going to next.)

- a. Give pc 3 numbers. Have him repeat. See if he remembered. Repeat this process.
- b. Give him incorrect datum. Have him repeat it. Discover if he could remember it. Discover if he could reject it. Repeat this process.
- c. Give him vital datum (concerning rudiments of auditing in the case of a Scientologist, for example). See if he can repeat it. See if he can rephrase it. Have him give objective examples. See if he can reject it. Repeat this process.

2. Learning Process No. 2:

- a. Discover things auditor and pc can agree on in vicinity.
- b. Feed pc vital data (Scientology and rudiments, for example). Get him to give objective examples, rephrase and reject and accept.

3. Learning Process No. 3:

Have pc discover unimportant data in environment.

4. Assigning Identity:

This is a walkabout, inside and outside.

Commands:

**Look around here and find something you could have.**

**For what is it used? (or What is it called?)**

**Could you invent another use (name) for it?**

5. Objective Forgettingness:

This is a Not-Know Process. It is another walkabout.

Commands:

**Look around here and find something it would be all right to forget (or not-know).**

If these five processes are flattened early in the week, note the changes, repeat, and effect further changes.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder