

THE NEW HUBBARD

PROFESSIONAL

**TR**  
*Course*

**L. RON HUBBARD**

A HUBBARD PUBLICATION

**Note:**

There is no checksheet included with this course pack. There use to be a wall of clay demos to this course which was on the chapter on communication in FOT. Now there is a Pro TR's processing done in clay.

# Contents

## KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING

HCO PL 7 Feb. 1965 **Keeping Scientology Working**  
*KSW Series I*

HCO PL 17 June 1970RB **Technical Degrades**  
*KSW Series 5R*

## TRs

|                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| HCOB 16 Aug. 1971R II               | <b>Training Drills Remodernized</b>                        |
| <i>Ability 54</i> , Sept. 1957 1973 | <b>More Confronting</b>                                    |
| HCOB 4 Jan. II                      | <b>Confront</b>  |
|                                     | <i>Study Series 9</i>                                      |
| HCOB 3 Feb. 1979                    | <b>Confront Tech — Has to Be Part of the TR Checksheet</b> |
| PAB 147, 1 Nov. 1958                | <b>Communication Course</b>                                |
| HCOB 25 Sept. 1971RB                | <b>Tone Scale in Full</b>                                  |
| HCOB 31 Jan. 1979                   | <b>Mood Drills</b>   |
| HCOB 15 Sept. 1958                  | <b>More on Training Drill Two</b>                          |
| PAB 149, 1 Dec. 1958                | <b>Dummy Auditing Step Two:</b>                            |
|                                     | <b>Acknowledgment</b>                                      |
| HCOB 12 Jan. 1959                   | <b>Tone of Voice—Acknowledgment</b>                        |
| PAB 150, 15 Dec. 1958               | <b>Dummy Auditing Step Three:</b>                          |
|                                     | <b>Duplication</b>   |
| HCOB 7 Apr. 1964                    | <b>Q and A</b>   |
| HCOB 20 Nov. 1973 I                 | <b>Anti-Q and A Drill</b>                                  |
| HCOB 5 Apr. 1980 Q&A,               | <b>The Real Definition</b>                                 |
| PAB 151, 1 Jan. 1959                | <b>Dummy Auditing Step Four:</b>                           |
| HCOB 1 Oct. 1965R                   | <b>Handling Originations</b>                               |
| HCOB 24 May 1968                    | <b>Mutter TR Coaching</b>                                  |
| HCOB 26 Apr. 1971 I                 | <b>TRs and Cognitions</b>                                  |
| HCOB 24 Dec. 1979R                  | <b>TRs Basics Resurrected</b>                              |
| HCOB 7 Aug. 1983                    | <b>Robotic TRs</b>   |
| HCOB 8 Aug. 1983                    | <b>Cycling Through TRs on a Professional TR Course</b>     |
| HCOB 5 July 1989                    | <b>Coaching TRs 0-4</b>                                    |

## COMMUNICATION

HCOB 5 Apr. 1973 **Axiom 28 Amended**

Alphabetical List of Titles Chronological List of Titles

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 FEBRUARY 1965

Remimeo  
Sthil Students  
Assoc/Org Sec Hat  
HCO Sec Hat  
Case Sup Hat  
Ds of P Hat  
Ds of T Hat  
Staff Member Hat  
Franchise

Keeping Scientology Working Series 1

Note: Neglect of this PL has caused great hardship on staffs, has cost countless millions and made it necessary in 1970 to engage in an all-out, international effort to restore basic Scientology over the world. Within 5 years after the issue of this PL, with me off the lines, violation had almost destroyed orgs. "Quickie grades" entered in and denied gain to tens of thousands of cases. Therefore actions which neglect or violate this policy letter are HIGH CRIMES resulting in Comm Evs on ADMINISTRATORS and EXECUTIVES. It is not "entirely a tech matter," as its neglect destroys orgs and caused a 2-year slump. IT IS THE BUSINESS OF EVERY STAFF MEMBER to enforce it.

SPECIAL MESSAGE

THE FOLLOWING POLICY LETTER MEANS WHAT IT SAYS.

IT WAS TRUE IN 1965 WHEN I WROTE IT. IT WAS TRUE IN 1970 WHEN I HAD IT REISSUED. I AM REISSUING IT NOW, IN 1980, TO AVOID AGAIN SLIPPING BACK INTO A PERIOD OF OMITTED AND QUICKIED FUNDAMENTAL GRADE CHART ACTIONS ON CASES, THEREBY DENYING GAINS AND THREATENING THE VIABILITY OF SCIENTOLOGY AND OF ORGS. SCIENTOLOGY WILL KEEP WORKING ONLY AS LONG AS YOU DO YOUR PART TO KEEP IT WORKING BY APPLYING THIS POLICY LETTER.

WHAT I SAY IN THESE PAGES HAS ALWAYS BEEN TRUE, IT HOLDS TRUE TODAY, IT WILL STILL HOLD TRUE IN THE YEAR 2000 AND IT WILL CONTINUE TO HOLD TRUE FROM THERE ON OUT

NO MATTER WHERE YOU ARE IN SCIENTOLOGY, ON STAFF OR NOT, THIS POLICY LETTER HAS SOMETHING TO DO WITH YOU.

## ALL LEVELS

### KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING

HCO Sec or Communicator hat check on  
all personnel and all new personnel as taken on.

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

The only thing now is getting the technology applied.

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

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

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

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

Getting the correct technology applied consists of:

One: Having the correct technology.

Two: Knowing the technology.

Three: Knowing it is correct.

Four: Teaching correctly the correct technology.

Five: Applying the technology.

Six: Seeing that the technology is correctly applied.

Seven: Hammering out of existence incorrect technology.

Eight: Knocking out incorrect applications.

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

Ten: Closing the door on incorrect application.

One above has been done.

Two has been achieved by many.

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

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

Five is consistently accomplished daily.

Six is achieved by Instructors and Supervisors consistently.

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

Eight is not worked on hard enough.

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

Ten is seldom done with enough ferocity.

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

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

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

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

On the other hand there have been thousands and thousands of suggestions and writings which, if accepted and acted upon, would have resulted in the complete destruction of all our work as well as the sanity of pcs. So I know what a group of people will do and how insane they will go in accepting unworkable "technology." By actual record the percentages are about twenty to 100,000 that a group of human beings will dream up bad technology to destroy good technology.

As we could have gotten along without suggestions, then, we had better steel ourselves to continue to do so now that we have made it. This point will, of course, be attacked as "unpopular," egotistical" and "undemocratic." It very well may be. But it is also a survival point. And I don't see that popular measures, self-abnegation and democracy have done anything for Man but push him further into the mud. Currently, popularity endorses degraded novels, self-abnegation has filled the Southeast Asian jungles with stone idols and corpses, and democracy has given us inflation and income tax.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The common denominator of a group is the reactive bank. Thetans without banks have different responses. They only have their banks in common. They agree then only on bank principles. Person to person the bank is identical. So constructive ideas are individual and seldom get broad agreement in a human group. An individual must rise above an avid craving for agreement from

a humanoid group to get anything decent done. The bank-agreement has been what has made Earth a Hell -- and if you were looking for Hell and found Earth, it would certainly serve. War, famine, agony and disease has been the lot of Man. Right now the great governments of Earth have developed the means of frying every Man, Woman and Child on the planet. That is bank. That is the result of Collective-thought Agreement. The decent, pleasant things on this planet come from individual actions and ideas that have somehow gotten by the Group Idea. For that matter, look how we ourselves are attacked by "public opinion" media. Yet there is no more ethical group on this planet than ourselves.

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

When you don't do Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten actively, you are working for the bank-dominated mob. For it will surely, surely (a) introduce incorrect technology and swear by it, (b) apply technology as incorrectly as possible, (c) open the door to any destructive idea, and (d) encourage incorrect application.

It's the bank that says the group is all and the individual nothing.

It's the bank that says we must fail.

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

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

What happened here? Instructor A didn't jump down Auditor B's throat, that's all that happened. This is what he should have done: Grabbed the Auditor's Report and looked it over. When a higher executive on this case did so, she found what the Case Supervisor and the rest missed: that Process X increased Preclear C's TA to 25 TA divisions for the session but that near session end Auditor B Q- and-Aed with a cognition and abandoned Process X while it still gave high TA and went off running one of Auditor B's own manufacture, which nearly spun Preclear C. Auditor B's IQ on examination turned out to be about 75. Instructor A was found to have huge ideas of how you must never invalidate anyone, even a lunatic. The Case Supervisor was found to be "too busy with admin to have any time for actual cases."

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

Then the pc wouldn't have come close to a spin and all four of these would have retained their certainty.

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

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

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

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

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

When people can't get results from what they think is standard practice, they can be counted upon to squirrel to some degree. The most trouble in the past two years came from orgs where an executive in each could not assimilate straight Scientology. Under instruction in Scientology, they were unable to define terms or demonstrate examples of principles. And the orgs where they were got into plenty of trouble. And worse, it could not be straightened out easily because neither one of these people could or would duplicate instructions. Hence, a debacle resulted in two



places, directly traced to failures of instruction earlier. So proper instruction is vital. The D of T and his Instructors and all Scientology Instructors must be merciless in getting Four, Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten into effective action. That one student, dumb and impossible though he may seem and of no use to anyone, may yet someday be the cause of untold upset because nobody was interested enough to make sure Scientology got home to him.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Do them and we'll win.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

Adopted as official  
Church policy by  
CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY  
INTERNATIONAL

LRH:CSI:jw.rr.nt.ka.mes.rd.bk.gm

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 17 JUNE 1970RB  
RE-REVISED 25 OCTOBER 1983

Remimeo  
Applies to all  
SHs and  
Academies  
HGCs  
Franchises

Keeping Scientology Working Series 5R

URGENT AND IMPORTANT

TECHNICAL DEGRADES

(This PL and HCO PL 7 Feb. 65 must be made  
part of every study pack as the first items  
and must be listed on checksheets.)

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

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

These checksheets were not approved by myself; all the material of the Academy and SH courses IS in use.

Such actions as this gave us "quickie grades," ARC broke the field and downgraded the Academy and SH courses.

A condition of TREASON or cancellation of certificates or dismissal and a full investigation of the background of any person found guilty will be activated in the case of anyone committing the following HIGH CRIMES:

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

2. Adding comments to checksheets or instructions labeling any material "background" or "not used now" or "old" or any similar action which will result in the student not knowing, using and applying the data in which he is being trained.
3. Employing after 1 Sept. 1970 any checksheet for any course not authorized by myself or the Authority, Verification and Correction Unit International (AVC Int).

(Hat checksheets may be authorized locally per HCO PL 30 Sept. 70, CHECKSHEET FORMAT.)

4. Failing to strike from any checksheet remaining in use meanwhile any such comments as "historical," "background," "not used," "old," etc., or VERBALLY STATING IT TO STUDENTS.
5. Permitting a pc to attest to more than one grade at a time on the pc's own determinism without hint or evaluation.
6. Running only one process for a lower grade between 0 to IV, where the grade EP has not been attained.
7. Failing to use all processes for a level where the EP has not been attained.
8. Boasting as to speed of delivery in a session, such as "I put in Grade Zero in 3 minutes." Etc.
9. Shortening time of application of auditing for financial or labor-saving considerations.
10. Acting in any way calculated to lose the technology of Dianetics and Scientology to use or impede its use or shorten its materials or its application.

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

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

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

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

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

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

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Adopted as official

Church policy by

CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY

LRH:CSI:iw.gm

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 16 AUGUST 1971R

Issue II  
REVISED 5 JULY 1978

Remimeo  
Courses Checksheets

**TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED**

Revises 17 April 1961  
This HCOB cancels the following:

|                             |                            |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Original HCOB 17 Apr. 61    | TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED |
| Reissued HCOB 5 Jan. 71     | TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED |
| Revised HCOB 21 June 71 III | TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED |
| HCOB 25 May 71              | THE TR COURSE              |

This HCOB is to replace all other issues of TRs 0-4 in all packs and checksheets.  
Due to the following factors, I have modernized TRs 0-4.

1. The auditing skill of any student remains only as good as he can do his TRs.
2. Flubs in TRs are the basis of all confusion in subsequent efforts to audit.
3. If the TRs are not well learned early in Scientology training courses, THE BALANCE OF THE COURSE WILL FAIL AND SUPERVISORS AT UPPER LEVELS WILL BE TEACHING NOT THEIR SUBJECTS BUT TRs.
4. Almost all confusions on meter. Model Sessions and Scientology or Dianetic processes stem directly from inability to do the TRs.
5. A student who has not mastered his TRs will not master anything further.
6. Scientology or Dianetic processes will not function in the presence of bad TRs. The preclear is already being overwhelmed by process velocity and cannot bear up to TR flubs without ARC breaks.

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

These TRs given here should be put in use at once in all auditor training, in Academy and HGC and in the future should never be relaxed.

Public courses on TRs are NOT "softened" because they are for the public. Absolutely no standards are lowered. THE PUBLIC ARE GIVEN REAL TRs— ROUGH, TOUGH AND HARD. To do otherwise is to lose 90% of the results. There is nothing pale and patty-cake about TRs.

THIS HCOB MEANS WHAT IT SAYS. IT DOES NOT MEAN SOMETHING ELSE. IT DOES NOT IMPLY ANOTHER MEANING. IT IS NOT OPEN TO INTERPRETATION FROM ANOTHER SOURCE.

THESE TRs ARE DONE EXACTLY PER THIS HCOB WITHOUT ADDED ACTIONS OR CHANGE.

***NUMBER: OT TR 0 (REVISED 1971)***

*NAME:* Operating Thetan Confronting.

*COMMANDS:* None.

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

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

*TRAINING STRESS:* Student and coach sit facing each other with eyes closed. There is no conversation. This is a silent drill. There is *NO* twitching, moving. "system" or vias used or anything else added to BE there. One will usually see blackness or an area of the room when one's eyes are closed. BE THERE, COM- FORTABLY. When a student can BE there comfortably and has reached a *major stable win*, the drill is passed.

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

***NUMBER: TR 0 CONFR ONTING (REVISED 1971)***

*NAME:* Confronting Preclear. *COMMANDS:* None.

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

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

**TRAINING STRESS:** Have student and coach sit facing each other, neither making any conversation or effort to be interesting. Have them sit and look at each other and say and do nothing for some hours. Student must not speak, blink, fidget, giggle or be embarrassed or anaten. It will be found the student tends to confront WITH a body part, rather than just confront, or to use a system of confronting rather than just BE there. The drill is misnamed if confronting means to DO some- thing to the pc. The whole action is to accustom an auditor to BEING THERE three feet in front of a preclear without apologizing or moving or being startled or embarrassed or defending self. Confronting with a body part can cause somatics in that body part being used to confront. The solution is just to confront and BE there. Student passes when he can just BE there and confront and he has reached a *major stable win*.

**HISTORY:** Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington in March 1957 to train students to confront preclears in the absence of social tricks or conversation and to overcome obsessive compulsions to be "interesting." Revised by L. Ron Hubbard April 1961 on finding that SOP Goals required for its success a much higher level of technical skill than earlier processes. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in August 1971 after research discoveries on TRs.

**NUMBER: TR 0 BULLBAIT (REVISED 1971)**

**NAME:** Confronting Bullbaited.

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

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

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

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

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

**PATTER AS A CONFRONTED SUBJECT:** The coach may say anything or do any- thing except leave the chair. The student's "buttons" can be found and tromped on hard. Any words not coaching words may receive *no* response from the student. If the student responds, the coach is instantly a coach (see patter above). Student passes when he can BE there comfortably without being thrown off or distracted or react in any way to anything the coach says or does and has reached a *major stable win*.



**HISTORY:** Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington in March 1957 to train students to confront preclears in the absence of social tricks or conversation and to overcome obsessive compulsions to be "interesting." Revised by L. Ron Hubbard April 1961 on finding that SOP Goals required for its success a much higher level of technical skill than earlier processes. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in August 1971 after research discoveries on TRs.

**NUMBER: TR 1 (REVISED 1961)**

**NAME:** Dear Alice.

**PURPOSE:** To train the student to deliver a command newly and in a new unit of time to a preclear without flinching or trying to overwhelm or using a via.

**COMMANDS:** A phrase (with the "he saids" omitted) is picked out of the book *Alice in Wonderland* and read to the coach. It is repeated until the coach is satisfied it arrived where he is.

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

**TRAINING STRESS:** The command goes from the book to the student and, as his own, to the coach. It must not go from book to coach. It must sound natural not artificial. Diction and elocution have no part in it. Loudness may have.

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

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

This drill is passed only when the student can put across a command naturally, without strain or artificiality or elocutionary bobs and gestures, and when the student can do it easily and relaxedly.

**HISTORY:** Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London, April 1956, to teach the communication formula to new students. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard 1961 to increase auditing ability.

**NUMBER: TR 2 (REVISED 1978)**

**NAME:** Acknowledgments.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**NUMBER:** *TR 2'2 (1978)*

**NAME:** Half-Acks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

*NUMBER: TR 3 (REVISED 1961) NAME:* Duplicative Question.

*PURPOSE:* To teach a student to duplicate without variation an auditing question. each time newly, in its own unit of time, not as a blur with other questions, and to acknowledge it. To teach that one never asks a second question until he has received an answer to the one asked.

*COMMANDS:* "Do fish swim?" or "Do birds fly?"

*POSITION:* Student and coach seated a comfortable distance apart.

*TRAINING STRESS:* One question and student acknowledgment of its answer in one unit of time which is then finished. To keep student from straying into variations of command. Even though the same question is asked, it is asked as though it had never occurred to anyone before.

The student must learn to give a command and receive an answer and to acknowledge it in one unit of time.

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

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

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

When the question is not answered, the student must say, gently, "I'll repeat the auditing question" and do so until he gets an answer. Anything except command, acknowledgment and, as needed, the repeat statement is flunked. Unnecessary use of the repeat statement is flunked. A poor command is flunked. A poor acknowledgment is flunked. A Q and A is flunked (as in example). Student misemotion or confusion is flunked. Student failure to utter the next command without a long comm lag is flunked. A choppy or premature acknowledgment is flunked. Lack of an acknowledgment (or with a distinct comm lag) is flunked. Any words from the coach except

an answer to the question, "Start," "Flunk," "Good" or "That's it" should have no influence on the student except to get him to give a repeat statement and the command again. By repeat statement is meant "I'll repeat the auditing command."

"Start," "Flunk," "Good" and "That's it" may not be used to fluster or trap the student. Any other statement under the sun may be. The coach may try to leave his chair in this TR. If he succeeds it is a flunk. The coach should not use introverted statements, such as "I just had a cognition." "Coach divertive" statements should all concern the student and should be designed to throw the student off and cause the student to lose session control or track of what the student is doing. The student's job is to keep a session going in spite of anything, using only command, the repeat statement or the acknowledgment. The student may use his or her hands to prevent a "blow" (leaving) of the coach. If the student does anything else than the above, it is a flunk and the coach must say so.

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

Coach may throw in remarks personal to student as on TR 3. Student's failure to differentiate between these (by trying to handle them) and coach's remarks about self as "pc" is a flunk.

Student's failure to persist is always a flunk in any TR but here more so. Coach should not always read from list to originate and not always look at student when about to comment. By originate is meant a statement or remark referring to the state of the coach or fancied case. By comment is meant a statement or remark aimed only at student or room. Originations are handled, comments are disregarded by the student.

*HISTORY:* Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956 to teach auditors to stay in session when preclear dives out. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in 1961 to teach an auditor more about handling origins and preventing ARC breaks.

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

#### TRAINING NOTE

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

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.jr.js.nt.pe.rd.lfg.iw.gm

# Ability

Issue 54

[1957, ca. early September]

*The Magazine of*  
DIANETICS and SCIENTOLOGY  
from Washington, DC

## MORE CONFRONTING

L. Ron Hubbard

That which a person can confront, he can handle. The first step of handling anything is gaining an ability to face it.

It could be said that war continues as a threat to man because man cannot confront war. The idea of making war so terrible that no one will be able to fight it is the exact reverse of fact—if one wishes to end war. The invention of the longbow, gunpowder, heavy naval cannon, machine guns, liquid fire and the hydrogen bomb add only more and more certainty that war *will* continue. As each new element which man cannot confront is added to elements he has not been able to confront so far, man engages himself upon a decreasing ability to handle war.

We are looking here at the basic anatomy of all problems. Problems start with an inability to confront anything. Whether we apply this to domestic quarrels or to insects, to garbage dumps or Picasso, one can always trace the beginning of any existing problem to an unwillingness to confront.

Let us take a domestic scene. The husband or the wife cannot confront the other, cannot confront second dynamic consequences, cannot confront the economic burdens, and so we have domestic strife. The less any of these actually are confronted, the more problem they will become.

It is a truism that one never solves anything by running away from it. Of course, one might also say that one never solves cannonballs by baring his breast to them. But I assure you that if nobody cared whether cannonballs were fired or not, control of people by threat of cannonballs would cease.

Down on skid row where flotsam and jetsam exist to keep the police busy, we could not find one man whose basic difficulties, whose downfall could not be traced at once to an inability to confront. A criminal once came to me whose entire right side was paralyzed. Yet, this man made his living by walking up to people in alleys, striking them and robbing them. Why he struck people he could not connect with his paralyzed side and arm. From his infancy he had been educated not to confront men. The nearest he, could come to confronting men was to strike them, and so his criminal career.

The more the horribleness of crime is deified by television and public press, the less the society will be able to handle crime. The more formidable is made the juvenile delinquent, the less the society will be able to handle the juvenile delinquent.

In education, the more esoteric and difficult a subject is made, the less the student will be able to handle the subject. When a subject is made too formidable by an instructor, the more the student retreats from it. There were, for instance, some early European mental studies which were so complicated and so incomprehensible and which were sown with such lack of understanding of man that no student could possibly confront them. In Scientology, when we have a student who has been educated basically in the idea that the mind is so formidable and so complicated that none could confront it, or perhaps so bestial and degraded that no one would want to, we have a student who cannot learn Scientology. He has confused Scientology with his earlier training, and his difficulty is that he cannot be made to confront the subject of the mind.

Man at large today is in this state with regard to the human spirit. For centuries man was educated to believe in demons, ghouls and things that went boomp in the night. There was an organization in southern Europe which capitalized upon this terror and made demons and devils so formidable that at length man could not even face the fact that any of his fellows had souls. And thus we entered an entirely materialistic age. With the background teaching that no one can confront the "invisible," vengeful religions sought to move forward into a foremost place of control. Naturally, it failed to achieve its goal and irreligion became the order of the day, thus opening the door for communism and other idiocies. Although it might seem true that one cannot confront the invisible, who said that a spirit was *always* invisible? Rather let us say that it is impossible for man or anything else to confront the nonexistent and thus when nonexistent gods are invented and are given moral roles in the society, we discover man becomes so degraded that he cannot even confront the spirit in his fellows, much less become moral.

Confronting as a subject in itself is intensely interesting. Indeed, there is some evidence that mental image pictures occur only when the individual is unable to confront the circumstances of the picture. When this compounds and man is unable to confront anything anywhere, he might be considered to have pictures of everything everywhere. This is proven by a rather interesting test made in 1947 by myself when it was discovered that if an individual could be made to "run a lock" of something he had just seen, run another lock on something he had just heard, and run an additional lock on something he had just felt, he would at length be able to handle much more serious pictures in his mind. I discovered, although I did not entirely interpret it at the time, that an individual has no further pictures when he can confront all pictures; thus being able to confront everything he has done, he is no longer troubled with the things he has done. Supporting this, it will be discovered that individuals who progress in an ability to handle pictures eventually have no pictures at all. This we call a Clear.

A Clear in an absolute sense would be someone who could confront anything and everything in the past, present and future.

Unfortunately for the world of action, it will be discovered that one who can confront everything does not have to handle anything. In support of this is offered that Scientology process, Problems of Comparable Magnitude. In this particular process the individual being processed is asked to

select a terminal with which he has had difficulty. In that the definition of a terminal is a "live mass" or something that is capable of causing, receiving or relaying communication, it will be seen that terminals are quite ordinarily people in the problem category of anyone's bank. The person is then asked to invent a problem of comparable magnitude to that person. He is asked to do this many, many times. It will be found midway in the process that he is willing to do something now about the problems he is having with that person. But at the end of the process a new and strange thing is found to occur. The individual no longer feels that he *must* do something about the problem. Indeed, he can simply confront or regard or view the problem with complete equanimity. Now an almost mystic quality enters this when it is discovered that the problem in the physical universe about which he has been worried often ceases to exist out there. In other words, the handling of a problem seems to be simply the increase of ability to confront the problem and when the problem can be totally confronted it no longer exists. This is strange and miraculous.

It is hard to believe that an individual who has a drunken husband could cure that individual of drink simply by processing out the problem of having a drunken husband, and yet this has occurred. I am not saying here that all the problems of the world could be vanquished simply by running Problems of Comparable Magnitude on a few people, but neither am I saying that all the problems of the world could not be handled by Problems of Comparable Magnitude on a few people, and indeed I am at this time undertaking an experiment in this direction on the subject of the atomic bomb. It is an oddity that the longer this experiment is continued, the less responsive these bombs are to test firing.

Perhaps it could be said, however, that if there existed one person in the entire universe who could confront the entire universe, the problems of the universe for all would deintensify enormously.

Man's difficulties are a compound of his cowardices. To have difficulties in life, all it is necessary to do is to start running away from the business of living-ness. After that, problems of unsolvable magnitude are assured. When individuals are restrained from confronting life, they accrue a vast ability to have difficulties with it.

There are many other things about confronting which are intensely interesting, but these we will take up in a later issue.

An earlier issue of *Ability* carried in it a full resume of Training 0, the name of which is Confronting. This drill, done for a great many hours, will be found intensely efficacious in the handling of life. A wife and a husband whose way has not been too smooth would find it extremely interesting in terms of resolution of domestic difficulties to co-audit with this training drill alone, each one running it upon the other for at least 25 hours. This would have to be done, of course, on a turnabout basis of not more than 2 hours on one and then a switch from "coach" to "auditor."

To run Confronting in this fashion and with considerable gain, it would be necessary to have some understanding of what a "coach" is and, in one of these co-auditing teams, what an "auditor" is. A much fuller understanding of this will be contained in the *Student Manual*. The

team sits in straightbacked—preferably uncomfortably upright—chairs. The coach and auditor sit facing each other a short distance apart. It is the task of the coach to keep the auditor "on the ball." The "auditor's" feet must be flat on the floor, his hands must be in his lap. His head must be erect and he must not use any system or method but must simply confront. A twitching muscle, a jittering finger alike would be reproached by the coach. The coach has several terms he uses. The first of these is "Start," at which moment the "session" begins. Every time the auditor falls from grace, does not hold his position, slumps, goes anaten (unconscious), twitches, starts his eyes wandering, or in any way demonstrates an incorrect position, the coach says "Flunk" and corrects the difficulty. He then says "Start" again and the session goes on. When the person in the role of "auditor" has been extremely successful over a period of time, the coach can say "Win" and then again "Start." When the coach wishes to make some comments or give some advice, the coach says "That's it," straightens up this point and then again says "Start."

In the coaching itself only these terms are employed: "Start," "Flunk," "Win," "That's it." Anything else the coach does or says is disregarded by the "auditor" unless the coach has said "That's it" and has then advised on a point and then has started again. The coach would be at liberty to do anything he wished, short of physical violence, to make the auditor nervous or upset him. The coach could say anything he wished between a "Start" and another command as above, and the auditor would flunk if he paid any attention or did otherwise than simply confronted. Ordinarily all the coach does is make sure that the auditor goes on confronting. That is very adequate for the first 25 hours of confronting. However, it should be understood that the drill can be toughened up considerably. The coach can do anything to throw the auditor off the simple business of confronting. If the auditor so much as twitches a smile, looks embarrassed, clears his throat or in any other way falls off from plain and ordinary confronting, it is, of course, always a "flunk."

It should be understood that *drill sessions* are *not* auditing sessions. In a drill session the entire session is in the hands of the coach, who is only in a vague way the "preclear" of the session. In an auditing session the entire session is in the hands of the auditor.

There is a basic rule here. Anything which the "auditor" or "student," as he is called in the drills, is holding tense is the thing *with* which he is confronting. If the "auditor's" eyes begin to smart, he is confronting with them. If his stomach begins to protrude and becomes tense, he is confronting with his stomach. If his shoulders or even the back of his head become tense, then he is confronting with the shoulders or the back of his head. A coach who becomes very expert in this can spot these things at once and would in this case give a "That's it," straighten the auditor out on it and would then start the session anew.

It is interesting that the drill does not consist of confronting *with* something. The drill consists only of confronting; therefore, confronting *with* is a "flunk."

Various nervous traits can be traced at once to *trying to* confront with something which insists on running away. A nervous hand, for instance, would be a hand with which the individual is trying to confront something. The forward motion of the nervousness would be the effort to make it confront, the backward motion of it would be its refusal to confront. Of course, the basic error is confronting *with* the hand.



The world is never bright to those who cannot confront it. Everything is a dull gray to a defeated army. The whole trick of somebody telling you "It's all bad over there" is contained in the fact that he is trying to keep you from confronting something and thus make you retreat from life. Eyeglasses, nervous twitches, tensions, all of these things stem from an unwillingness to confront. When that willingness is repaired, these disabilities tend to disappear.

Of course, tumultuously married couples may encounter some knock-down and drag-out moments in doing this confronting drill. However, it should be kept in mind that it is the coach in these training drills who is bound by the Instructor's Code and that the only harm that can result would come about if the "auditor" were permitted to "blow" (leave) the session without the coach, even with manhandling, getting the auditor back into the drill. It will be found that these "blows" occur most frequently when the person being coached, in other words the "auditor," is being given too few wins and is being discouraged by the coach. Of course, things he does wrong should be flunked, but it will be found that the way is paved to success with *wins*; therefore, when he does it well for a period of time, the "auditor" should be told so. Go into this drill expecting explosions and upsets and simply refuse to give up if they occur and you will have it whipped in short order. Go into it expecting that all will be sweetness and light and everyone should be a little gentleman and a little lady and disaster will loom.

Neither I nor the management are responsible for cuts, contusions, violent words or divorces resulting from attempts to run confrontingness drills by husbands and wives on each other. May you never be the same.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 4 JANUARY 1973

Remimeo

*Study Series 9*

**CONFRONT**

There are several choices in English on the meaning of "confront." These include the right one: "To face without flinching or avoiding." An example in a sentence: "The test of a free society is its capacity to confront rather than evade the vital questions of choice."

There is another meaning: "To stand facing or opposing, especially in challenge, defiance or accusation."

English is a pretty limited language in many ways. I imagine the thought of facing something (which is what the word came from and originally meant *way* back—"frons" being "face") was so horrifying to the types who write dictionaries they knew it would be bad!

In essence it is an action of being able to face. If one cannot, if he avoids, then he is not AWARE. Awareness is the ability to perceive the existence of. In the dictionary it also fails to confront that and says: "Awareness: the quality or state of being aware." And "aware" means: "Marked by realization, perception or knowledge."

So these chaps couldn't confront and so conceived awareness to be figure- figure.

We are moving out of the range of language when we want to say: "He could stand up to things and wasn't always shrinking back into himself and avoiding, so he could be fully conscious of the real universe and others around him."

And that's what confront means.

If one can confront, he can be aware.

If he is aware, he can perceive and act.

If he can't confront, he will not be aware of things and will be withdrawn and not perceiving.

Thus he is unaware of things around him.

That's the tech of it.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:ntm.jh.gm

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 3 FEBRUARY 1979

Issue II

**CONFRONT TECH HAS TO BE  
PART OF THE TR CHECKSHEET**

The inability to confront is basically caused by withholds, and where a person cannot be drilled into confronting, he has to have his withholds pulled.

That he has committed overts and doesn't want them exposed apparently causes him to withhold his attention, and the result is his ability to confront is lessened.

Also, where a person has overts on a subject and is withholding, he has a tendency to complicate that subject and cannot get down to its basic simplicities. The world looks very complicated to him, probably because his attention is wrapped up in his withholds instead of on his real problems or the subject.

The new discovery here is that a person who has overts and withholds on a subject cannot perform in that area and introduces complexities, for of course they can't confront it.

Where a person cannot take responsibility for his withholds and he is not benefiting casewise from giving them up, he is half-dead as a being. It is a vicious circle: he began to commit overts because he couldn't confront things and then withheld what he had done. He became half-dead as a being because of his overts and withholds. Because he had withholds and could not confront, he began to take heavy drugs and alcohol. These pushed him toward deadness and further worsened his ability to confront and even caused him to commit further overts which he then withheld, and this further deteriorated his ability to confront. And all this traces back to the fact that he couldn't confront in the first place. There is nothing more irresponsible than a dead man. And when confront drops and withholds enter in, one has entered the death slide as a being.

This vicious circle can be handled in processing at various levels and will unsnarl and the person will become alive and able to confront. But the first steps of it, and ones which could carry him well up the ladder, are the drills of the TRs course if done properly and over and over in rotation each time to a win on each particular drill.

Truly, the world begins anew by regaining the ability to confront.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:jk.gm

## **PAB 147 PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN**

The Oldest Continuous Publication in Dianetics and Scientology

**From L. RON HUBBARD**

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

1 November 1958

### **COMMUNICATION COURSE**

I want to welcome you to the Communication Course. It seems that a Communication Course is necessary as the first step to an auditor. And if an auditor doesn't successfully pass the Communication Course, then to the end of any curve he has as an auditor, there will be something wrong with his auditing.

It is very odd that one of the highest levels of indoctrination, Tone 40 on an Object, is most often unsuccessfully approached by a student at the HPA or HCA level when he has flunked the one I am going to talk about right now, which is a newcomer's first look inside the Academy at communication. And that is Dear Alice, part A.

It would have amused you the other day to have found a former Director of Training of an organization being sent back by the HCO Board of Review coach in his coaching to Dear Alice so that he could get good enough to pass Tone 40 on an Object. But it was absolutely necessary that this happen, because he had for some reason or another, being an old-timer and having been in it for a long time, never hit Dear Alice. It had been omitted from his training. In spite of all the auditing he had done and all the experience he had had, at the end of this time we find him sitting up in the coaching room, good as gold, perfectly comprehensible, doing Dear Alice, part A—a man who has probably audited two or three thousand hours' worth. But everywhere he had difficulty with a preclear, that difficulty stemmed from an inability to do Dear Alice, part A, which is in effect to deliver an auditing command in a unit of time as a completed cycle of action—he delivered an auditing command.

Well, now you have to get up to step 2 and even step 3 before you can call it a full cycle of action. But as far as the auditor is concerned in Dear Alice, part A, only, his job is done when he has delivered an auditing command to a preclear. He didn't deliver it over the hills and far away or to the window; he delivered it to a being and he delivered it from where he was to where the preclear was—and it's so easy.

Anyone to whom this was described briefly, insufficiently, out in the street would, flunking it at the same time, tell you, "Of course I can communicate to people! Well, yes! There's nothing to it. I'm a salesman, you know. I run the Atomic Energy Omission. I'm a big man! Of course I communicate to anyone." We look in that man's vicinity and nobody's heard anything he's said since the days of Noah's Ark. He never said it to anybody in the first place. He sort of throws

things out, you know, and he just hopes they land. Well, that's what passes for communication, and it isn't by a long ways—he throws out a statement of some sort or another and he thinks he's communicating with somebody.

It's a great oddity, but I must confess to you at this moment that the dynamic is simply an agreement. It is an agreement which people have agreed to and therefore it has an existence and we certainly cannot live in this world without it, but it's a violation of the communication formula. A violation of it. The only thing that you can talk to in the final analysis is a living being, and all third dynamics are composed of individual dynamics. And you can summate them and you can say this is a third dynamic, and that is the agreement on which we go, and it is quite factual and they are quite actual unless we stress them with the communication formula—so that you don't talk to all preclears, you talk to *a* preclear.

There was a fellow by the name of Franklin Delano Roosevelt that never talked to the nation—he never talked to the nation—he talked to an individual citizen. And therefore he communicated. There was another fellow who spoke the most beautiful English I have ever heard, almost incomprehensibly parsed. Perfect. Would have passed any Oxford English Professor's most critical look, and that was Herbert Hoover. And I don't think Herbert Hoover ever said hello to a dog. I don't think in his whole life he ever said anything to anybody anywhere. And when this man uttered pronunciamentos, they pronounced nothing to anybody anywhere. And therefore he couldn't lead a nation out of a depression. He couldn't lead anything for an excellent reason. He had no concept in the final analysis of talking to an individual, of getting his communication to land right there.

Now this is a touchy point that I open up. You say, "Well, how about you, Ron? You talk to an awful lot of people." Well, that's the whole secret of Scientology—I don't talk to an awful lot of people—I talk to you. I haven't any concept of a large multitude that reads my books or listens to my lectures. I can get a multiple concept of talking to a great many at the same time by talking to every one of them individually. Therefore I perhaps add a little conceit to the line, but I do communicate.

Therefore someone wanting to know how to speak to a crowd would first begin with Dear Alice, part A. So it is very, very far from an unimportant step. It is not just the entrance step that you have to get through to get your Communication Course over so you can really learn something. That is not what it is. It is the first door that opens and that door opens when it opens, and it opens when you can communicate a statement from you to a person. We won't worry about a preclear, because really the person in dummy auditing who is sitting there as preclear is really a coach, you know. But you've got to get something across from you to that person. And it has to be from you to that person—it has to be *a* communication. And when you can do that well, you're all set.

I once told somebody that if he had a very difficult student—not you—but if he had a very, very difficult student, the thing to do with this difficult student would be to put him through seven weeks of dummy auditing and then teach him in the last week to remedy havingness and turn him loose with a certificate and it would be a safe investment. We would be perfectly safe in doing that. But to give him one week when he needed two or three on dummy auditing and then

try to cram him full of data and hope that the processes would carry him through somehow didn't make an auditor; it made a liability—both to himself and to preclears.

So this first step is not just an easy one – it is toughest step you'll perform in Scientology and that's why it's right at the beginning. It's to say something to somebody with the full confidence that they will receive it. And that's quite a trick.

All right. How exactly is this done? We give a person a book. The book is *Alice in Wonderland*. Why *Alice in Wonderland*? Well, that's just because it is. No further significance. We give him this book and he is supposed to find any sentence in that book that he cares to find. (These people who just want to read the book consecutively to the preclear are not doing dummy auditing. They again are not in communication with the preclear.) He is supposed to find a line. Now he doesn't put "Alice said" or "The Queen said" or something like that on the line. He just puts the statement itself, you see. "Why do they run so fast?" Well, the book says, "Why do they run so fast?" the Queen asked." Well, we don't use "the Queen asked." We just say, "Why do they run so fast?"

All right, he picks that up out of the book. Why out of a book? Why not out of his head? Oh, remember. Remember something—in using the English language, you are not using your own ideas; you did not invent the words. You only helped invent the words that compose the English language. You are already using somebody else's ideas. Now there is nothing wrong with your composing these into new ideas of your own, but remember you are already using somebody else's ideas when you're speaking English.

All right. Now let's get it a little bit further. We are given a set pat process. Oh, I know I dreamed it up, I found it one way or the other, but an awful lot of auditors worked with this. It's had a lot of looking at, and it's become phrased in a certain way, and that certain way might very well be taken by you out of the textbook and given to the preclear, and it won't ever work if you do. "Do fishes swim?" is not a therapeutic procedure—it's not. The repetition of it can be very good for an auditor, but it's not a therapeutic procedure. But the statement "Do fishes swim?" is not yours really, at the beginning, is it? You got it from the Instructor or off of a book, and then you used it. Well, when *does* it become yours? Well, any idea is yours that you make yours. We won't go along with dialectic materialism and say that no ideas are new, because that's not true. There can be new ideas. But if you get an idea from someone else, it is not still their idea. It's *your* idea. There is nothing wrong with misowning ideas; there's no mass in them to get you confused. You take an idea out of a book, it becomes your idea and then as your idea you relay it to the preclear. And that is all there is to it. It is coached this way. It is not from the book to the preclear it is from the book to the auditor, and then the auditor, making it his own idea, expresses that idea to the preclear in such a way that he arrives at the preclear. So it's from the auditor to the preclear. But we give him the book as the third via because most of the material he is going to handle in communication is from a source outside himself. You've just got to get used to the idea that there is nothing wrong with using another person's ideas.

I always know what someone's state of learning is in Scientology when they speak of Scientology as "your" ideas. They say, "I've been reading your ideas." I know at once this person can't communicate. It's a great oddity. It's quite wonderful. Because they reveal at once that they

cannot take this first basic step of taking an idea and then communicating it to someone else. They are standing back looking at the world in some large sense and they are not any part of it, because they can't own any of the world's ideas. If they can't own any of the world's ideas, then they won't own any of the world because the easiest thing to own is an idea. No mass to impede it.

So we coach just exactly in this way. We want the person to find a phrase in *Alice in Wonderland* and then, taking that as his own idea, communicate it directly to the preclear and he can say it over and over, the same phrase if he wishes, in any way he wishes to say it, until the preclear (who is really a coach) tells him that he thinks it has arrived.

Now sometimes the preclear, the first day, feels just a little bit strange about these communication lines, too, and sometimes has his entire criticism based upon the erudition, the pronunciation, the way the auditor holds his little finger while he announces the phrase—this has nothing to do with it. It is the intention that communicates, not the words. And when you have the intention to communicate to the preclear and that intention goes across, it will arrive. If you broadcast that intention, no matter if you're saying it in Chinese, if you're a Scientologist it will arrive.

One of the steps of the much higher indoctrination level, Tone 40 8-C, consists entirely and completely of saying things in funny voice tones while one is communicating an intention—using very odd voice tones; well, this is not part of Dear Alice. The voice tones are unimportant; pronunciation is unimportant. It's whether or not the person could take that idea out of that book, own it and then communicate it. And the intention must communicate. And it must be communicated in one unit of time. That is to say, it isn't repeated from the last time it was repeated. It is new, fresh, communicated in present time. The fifty-fifth command of "Do fishes swim?" is the fifty-fifth, not the first repeated. So we have one unit of time, one command, and the intention. And when we have those things relayed across, then he can find another phrase and communicate that. And that is the way we do that, and I hope you find it helps communication.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

Remimeo  
PR Hats D of P  
Hats  
Auditors

HCO BULLETIN OF 25 SEPTEMBER 1971RB  
REVISED 1 APRIL 1978  
**TONE SCALE IN FULL**

***TONE SCALE EXPANDED***

***KNOW TO MYSTERY SCALE***

|                                    |      |               |
|------------------------------------|------|---------------|
| SERENITY OF BEINGNESS              | 40.0 | KNOW          |
| POSTULATES                         | 30.0 | NOT KNOW      |
| GAMES                              | 22.0 | KNOW ABOUT    |
| ACTION                             | 20.0 | LOOK          |
| EXHILARATION                       | 8.0  | PLUS EMOTION  |
| AESTHETIC                          | 6.0  |               |
| ENTHUSIASM                         | 4.0  |               |
| CHEERFULNESS                       | 3.5  |               |
| STRONG INTEREST                    | 3.3  |               |
| CONSERVATISM                       | 3.0  |               |
| MILD INTEREST                      | 2.9  |               |
| CONTENTED                          | 2.8  |               |
| DISINTERESTED                      | 2.6  |               |
| BOREDOM                            | 2.5  |               |
| MONOTONY                           | 2.4  |               |
| ANTAGONISM                         | 2.0  | MINUS EMOTION |
| HOSTILITY                          | 1.9  |               |
| PAIN                               | 1.8  |               |
| ANGER                              | 1.5  |               |
| HATE                               | 1.4  |               |
| RESENTMENT                         | 1.3  |               |
| NO SYMPATHY                        | 1.2  |               |
| UNEXPRESSED RESENTMENT             | 1.15 |               |
| COVERT HOSTILITY                   | 1.1  |               |
| ANXIETY                            | 1.02 |               |
| FEAR                               | 1.0  |               |
| DESPAIR                            | .98  |               |
| TERROR                             | .96  |               |
| NUMB                               | .94  |               |
| SYMPATHY                           | .9   |               |
| PROPITIATION                       |      |               |
| - (HIGHER TONED-SELECTIVELY GIVES) | .8   |               |



|                                    |       |
|------------------------------------|-------|
| GRIEF                              | .5    |
| MAKING AMENDS                      |       |
| - (PROPITIATION-CANT W/H ANYTHING) | .375  |
| UNDESERVING                        | .3    |
| SELF-ABASEMENT                     | .2    |
| VICTIM                             | .1    |
| HOPELESS                           | .07   |
| APATHY                             | .05   |
| USELESS                            | .03   |
| DYING                              | .01   |
| BODY DEATH                         | 0.0   |
| FAILURE                            | -0.01 |
| PITY                               | -0.1  |
| SHAME-(BEING OTHER BODIES)         | -0.2  |
| ACCOUNTABLE                        | -0.7  |
| BLAME-(PUNISHING OTHER BODIES)     | -1.0  |
| REGRET—(RESPONSIBILITY AS BLAME)   | -1.3  |
| CONTROLLING BODIES                 | -1.   |
| PROTECTING BODIES                  | -2 2  |
| OWNING BODIES                      | -3.0  |
| APPROVAL FROM BODIES               | -3.5  |
| NEEDING BODIES                     | -4.0  |
| WORSHIPING BODIES                  | -5.0  |
| SACRIFICE                          | -6.0  |
| HIDING                             | -8.0  |
| BEING OBJECTS                      | -10.0 |
| BEING NOTHING                      | -20.0 |
| CANT HIDE                          | -30.0 |
| TOTAL FAILURE                      | -40.0 |

EFFORT

THINK

SYMBOLS

EAT

SEX

MYSTERY

WAIT

UNCONSCIOUS

UNKNOWABLE

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:ams.dr.em

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 31 JANUARY 1979

Remimeo  
TRs Course Checksheet  
TRs Course Supervisor Hat  
Tech Sec  
Qual Sec

### MOOD DRILLS

Beings can be fixed or stuck in a chronic mood (emotion)—always sad, always angry, always bored, etc. Just in life and livingness this makes them rather hard to live with, but in an auditor it is fatal. The mood of an auditor, particularly if fixed and chronic, can color the session and the results he obtains.

TRs are a matter of sound, not how an auditor feels. When an auditor has a stuck or fixated mood, such as monotony, timidity, dullness, showing up in his TR drills or in session, this can slow up a pc's progress or rough up or upset a pc. The auditor's TRs should sound live and interested and natural.

Mood Drills have been developed to handle fixed, uncontrolled or unsuitable tone levels in an auditor. These drills consist of drilling TR 1 over and over at each tone level of the full Tone Scale (HCOB 25 Sept. 71RB, Rev. 1.4.78, TONE SCALE IN FULL). You start low on the scale and do TRs at each tone level *in that tone*, then up to the next tone, and the next, i.e., TR 1 done over and over at "Dying," then at the tone of "Useless," and so on up the scale. The coach simply has the student do TR 1 at the particular tone level so that the coach and the student are both satisfied that the student has conveyed that tone and the student has a win.

A technical fact is that moods or emotions are usually "automatic" which means they are not necessarily under control but tend to control the person himself. It is as if he is under other-determinism. Technically, you can "take over" the automaticity and put it under a being's control just by having him consciously do it over and over. You can also change a chronic tone level by shifting a person's attention from it by making him do something else. (Ref: *Ability* 36 and *Ability—Straightwire*)

Body position, voice tone, facial expression and attitude are all part of conveying the mood or tone level. For example, the student doing Mood Drills is on TR 1 working on the tone "Anger." He gives a line from *Alice in Wonderland* and it sounds a bit weak. Coach's patter: "That's it. It sounds a bit gentle. Let's get some more G-r-r-r in it. Start." Student repeats the line but smiles a bit, although he sounds more angry. Coach: "That's it. It *sounded* more angry, but you smiled. Do it again—you *feel* angry. Start." Student gives the line again, this time frowning fiercely and in a very snarly tone of voice, leaning forward aggressively. Coach: "Good! Do you feel you did it?" Coach continues until the student is certain he can do it easily. The coach must be able to identify the various emotions, and if he is in question about it, the dictionary should be resorted

to until both student and coach are in agreement on what the tone is or means and that it is being accurately and demonstrably expressed.

A student drilling these must beware of Mis-Us, and the coach must make sure that he and the student both understand each mood (tone). Any moods that are too easy to do should be spotted by the coach and repeated until the automaticity is broken.

If a mood is too hard for the student to master, have him do TR 1 in different beingnesses, e.g., a timid student who is trying to sound antagonistic could be asked to do TR 1 as a panther, a lion, a villain, etc. If you had him do it as a timid bird or some such timid thing that would never be antagonistic, you would probably have your student where he lived. Again, do such things to a student win and don't use it to harass him. The whole point is to get him to do TR 1 antagonistically. These shifts of beingness help to shift his attention to an emotion he cannot easily do.

Once begun. Mood Drills should be continued until the whole scale is flat so the auditor doesn't get stuck on the Tone Scale but can do any mood easily and without strain. When an auditor is upset about his voice, you can have him try speaking melodiously, boringly, enthusiastically, until he can change his voice mood about at will.

Mood Drills should be done when the auditor sounds mechanical or his tone is brushoff, not interested or some set emotion. An auditor can be drilled on assessments in the E-Meter Drill book with Mood Drills when his assessment is dull or monotonous. Any set emotion like "sweet," "light and airy-fairy" or sad, dreary, deadly serious, indifferent can be handled by drilling with Mood Drills.

## **FIFTY-FOOT MOOD DRILLS**

Fifty-foot Mood Drills can be used to cure a fixed mood that doesn't seem to budge with regular Mood Drills. Student and coach go to an area where they can do some shouting without disturbance. The coach and student are at least fifty feet apart and the Mood Drill is done, as described above, at this distance.

Mood Drills are not only fun to do, but also enable an auditor to be at cause over how he sounds in a session, without strain and without his own feelings interfering with the session, and thus to get maximum gain for the pc.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:jk.gm

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Washington, DC

HCO BULLETIN OF 15 SEPTEMBER 1958

**MORE ON TRAINING DRILL TWO**

Avoidance of double acknowledgment is vital if you ever hope to keep pc in session. Double acknowledgment occurs when pc answers up, the auditor then acknowledges, *and* the pc then finishes his answer, leaving the auditor with another acknowledgment to do (and also leaving the auditor with no session).

Wrong:

Command: "What could you say to your father?"  
PC: "I could say, 'Hello.' "  
Auditor: "FINE."  
PC: ". . . Father, how are you?" I could say that."  
Auditor: (weakly) "Good. What could you say to your father?"  
PC: "I could say, 'Are you feeling well?' "  
Auditor: (desperate by now) "GOOD!"  
PC: "' . . . enough to go fishing?' "  
Auditor: "Well, okay, all right. Now . . ."

A pc is not always sure he has answered the question, so he often changes his mind. If the auditor gives him Tone 40 or any ack at all in between a pc's reply, the *auditor* is wrong. You just don't "encourage" a pc with a lot of agreement okays and yes in the midst of answers. The pc answers, the pc is *sure he has answered* and the auditor then acknowledges. After all, it's the pc that must be satisfied.

There are many ways to misacknowledge a pc. But any misacknowledgment is only and always a failure to end the cycle of a command—auditor asks, pc replies and knows he has answered, auditor acknowledges. Pc knows auditor has acknowledged. That is a full auditing command cycle. Don't forget it and expect a process to work, it won't. The roughest spot in most students is TR 2, not so much *how* to acknowledge *but when*.

An auditor running into this with a pc should handle it this way.

Auditor: "What could you say to your father?"  
PC: "I could say, 'Are you feeling well?' "  
Auditor: "Did that answer the question?"  
PC: "Well, no. I could say, 'Are you feeling well enough to go fishing?' "  
Auditor: "Did that answer the question?"  
PC: "Yes, I guess it did. He always liked fishing and sympathy."  
Auditor: (sure pc is through) "Good! What could you say to your father?"

And there's the way of it. If the pc is not sure he has answered and that the auditor has accepted the answer, the *pc will get no benefit from the auditing*. And that's how important that is.

You can always spot a bad auditor. He does two things: He talks too much to the pc and he stops the pc from properly answering.

Add all the above to all training of students.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:md.rd.gm

## **PAB 149 PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN**

The Oldest Continuous Publication in Dianetics and Scientology

**From L. RON HUBBARD**

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

1 December 1958

### **DUMMY AUDITING Step Two: Acknowledgment**

Compiled from the research material and taped lectures of L. Ron Hubbard.

Dummy Auditing, Step Two, Acknowledgment, is the second part of the communication cycle. Now, the actual fact is when you have gotten a thought over to a preclear it is customary to prove it. The whole stress of acknowledgment is entirely and completely upon making sure that the preclear receives the auditor's acknowledgment. That is the entire stress.

Now, why all this stress on acknowledgment? Well, acknowledgment is a control factor. I'll just let you in on a secret right here at the beginning. If you acknowledge a preclear well, you will have the preclear under much better control. Now, why? The formula of control is Start, Change and Stop. And that's just it—an acknowledgment is Stop. If you said to him "Keep going" or "Keep talking," you would not be acknowledging him. The perfect acknowledgment communicates only this: *I have heard your communication*. That's all there is to it—*I have heard what you said*. It signalizes that the preclear's (or person's, since Scientology applies to life, not just to an auditing room) communication to you has been received. But when you use it as an auditor, you use it also as a control factor. And it says this: *Your communication has been received—and that is all there is to it, and that is the end of that cycle of action, thank you*. That's what it says, and you have to put that whole intention into a "Yes" or an "Okay" or anything else you use. It isn't the word, it's the intention that ends it. *Your communication has been received and I have now decided to stop that cycle of communication and your communication is therefore under my control*. Those things which you stop, very crudely, are things which you control. You have to be able to stop things if you control them. If you cannot control a preclear's communication line, you can't control the preclear.

I'll give you an example of this. Let's say we're auditing Mrs. Gotrocks, the wife of the executive manager of Fleabite Dustpowder or something, and she is bored (the only thing wrong with her) and she's crazy (that's the only other thing wrong with her) and she never had anything to do and she's just been lying around and she has ailments. She comes into the auditing room and she starts to talk to you. She says, "Oh, I've been to this specialist and that specialist and it cost this much money and that much money and I've been here and I've been there and what's really wrong with me and what you really should take up is so and so rah rah rah. ..." It's none of your business. The longer you let such a person talk, the less havingness they have. You can watch

them go straight down the ARC Tone Scale if you keep on letting them talk. Obsessive communication—obsessive outflow.

And the first major use that you will make of this, the first time you really understand what this acknowledgment is all about, is when somebody starts this on you and starts talking, talking, talking, talking, and you want to get a session started, and you get the intention real good and you say to them, "Good." And they stop talking. Your intention was such that they knew that you had received their communication. And if you can do this very well, if you can get that acknowledgment just right and if it does exactly what it is supposed to do, very often the person will look at you fixedly and say, "You know, I don't think anybody has ever heard me before." Why is this person talking obsessively? They are trying to make up in quantity what they lack in audience. There's nobody listening to them. They are not talking to anyone. And you all of a sudden come up with an acknowledgment and say, "Hey! I heard you. I heard that. You have communicated to me, and that's it now." And they say, "Wow. I don't think I've ever talked to anybody before." It's quite amazing. I have seen an auditor on an obsessive outflow case get down in front of the preclear, fix him with an eye, move his finger back and forth just in front of the preclear's nose and say, "Good; I heard that," and have the preclear all of a sudden say, "Ooooh. Geeeeeee. You are there, aren't you!" So a good acknowledgment can actually wind up the entire goal of the process and find the auditor—that's how important it is.

Now, that is a specialized use, stopping a compulsive outflow. Its general use is putting a period to the communication cycle. It ends the moment of time in which you gave the command you learned how to give, we hope, in Dear Alice, part A. You said something, the preclear heard it, and we understood then that the preclear had heard it, and we said, "Good." Now the exact way Dear Alice, part B (which is Dummy Auditing, Step Two), is done is this. The coach—or a person acting as a preclear—takes *Alice in Wonderland* and reads random phrases out of it. And, reading the phrase in any old way, we don't care how (we're not disciplining the preclear, you know; we never do that, we merely control them within an inch of their lives), in this particular case this person says something out of *Alice in Wonderland* and the auditor has to say, "Good," "Fine," "Okay," "I heard that," *anything* in such a way as actually to convince the person who is sitting there acting as the preclear that he has heard it.

Now, there is a specific way to do this. That is to *intend* that the communication cycle ends at that point and to end it there. Anything that you do to make that come about is, of course, legitimate, unless it utterly destroys ARC. But it finishes a cycle of communication. So what could the auditor in this case do? You see, there sits the auditor, no book; there sits the preclear with a book; and the preclear is reading, "And the Mad Hatter dipped his watch into the teapot," and the auditor says, "Good." But that ends that, you see. Now, in view of the fact that the preclear is reading a continued story which goes on sentence after sentence after sentence, the auditor will have a tendency to treat this as "in passing," and that is not an acknowledgment. The auditor *could* say, "Well, read some more." That's not an acknowledgment—it didn't stop it, did it? "Continue, go ahead" —no, that's not an acknowledgment at all. An acknowledgment says, "Stop"—"Whoa"—"Air brakes"—"Period"—"End"—"Heard you"—"You've communicated" — "That's the end of that moment of time" — "Final cycle" — "That's it"—"You've had it." You get that?

So the auditor has to say "Good," "Fine," "Okay," in such a way as to receive the communication in the preclear's eyes. The preclear has to know that the auditor has received the communication, and that's the only point on which they are coached— at first.

Then we could start to bear down and say, as an Instructor, "Well, did you acknowledge that preclear's communication? Did you?" And the auditor says, "Well, uhh ..." "Did you do a perfect acknowledgment?" "Well—certainly." And the answer to that would be "No." The preclear is still reading, still got the book in his hands, still going on with it, still sitting in the chair, and he's still not in this universe.

What is this all about? What are we actually trying to do? Well, we are not trying to reach the ultimate in an acknowledgment because that would be the end of the universe. If somebody could say "Yes," "Good" or "Okay" with enough intention behind it, all communications of this universe from the moment of its beginning would then be acknowledged, totally. (Except that this would violate the communication formula because they weren't all addressed to him, although lots of people think they were.) But what does the auditor actually feel called upon to do? Well, he feels called upon to put a period to that cycle of communication. It actually started, you see, with the auditor's phrase to the preclear, then the preclear signified with some kind of wince or grunt or something that it had been heard, and then the auditor says, "Well, that's the end of that. Good. Fine. That finished that." You see?

But an acknowledgment ends the cycle of the communication which you read about in *Dianetics* 55! and that is the Bill-Joe cycle. "Good," says the auditor. This is fantastic. If you got good enough at this, a traffic cop would drive up and say something to you and you would acknowledge the fact that he had spoken and he would simply get back on his bike or go back to the station house and turn in his badge and retire. You see, that would be the end of that. That would be it. As a matter of fact, it actually staggers people to have an acknowledgment come to them—it staggers them, really to get it through. People who are having a hard time, particularly. It's a good thing, and it's very therapeutic for a person to know that he has been acknowledged. I know that you will be around in the local stores, maybe stopping a pedestrian on the street and suddenly looking at him and saying, "Good"—acknowledging him. And you will have some fantastic things occur if you do. An acknowledgment is a very, very powerful sixteen-inch gun in the communication formula; and you shouldn't use it sparingly, you should use it to end cycles of communication. I hope you learn to do that very, very well.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Washington, DC

HCO BULLETIN OF 12 JANUARY 1959

DofT  
Acad Admin  
Ext Course Dir  
Acad Instructors  
DofP  
Processing Admin  
HCO Bd of Review  
ACC Worldwide Instructors  
HCO

**TONE OF VOICE-ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

Mood can be expressed by an acknowledgment. Evaluation can also be accomplished by acknowledgment, depending on the tone of voice with which it is uttered.

There is nothing bad about expressing mood by acknowledgment, except when the acknowledgment expresses criticalness, ridicule, or humor.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:mp.rd.gm

**PAB 150 PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN**  
The Oldest Continuous Publication in Dianetics and Scientology

**From L. RON HUBBARD**

Via The Hubbard Communications Office  
35/37 Fitzroy Street, London W1  
15 December 1958

**DUMMY AUDITING**  
**Step Three: Duplication**

Compiled from the research material  
and taped lectures of L. Ron Hubbard.

This interesting, interesting dummy auditing step has a villainous and vicious goal. It makes somebody duplicate. 'Way back in 1950 we found out that auditors, in order to be interesting, would vary their pattern; and every time the pattern was varied, every time the auditing command changed, the preclear received a little jolt. There was an upset because of it. A long time ago we would have considered it fairly legitimate for an auditor, using the auditing command "Do fishes swim," to say, "By the way, do finny creatures wiggle in the water?"—and next time to say, "Say! Does the finny tribe bathe?"—and the next time to say, "What brands of fishes are there that progress from point A to point B in liquid habitats?" That possibly would have been legitimate then, but we don't do that today. We do a horrible thing. The auditor says, "Do fishes swim?" And just to vary it, he then says, "Do fishes swim?" And just for good wild variation, he then says, "Do fishes swim?"

This is where we learn why we were so insistent on one command in one moment of time back in Dear Alice, part A, because we don't repeat the first "Do fishes swim" another thousand times. No auditing command should ever depend for any of its meaning on any other auditing command ever uttered. Each one exists, theoretically and purely, in its own moment of time and is uttered itself in present time with its own intention.

Now this is quite important. Do you know that the basic auditing process of CCH does not work unless each command is in a separate unit of time? If you run it this way, "Give me your hand—thank you; give me your hand—thank you; give me your hand—thank you," it's not very therapeutic and nothing happens to the pre-clear. Why? Well, we've got a machine which is simply repeating the first "Give me your hand" over and over again. We're not saying it; there's no intention there. Do you know that if you told somebody to give you his hand with enough intention behind it his body would respond without any via through the thetan? The body doesn't obey the words, the body obeys the intention to extend a hand. Therefore, when you are asked to express an auditing command with the same words over and over and over, each time you must express it in present time as itself with its intention. It isn't just a long duplication of it. Just duplicating something over and over and over is sometimes so trying that people wonder how auditors ever arrive at all. Nobody could sit in a chair and say each time with a new intention "Do fishes swim" for seventy-five hours. It's beyond human possibility, according to some

people. But the trick is that if it's always uttered in present time it could be said for a thousand and seventy-five hours. It's only when it is repeated – only when the first command is repeated over and over and when no new intention arrives—that it becomes very arduous. Only when it goes onto a machine does it become almost impossible to do.

Communication is reached by control plus duplication. At first you find that to make each utterance of the command different in its own unit of time you use different voice inflections. But as you come up the line on this, you find out that you actually can pattern the same tone and each time have it entirely new. It would be very, very incorrect to teach this, to have the auditor each time duplicate his own voice tones as they were the last time, because that is making an auditing command depend on the last auditing command. We couldn't care less, and after a while you couldn't care less either, what voice tone you're uttering, but each intention is new and fresh. The intention is to ask and get an answer to this question, "Do fishes swim?" and, each time you utter it, it is uttered newly and in its own area of time. That's really the only stress there is. One command per unit of time. Each command separate and each command containing the words, quite incidentally, "Do fishes swim?"

Here we learn a great deal about the duplicative factors of communication. We find out that, in having to duplicate, we think we actually lose some of the communication at first. It's utterly idiotic—how could you possibly maintain ARC and therefore, of course, interest, asking a person over and over again this silly question, "Do fishes swim?" Who could do this? Well, interest in communication has everything to do with the intention to be interesting and very little to do with text. Furthermore, it is not the auditor's job to be interesting. Being interesting is a part of the communication formula, but to an auditor the least possible part as far as the preclear is concerned. He's not there to interest and intrigue the preclear. Right away people think they are. Place two people in chairs facing each other and each one of these two people feels the compulsion to be interesting to the other. That's not auditing, that's being interesting, that's being social and so on. So if a person had any difficulty doing Step Three, Do Fishes Swim, the Instructor would be perfectly in order if he simply told the person to sit in that chair and told some other student who wasn't doing too well, or just some other student, to sit in the other chair, and told them just to sit there and look at each other without saying a thing or being embarrassed or anything else. Interesting drill, if you think of it. We do have variation, and therefore interest, in the first and second dummy auditing steps; but now we reach this one and it is utterly devoid of interest. We're saying the same thing over and over and over and over. And if a person can't do this, he probably has a compulsion to vary, to alter-is, to be interesting, and he wouldn't find it easy just to sit in a chair and face another human being and not say a word and not do a thing but just sit there and look at the other human being. And if I were coaching someone that had difficulty in repetition of steps, I would do that for an hour or two that day.

All right. It is absolutely necessary that an auditor be able to duplicate. But answer me this: Is a person who is saying something in present time each time really duplicating the last moment of time? He really isn't, is he? And so this duplication that we do in Scientology means only the ability apparently to duplicate while being in present time.

The greatest motto of experience and the life we have lived is this: *I won't ever do that again.* This is the one thing your mama wanted you to promise. If you did nothing else, if you lived a

completely sinful life, why. Mama still wanted you to learn by experience; which is to say that when you did something wrong, or did *something*, you weren't ever to do it again. She hoped perhaps you would eat enough candy to make you so sick that you wouldn't "wolf" candy again; that you would eat enough ice cream so that ice cream would make you so green that you wouldn't make a pig of yourself over ice cream again; that you would become so embarrassed and lose so many friends that you would not do that evil thing again, whatever it was you did; and thus learn by experience never to do it again. And this is experience talking. One thing you must understand—that experience teaches you—is never to do anything the second time. This doesn't necessarily mean that all experience is painful, but people who are having a hard time tend to believe that it is; and when they begin to depend upon experience and stand by this lesson of never doing it again, they can no longer duplicate. And what do you know, they can't communicate. Also, their bank jams. All sorts of interesting things occur. All moments become one moment. One moment becomes all moments. Identification occurs all over the place. And just the action of repeating something like "Do fishes swim?" as an auditor, with a full intention, has a tendency to unjam the time track.

You should know that this is what this step is up against. It is violating all of that hard-won experience that you have accumulated in the last seventy-six trillion years—if you believe an E-Meter, you're seventy-six trillion years old. And all that hard-won experience, all that wonderful, wonderful lot of mess that you got into, added up completely to *Never do it again*. And so you've been taught not to live, which is what happens when you get experience. And when you can duplicate an auditing command over and over again, you will find out that auditing does not become a painful experience. A person who can do this well, by the way, never gets restimulated. Why should he—he's not in the moment of time in which the restimulation took place.

There is a more basic step to this particular one, by the way. This is to pat the wall five times and then distinguish one of the pats from the rest. An Instructor can do that on a student with some profit. Pretty soon the student can tell all five pats apart, and when the student can tell them all apart, even though they sounded all the same, he can also duplicate an auditing command in present time all the way. I've broken cases with that one.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 7 APRIL 1964

CenOCon

*ALL LEVELS*

**Q AND A**

A great number of auditors Q-and-A. This is because they have not understood what it is. Nearly all their auditing failures stem not from using wrong processes but from Q and A.

Accordingly, I have looked the matter over and redefined Q and A.

The origin of the term comes from "changing when the pc changes." The basic answer to a question is, obviously, a question if one follows the duplication of the comm formula completely. See Philadelphia Congress 1953 tapes where this was covered very fully. A later definition was "Questioning the pc's answer." Another effort to overcome it and explain Q&A was the Anti-Q and A Drill. But none of these reached home.

The new definition is this:

Q AND A IS A FAILURE TO COMPLETE A CYCLE OF ACTION ON A PRECLEAR.

A CYCLE OF ACTION IS REDEFINED AS START-CONTINUE- COMPLETE.

Thus, an auditing comm cycle is a cycle of action. It starts with the auditor asking a question the preclear can understand, getting the preclear to answer it and acknowledging that answer.

A process cycle is selecting a process to be run on the preclear, running the tone arm action into it (if necessary) and running the tone arm action out of it.

A program cycle is selecting an action to be performed, performing that action and completing it. Thus, you can see that an auditor who interrupts or changes an auditing comm cycle before it is complete is "Q-and-Aing." This could be done by violating or preventing or not doing any part of the auditing cycle, i.e., ask the pc a question, get an answer to a different idea, ask the different idea, thus abandoning the original question.

An auditor who starts a process, just gets it going, gets a new idea because of pc cognition, takes up the cognition and abandons the original process is Q-and-Aing.

A program such as "Prepcheck this pc's family" is begun, and for any reason left incomplete to go chasing some new idea to Prepcheck, is a Q and A.

Unfinished cycles of action are all that louse up cases.

Since time is a continuum, a failure to carry out a cycle of action (a continuum) hangs the pc up at that exact point.

If you don't believe it, prepcheck "Incomplete actions" on a pc! What incomplete reaction has been suppressed? etc., cleaning the meter for real on every button. And you'd have a Clear—or a pc that would behave that way on a meter.

Understand this and you'll be about ninety times as effective as an auditor.

"Don't Q-and-A!" means "Don't leave cycles of action incomplete on a pc."

The gains you hope to achieve on a pc are lost when you Q-and-A.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:dr.rd.cden.gm

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 20 NOVEMBER 1973  
Issue I

(Reissued from 21st Advanced Clinical Course Training Drills)

Remimeo  
All Levels  
Flag  
Interns  
LRH Comms

**ANTI-Q AND A DRILL**

*NAME:* Anti-Q and A TR.

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

*POSITION:* Student and coach sitting facing each other at a comfortable distance and one at which the coach can reach the student's knee with ease.

*PURPOSE:*

- a. To train student in getting a pc to carry out a command using formal communication, NOT Tone 40.
- b. To enable the student to maintain his TRs while giving commands.
- c. To train the student to not get upset with a pc under formal auditing.

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

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

The coach flunks for:

- a. Any communication not directly concerned with getting the command executed,
- b. Previous TR,
- c. Any upsetness demonstrated by student.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:nt.rd.gm



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 5 APRIL 1980

TRs Courses

**Q & A, THE REAL DEFINITION**

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

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

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

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

Example:

Question: How are you?  
Answer: I'm fine.  
Question: How fine?  
Answer: My stomach hurts.  
Question: When did your stomach begin hurting?  
Answer: About four.  
Question: Where were you at four?  
etc., etc.

The above example is a grievous auditing fault. As each question is based on the last answer, it is called "Q and A." It could also be called "Q based on last A." It never completes any cycle. It tangles pcs up. It violates TR 3. Don't do it. I trust the above handles any confusion on this subject.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:dr.nf.gm

**PAB 151 PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN**  
The Oldest Continuous Publication in Dianetics and Scientology

**From L. RON HUBBARD**

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

1 January 1959

**DUMMY AUDITING**  
**Step Four: Handling Originations**

Compiled from the research material and tape lectures of L. Ron Hubbard.

The fourth thing an auditor has to do (in that order) is to handle an origin from the preclear. It is actually true that when you are handling Tone 40 processes, you do not handle the preclear's originations. But if you will look on the HPA/HCA chart, you will find that these Tone 40 processes are in the minority amongst processes, and *in all processes not Tone 40 a preclear's originations are handled*—remember that. Don't let anybody talk you out of it. If you are handling Tone 40, which is just pure, positive postulating, you, of course, are not worried about anybody's opinion, origin, condition or anything else—you simply want him to do certain things, and he finds out that his beingness can be controlled and therefore that he can control it.

What do we mean by an origin of the preclear? He volunteers something all on his own; and do you know that is a very good index of case—whether the person volunteers anything on his own? An old-time auditor used this as a case index. He said, "This fellow isn't getting any better. He hasn't offered up anything yet." You see, he didn't originate—he didn't originate a communication. Do you know that that is the hardest thing to get an organization to do: to originate a communication?

You actually could work in the direction of getting a preclear to originate a communication, in spite of the fact that you just previously were running him on Tone 40 processes. He originated the communication that his arms and legs felt like they were just going to fall off, and you said, "Give me your hand—thank you." Preclear says, "My head's coming off now! I know it's going to fall on the floor!" Auditor: "Give me your hand—thank you." Good Tone 40. But on control of person, the first two processes are Tone 40, but Book Mimicry and the next process up the line from it, Hand Space Mimicry, are not Tone 40, and originations by the preclear are not only handled but encouraged. So remember that we have not lost out of the galaxy of processes the fact that the preclear is as well as he can originate a communication. That means he can stand at cause on the communication formula. And that is a desirable point for him to reach. You see, in controlling people we are really only showing them that they can be controlled, that it is possible for their possessions to be controlled. And then they eventually decide that these are controllable and that people are controllable and that things are controllable and their bodies are controllable, and they say, "Wonderful! Look, I'll try!" And before that they didn't even try.

So we are controlling a person's possessions or body only until this person then himself decides to take a hand in it, too. And then he finds out that control is possible. But most people don't originate. Circuits originate, computers originate, compulsive outflows originate. And when you first start to use Tone 40 on a person, you will apparently see originations—but they are not originations, they are restimulations being dramatized. There is a big difference between a restimulation being dramatized and an origination. It's whether or not the thetan said it. Did *he* say it, or was it just a circuit starting up? Well, you can start up circuits and actually throw them into being and you will see that these are not originations.

But when an origination appears in anything but a Tone 40 process, you handle it. And you must handle it well and conclusively. There are preclears who have had astonishing things happen to them, who have tried to communicate them to the auditor, who have failed to do so and have then sunk into apathy and just gone right on out of session because their communication origination was not handled properly by the auditor. There are instances of this, and many of them. Tone 40 processes do not particularly violate this. An understanding of what they are takes place rather rapidly with the preclear and he doesn't expect you to. But if he has graduated into being a human being and he's getting up there and he originates something and you answer it, now he's liable to say the most astonishing things to you. And if you don't handle them, he's liable to drop into apathy about the whole thing.

So you must handle them well because they're always unexpected. I would say that unexpectedness actually should be part of the definition of an origination, because they are quite often completely off the subject, they take you completely by surprise, they are apparently not at all what you expected him to say. The fellow says, "Huh! I'm eight feet back of my head!" Well, what do you do? In the old days, we might have gone right onto Route One, but we don't today—we handle the origination. (By the way, this used to be an old technical phrase, "He Q-and-Aed." In other words, he did what the preclear did. Any time the preclear changed, the auditor changed. That is the deadliest crime in auditing. The preclear changes because he is being processed and the auditor changes the process. Q and A—the preclear changed, the auditor changed. Well, that isn't what you do.) He says, "You know, the whole back of my head feels like it's on fire." Once upon a time we might have handled this. We might have gone right in there and said, "Oh, that's very good." We had finally gotten a somatic on this fellow and we would have handled it in some fashion or other and questioned him about it and audited it, and so on. But we found out that this stuck people on the time track. Therefore, we do not do that any more. So what do we do when he says, "The back of my head is on fire!"—do we ignore it? Well, if we are running Tone 40 processes, we ignore it. But if we are auditing any other process, of which there are many in CCH, we *handle the origin*. And an auditor who has not been trained to do this will often find himself very embarrassed.

But how about in the walk-away world—the world that is ambulant and moving around and spinning quietly, or noisily, as the case may be? Do you ever have to handle an origin in it? Well, I dare say that every argument you have ever got into was because you did not handle an origin. Every time you have ever got into trouble with anybody, you can trace it back along the line you didn't handle. If a person walks in and says, "Whee! I've just passed with the highest mark in the whole school," and you say, "I'm awfully hungry, shouldn't we go out and eat?" you'll find yourself in a fight. He feels ignored. He originated a communication to have you prove to him

that he was there and he was solid. Most little kiddies get frantic about their parents when their parents don't handle their originations properly. Handling an origination merely tells the person, "All right, I heard it, you're there." You might say it is a form of acknowledgment, but it's not; it is the communication formula in reverse. But the auditor is still in control if he handles the origin—otherwise, the communication formula goes out of his control and he is at effect-point, no longer at cause-point. An auditor continues at cause-point.

So let's look this over. The handling of an origin has a great deal of use and, until recently, it was the least pat step in Scientology. How did you handle an origin? And we finally found out. I finally had a cognition myself. I tried for a long time to communicate this to people and they still blundered on it occasionally. And I finally found out something that did seem to communicate. There are three steps in handling an origin. Here is the setup: The preclear is sitting in the chair and the auditor is sitting across from the preclear, and the auditor is saying, "Do fishes swim?" or "Do birds fly?" and the preclear says, "Yes." Here is the factor, now, entering: "Do fishes swim?" The preclear doesn't answer *Do fishes swim*, the preclear says, "You know—your dress is on fire," or "I'm eight feet back of my head," or "Is it true that all cats weigh 1.8 kilograms?" You see, wog, wog—where did this come from? Well, although it is usually circuitry or something like that at work when it's that far off beam, it is, nevertheless, an origin. How do you handle it? Well, you don't want the preclear to go out of session, and he would if you handled it wrongly, so (1) you answer it; (2) you maintain ARC (you don't spend any time at it, but you just maintain ARC); and (3) you get the preclear back on the process. One, two, three. And if you spend too much time in (2), you'll be doing wrong.

What is an origin? All right, he says, "I'm eight feet back of my head." It's an origin; what are you supposed to do with it? Well, you're supposed to answer it. In this particular case, you would say to him something in the order of, "You are?" (You mean something like, "I've heard the communication—it's made an effect on me.") Now, in maintaining ARC you can skimp that second one *if you* handle the third one expertly enough. The least important one is the second one, but the most deadly thing you can do is utterly to neglect the second one of maintaining ARC. That's deadly. But you can skip it if you really punch it into the third one, which is to say, get him back into session. So he says, "I'm eight feet back of my head," and you say, "YOU ARE???" (What he said really hit, you know.) He's kind of wog- wog about this—he's not sure what this is all about. You say, "You are?" and the fellow says, "Yes."

"Well!" you say. "What did I say that made that happen?"

"Oh, you said 'Do birds fly,' and I thought of myself as a bird and I guess that's the way it is, but I am eight feet back of my head."

"Well, that's pretty routine," you say—reassure him, maintain the ARC. "Now, what was that auditing question?"

"Oh, you asked me 'Do birds fly?'" "And you say, "That's right. Do birds fly?" Back in session, you see.

You can't do this: You can't put it into a can and put a label on it and say *This is how you do it always*, because it's always something peculiar; but you can say these three steps are followed.

I will give you another example. You say, "Do birds fly?" and he says, "I have a blinding headache."

"You do?" you say. "Is it bothering you (that's the ARC) too much to carry on with the session (and you've reached number three at once)?"

"Oh no—it's pretty bad though."

"Well, let's go on with this, shall we?" you say. "Maybe it'll do something with it (maintaining ARC)."

He says, "Well, all right," and you're right back onto it again: "Do birds fly?" One of the trickiest of these is "What in my question reminded you of that?" The fellow says, "Well, so and so," and he explains it to you and you say, "Well, good. Do birds fly?" and you're right back in session again.

Three parts, and—that is the important thing—you have to learn how to handle these things.

At the same time that we are doing this, we can get much more complicated, particularly toward the end of the session, by just trying out a communication bridge. A communication bridge from "Do birds fly" to "Do fishes swim" and from "Do fishes swim" back to "Do birds fly." A communication bridge is a very easy thing. It simply closes off the process you were running, maintains ARC and opens up the new process on which you are about to embark. If you could look at it as two V's, the points facing each other, with a line between the bottoms of the two V's, you would see that one process, which you have been running, is closed on down to nothing, easily, by gradients. You say, "How about running this just three or four more times and then we'll quit—okay?" We give him warning, you see, that we're closing the process off, and we do run it three or four more times. Then we say, "How are you doing?" (We never ask people, by the way, "How do you feel?" — this as-is-es havingness.) We say, "How are you doing?" and he says, "Oh, not too badly," and so on. "Well, did anything happen there while we were running 'Do fishes swim'?" And he says, "I don't know. I got a little bit of reality—I felt like a fish for a couple of moments there." Auditor says, "How do you feel about that?" and so on. "Is it okay? Are you doing all right now?" The preclear says, "Not too badly." You say, "Well, let's go over onto 'Do birds fly?' It's an interesting process and it just goes like this—I ask you, 'Do birds fly?' and you answer me. How about running that?" and he says, "Well all right, okay." You establish agreement again and away we go. Actually, it is three contracts in a row. The first contract is to stop the process we are running; the next contract is we are in an auditing session, binding this as a continuing auditing session; and the third contract is simply we have a new process we would like to run, and I want your signature on this dotted line that you will run it. That actually is a communication bridge. The reason we do this is so a preclear will not be startled by change, for if we change too rapidly in a session we stick the preclear in the session every time. We give him some warning; and that is what a communication bridge is for.

The handling of origins, however, is most important. Learn how to handle origins and you'll never be taken by surprise by a preclear. You'll be right in there pitching and the session will keep on. I have seen an auditor sit with his mouth open for twenty or thirty seconds after some preclear said something fantastic. He just didn't know what to make of it. Well, you answer it, you maintain ARC and you get him back in session.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 1 OCTOBER 1965R  
REVISED 24 FEBRUARY 1975

Remimeo  
All Students

**MUTTER TR**

*NAME:* Mutter TR.

*PURPOSE:* To perfect muzzled auditing comm cycle.

*COMMANDS:* "Do fish swim?" "Do birds fly?"

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

*TRAINING STRESS:*

1. Coach has student give command.
2. Coach mutters an unintelligible answer at different times.
3. Student acknowledges.
4. Coach flunks if student does *anything* else but acknowledge.

*(Note: This is the entirety of this drill. It is not to be confused with any other training drill.)*

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

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:rs.rd.gm

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 24 MAY 1968

Remimeo

**COACHING**

In order to help you to do the best you possibly can in the course as far as being a coach is concerned, below you will find a few data that will assist you:

**1. Coach with a purpose.**

a. Have for your goal when you are coaching that the student is going to get the training drill correct; be purposeful in working toward obtaining this goal. Whenever you correct the student as a coach, just don't do it with no reason, with no purpose. Have the purpose in mind for the student to get a better understanding of the training drill and to do it to the best of his ability.

**2. Coach with reality.**

a. Be realistic in your coaching. When you give an origination to a student, really make it an origination, not just something that the sheet said you should say, so that it is as if the student was having to handle it exactly as you say under real conditions and circumstances. This does not mean, however, that you really feel the things that you are giving the student, such as saying to him "My leg hurts." This does not mean that your leg should hurt, but you should say it in such a manner as to convey to the student that your leg hurts. Another thing about this is do not use any experiences from your past to coach with. Be inventive in present time.

**3. Coach with an intention.**

a. Behind all your coaching should be your intention that by the end of the session your student will be aware that he is doing better at the end of it than he did at the beginning. The student must have a feeling that he has accomplished something in the training step, no matter how small it is. It is your intention and always should be while coaching that the student you are coaching be a more able person and have a greater understanding of that on which he is being coached.

**4. In coaching take up only one thing at a time.**

a. For example: Using TR 4, if the student arrives at the goal set up for TR 4, then check over, one at a time, the earlier TRs. Is he confronting you? Does he originate the question to you each time as his own and did he really intend for you to receive it? Are his acknowledgments ending the cycles of communication, etc. But only coach these things one at a time, never two or more at a time. Make sure that the student does each thing you coach him on correctly before going on to the next training step. The better a student gets at a particular drill or a particular part of a drill you should demand, as a coach, a higher standard of ability. This does not mean that you should



be "never satisfied." It does mean that a person can always get better, and once you have reached a certain plateau of ability, then work toward a new plateau.

As a coach you should always work in the direction of better and more precise coaching. Never allow yourself to do a sloppy job of coaching because you would be doing your student a disservice, and we doubt that you would like the same disservice. If you are ever in doubt about the correctness of what he is doing or of what you are doing, then the best thing is to ask the Supervisor. He will be very glad to assist you by referring you to the correct materials.

In coaching never give an opinion, as such, but always give your directions as a direct statement, rather than saying "I think" or "Well, maybe it might be this way," etc.

As a coach you are primarily responsible for the session and the results that are obtained on the student. This does not mean, of course, that you are totally responsible but that you do have a responsibility toward the student and the session. Make sure you always run good control on the student and give him good directions.

Once in a while the student will start to rationalize and justify what he is doing if he is doing something wrong. He will give you reasons why and because. Talking about such things at great length does not accomplish very much. The only thing that does accomplish the goals of the TR and resolves any differences is doing the training drill. You will get further by doing it than by talking about it.

In the training drills the coach should coach with the material given under "Training Stress" and "Purpose" on the training sheet.

These training drills occasionally have a tendency to upset the student. There is a possibility that during a drill a student may become angry or extremely upset or experience some misemotion. Should this occur, the coach must not "back off." He should continue the training drill until he can do it without stress or duress and he feels "good about it." So, don't "back off" but push the student through whatever difficulty he may be having.

There is a small thing that most people forget to do and that is telling the student when he has gotten the drill right or he has done a good job on a particular step. Besides correcting wrongnesses, there is also complimenting rightness.

You very definitely "flunk" the student for anything that amounts to "self-coaching." The reason for this is that the student will tend to introvert and will look too much at how he is doing and what he is doing rather than just doing it.

As a coach keep your attention on the student and how he is doing and don't become so interested in what you yourself are doing that you neglect the student and are unaware of his ability or inability to do the drill correctly. It is easy to become "interesting" to a student, to make him laugh and act up a bit. But your main job as a coach is to see how good he can get in each training drill and that is what you should have your attention on; that, and how well he is doing.

To a large degree the progress of the student is determined by the standard of coaching. Being a good coach produces auditors who will in turn produce good results on their preclears. Good results produce better people.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:js.cden.gm

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 26 APRIL 1971

Issue I

Remimeo  
Dn Checksheet  
Sen Grades Checksheet  
Qual Cramming  
HQC Auditors

**TRs AND COGNITIONS**

In the presence of rough TRs cognitions do not occur. Cognitions are the milestones of case gain. Rough TRs, rough metering, out-Code and a distractive auditor then make no case gain.

When an auditor has smooth, usual TRs, does his metering expertly and without attracting the pc's attention, when he follows the Auditor's Code (particularly regarding evaluation and invalidation) and when he is interested, not interesting as an auditor, the pc cognites and makes case gain.

Further, according to the axioms, a bank straightens out by AS-ISING its content. If the pc's attention is distracted to the auditor and meter, his attention is not on his bank so AS-ISING cannot occur.

The definition of in-session is INTERESTED IN OWN CASE AND WILLING TO TALK TO THE AUDITOR. When this definition describes the session in progress, then of course the pc will be able to AS-IS and will cognite.

By *Dianetics: The Original Thesis*, the auditor plus the pc is greater than the pc's bank. When the auditor plus the bank are both overwhelming the pc, then the bank seems greater than the pc. It is this situation which gives a pc a low tone arm.

An auditor who can't be heard, doesn't ack, doesn't give the pc the next command, fails to handle origins, simply has OUT-TRs.

The auditor who is trying to be interesting to the pc, who overacks, who laughs loudly, is pulling the pc's attention onto himself. So the pc's attention, not being on his bank, doesn't as-is or cognite.

The auditor whose metering bypasses F/Ns or calls F/Ns at wrong points, or who tells the pc "That reads," "That blew down," etc., or who any other way uses the meter distractingly (the pc knows when he is being under- or overrun and knows when he is being mismetered) is of course

violating the definition of IN-SESSION. The pc's attention goes to the meter, not his bank, so he doesn't AS-IS or cognite.

Auditor invalidation and evaluation is just plain villainy. It interferes with pc cognitions. Other Code breaks are similarly distractive.

### **A PERFECT SESSION**

If you understand the exact definition of IN-SESSION, if you understand the pc's necessity to have his attention on his bank so as to AS-IS it and work out what is really going on in a session that brings about a cognition (as-ising aberration with a realization about life), you will then be able to spot all the things in TRs, metering and the Code that would prevent case gain.

Once you see that out-TRs, mismetering and Code breaks would PREVENT the IN-SESSION definition, you will see what would impede a pc from AS-ISING and cogniting.

When you have this figured out, you will then be able to see clearly what are IN-TRs, CORRECT METERING and CORRECT CODE APPLICATION.

There can be an infinity of wrongnesses. There are only a few rightnesses.

Recognition of right TRs, right metering and right Code use depend only on:

- a. Understanding the principles in this HCOB and
- b. Their practice so as to establish habit.

This mastered, one's pcs will get cognitions and case gain and swear by "their auditor"!

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:mes.rd.gm

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

**HCO BULLETIN OF 24 DECEMBER 1979R**

REVISED 19 JUNE 1986 TRs

Remimeo  
Course TR Supervisors  
Cramming Officers  
Auditors  
C/Ses

**TRs BASICS RESURRECTED**

*Refs:*

|                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| HCOB 16 Aug. 71R II               | TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED                     |
| Rev. 5.7.78                       |  |
| HCOB 8 Aug. 83                    | CANCELLATION OF ISSUES ON TRs                    |
| HCOB 5 Apr. 73                    | AXIOM 28 AMENDED                                 |
| Rev. 25.5.86                      |  |
| Book: <i>Dianetics</i> 55         | Chapter 7: "Communication"                       |
| Book: <i>The Problems of Work</i> | Chapter 6: "Affinity, Reality and Communication" |
| Book: <i>Scientology</i> :        | <i>The Fundamentals of Thought</i>               |
|                                   | Chapter 5: "The ARC Triangle"                    |
| HCO PL 7 Aug. 79                  | Product Debug Series 8                           |
|                                   | Esto Series 36                                   |
|                                   | FALSE DATA STRIPPING                             |
| HCOB/PL 9 Feb. 79R II             | HOW TO DEFEAT VERBAL TECH                        |
| Rev. 23.8.84                      | CHECKLIST  |

TRs have been under study and pilot for the past year, as just about this time last year it became all too obvious, through review of the video-taped TRs of special corps of auditors as well as those from piloted TRs courses, that students seemed to have become incapable of mastering the TRs.

This presented a mystery, as I have always been able to teach TRs effectively in about a week's time, give or take a few days. Once the student has his basics in, it's done by simply getting the student to DO it, as TRs are neither a "think" action nor a subjective action. They're practical drills on the comm cycle. There's nothing subjective about them. TRs are a doingness.

But we suddenly had entire corps of student auditors unable to master these drills.

What had happened to the teaching of TRs?

A good many months were spent in isolating exactly what had gone wrong, and it has now all been boiled down to a very few factors.

1. Hard TRs had been dropped out.
2. Doing the communication formula in clay had been omitted.

Those were the two major points of change, and when these two were omitted, that was it. That was the end of anybody being able to do TRs. One can't master TRs without familiarity with the comm cycle. One can't master TRs with permissive, pat-a-cake drilling. TRs are gotten in by drilling them HARD.

It is one thing to try to teach Hard TRs to raw public and it is quite another to make an auditor. People studying to become auditors have to be made into auditors. It's all right to teach a mild TRs course in Division 6 and one should, but when it comes to making auditors, there is no substitute for Hard TRs.

Somewhere along the line, doing the communication formula in clay as the beginning part of the TRs course was dropped out. This left the student with no slightest concept of why he was doing TRs. The communication formula is a Scientology discovery, and when you omit teaching it, the student suffers from out-basics. So the omission of doing the communication formula in clay on a TRs course was fatal.

There were also three additional factors found to be further influencing the scene.

3. Student auditors had no real understanding of the ARC triangle. Thus, their communication was stuck because their affinity and reality and, therefore, their understanding were deficient.
4. The lack of a bona fide TRs checksheet had opened the way for all kinds of false data to be entered into the subject.
5. Ignorance of the end phenomena of a TRs course or why they were doing TRs.

The result of this past year's study and piloting and the isolation of these factors has now culminated in a full and final TRs course which will be issued very soon in unalterable book form.

Meantime, this bulletin is being issued as a holding action to make these errors and omissions in the teaching and drilling of TRs broadly known so that they can be remedied at once wherever auditor TRs are being taught.

## OMITTED CHECKSHEET AND FALSE DATA

Since the cancellation of HCO PL 24 May 71, THE PROFESSIONAL TR COURSE, there has been no real TRs checksheet, complete with the basics of communication and the theory of communication, which underlie the TRs. That was a huge out-basic right there. TRs as drills appeared on various checksheets, sometimes with several accompanying bulletins, but omitted was any thorough preliminary in-sequence study of the theory upon which the TRs are based.

Here we had a course without a checksheet, which made it possible for false data to spring in from various quarters. And so it did. It wasn't that people were willfully entering false data into the subject. It was simply that there was no standard checksheet which took the student through the true data, and *only* the true data, on the simple basics (the ARC triangle and the communication formula) underlying the TRs and then the TRs drills themselves. With that situation you can get all kinds of false data coming into an area. And that is exactly what was found. Almost one for one the students coming onto the special piloted courses conducted this past year were ridden with false data, various types of "think" and figure-figure and alter-is of the tech of the TRs.

A number of BTBs and BPLs on the subject contributed to this scene and actually perpetrated out-tech in the area, and these have now been cancelled, by specific title, by HCOB 8 Aug. 83, CANCELLATION OF ISSUES ON TRs, which lists and corrects the outnesses these issues introduced.

A further handling is to give the student the true data on communication and TRs, as covered in the chapters on ARC in *The Problems of Work* and *Scientology: The Fundamentals of Thought*, the chapters on communication in *Dianetics 55!*, and HCOB 16 Aug. 71R, TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED. As he studies this, one then digs up and strips off the false data accumulated on the subject or drill, using HCO PL 7 Aug. 79, FALSE DATA STRIPPING.

Where false data on a subject exists, it hits immediately and directly up against the true data, and until this conflict is blown by False Data Stripping, the person can be untrainable on the subject. Thus, this brand-new tech tool. False Data Stripping, is and has been tremendously useful in correcting TR outnesses and ensuring correct training on the TRs.

It might be noted in passing that the most false subject on the planet at this time is psychology, because the mission of a psychologist is a government one—to make the population into controllable zombies. The subject is being taught earlier and earlier in schools, and a lot of your students and even Supervisors have been subjected to this propaganda and false data about man and the mind. I recall that the people it took longest to get through TRs courses were professional psychologists. The basis of this is false data—they are loaded with it. It is not that psychology teaches anything about communication (they never heard of the subject until we came along) but that they simply have so many false data about life that they actually can't study or drill in a life subject such as Scientology. And you may find it necessary to clean this up. This prevents horrible slows on TRs courses. It's not an action that would be done in the course, of course, but would be done in Review.

## **THE COMMUNICATION FORMULA IN CLAY**

The TRs are drills on the various parts of the communication formula.

This basic datum seems to have become obscured in recent years. It appeared that, to many, TRs were considered to be drills that were done for the sake of doing drills, with only some vague accompanying idea of their actual use or application or how they related to auditing and an auditing session.

The truth of the matter is that TRs are simply the drills that enable a person to polish and perfect his comm cycle.

But if one doesn't know what the cycle of communication is to begin with, if one isn't totally familiar with the various parts of the communication formula, the TRs as drills are not going to make much sense to him. Drilling becomes a struggle because he doesn't even know what it is he's trying to handle.

So one of the first things a TRs student needs is a sound understanding of the communication formula.

The way to learn the communication formula is to do it in clay. That defines it, puts it there in the physical universe for him. By demonstrating the communication formula, all of its parts, in clay, he will actually *see* how it works. It becomes real to him. Now he knows what it is he's drilling.

Unfortunately, with the cancellation of the 24 May 71 TRs checksheet, the basic action of demonstrating the communication formula in clay was dropped out, and with that a real understanding of the use of TRs was obscured for many.

Representing the comm formula in clay is now reinstated firmly as a vital preliminary step to drilling TRs.

## **USE OF THE ARC TRIANGLE**

Even below an understanding of the communication formula comes an understanding of the ARC triangle. Now we are getting more basic.

This turned up as a very interesting technical factor in reviewing countless TR video tapes this past year. It was actually a very interesting technical bug. I studied and studied these flunked video TR sessions to find the common denominator of all of them, and I finally nailed it. What I found was that they were specializing in "C," communication, on the ARC triangle. They were specializing in "C" but what was out was their "A" (affinity) and "R" (reality), and their "C" was being pegged—it would go up just so far—because they weren't anywhere up the line on their "A" and "R."



As a result, they couldn't *understand* anything the other guy was saying. Most of the flubs were on this basis. They didn't have any pc there; they weren't listening to what the pc said; the ARC was out the bottom.

The person gets stuck without full use of the ARC triangle. You can raise the communication level, but then you have to raise the reality and then you have to raise the affinity and then you get some understanding. Only then can you continue to improve each point of the triangle.

On most of those videos, they were stuck with the communication being raised just a bit and that was that, because they weren't raising the affinity and reality levels along with it. So they did not advance or improve.

A handling is to make sure the student gets a very sound understanding of the ARC triangle and its use before he tackles the TRs.

This can be accomplished by having him represent it in clay, using the chapters on ARC in *Scientology: The Fundamentals of Thought* and *The Problems of Work* and Chapter 7 of *Dianetics 55!*

When he knows how A and R and C interrelate and how they're used to bring about understanding, he's then prepared to really grasp the communication formula. And when he has a good familiarity with the communication formula, he can drill the TRs and polish up his own communication cycle and improve with comparative ease.

### **TRs THE HARD WAY**

When TRs the hard way slipped out of use and permissive TRs entered the picture, the results were less competent auditors and less case gain for pcs.

Auditor TRs must be taught rough, tough and hard. This does not mean invalidative drilling or coaching or supervision. It does mean you get the student to **DO** the TRs. He's got to drill the TRs, not figure-figure on them or dive into his case to avoid them.

TRs the hard way means stringent, spot-on coaching and supervision on the proper gradient. Each button found on the student is flattened before it is left. Flunks are given when the student flunks. And when he flunks, he goes right back in again and he drills it until he's got it.

The TRs are taught and drilled per the 16 Aug. 71R bulletin, **TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED**, and per the advices in HCOB 8 Aug. 83, **CANCELLATION OF ISSUES ON TRs**. The student is coached to wins, not losses. You make sure he understands the drill, and after that it's a matter of his **DOING** it. It's a matter of keeping him at it, getting him through it, regardless of what buttons crop up to be flattened, until he's mastered each TR and can handle any comm cycle with ease.

Permissive, namby-pamby, pat-a-cake TRs have no place in the training of an auditor or on a bona fide TRs course. A student who hasn't mastered his TRs won't master any of the training that follows them. The way to master TRs is to drill them the hard way. It is hard TRs that make an auditor. (A more gradient approach to TRs would be taken on the HAS Course where the new Scientologist is getting his first taste of how to handle communication in his everyday life and livingness.)

Given sound training on the basics, ARCU and the formula of communication, with any false data stripped off, and the student then drilled on TRs the Hard Way, to perfection, you'll find he comes through with flying colors to a smooth, flubless comm cycle. And it doesn't take a year or even months to accomplish it.

### **END PHENOMENON OF TRs**

As the students really had no idea of the communication formula as such, due to the omission of the requirement that they do it in clay and learn it, they of course didn't know where they were going. A surprising number of students were heard making stupid remarks like, "I would never use the TRs in auditing," which is about the same as saying, "I would never use food when I eat." Practically no students on TRs courses had any idea why they were doing TRs or what had to be achieved in order to be a finished product on a TRs course. This, unfortunately, included the Supervisors and, of course, the coaches. So one got all sorts of silly, invalidative, evaluative teaching and coaching. If they didn't know where they were going and what the end phenomenon of a TRs course was, of course they couldn't train a student toward it, and so TRs courses which would only involve a week or two, turned into months and months of floundering around due to miscoaching and, mainly, destructive criticism which had no purpose.

Instruction and coaching are not based on opinion. They should be based on producing the end phenomenon.

The PRIMARY VALUABLE FINAL PRODUCT of TRs is:

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

The SECONDARY VALUABLE FINAL PRODUCT of TRs is:

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

The END PHENOMENON of TRs is:

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

That's the EP and that's the direction all instruction and coaching must take. Each TR must be in against the standard above.

As we know the communication formula, and as the TRs are parts of it, the end phenomenon can be achieved relatively rapidly. It is that we know, for the first time in man's history, the communication formula that makes it possible to drill people on it and produce the above end phenomenon. This was a major point that was being missed—that one was trying to produce something. If you don't know what you're trying to produce, it can take forever, can't it?

### **PREREQUISITE**

There is one factor that would effectively block a smooth run through this training, basics or no basics. You're not going to get a person who has been loaded up with drugs to grasp this data and come out the other end as any kind of product until he's had his drugs handled.

You now have the Purification Rundown to handle that, along with Objectives and the Drug Rundown. With this fantastic new rundown, which is an undercut to all training and processing, we have the means to make even the seemingly untrainable trainable.

### **SUMMARY**

I wanted to let you know what has been happening in regard to TRs study and training over the past year and what bugs have now been uncovered. Each of the points taken up in this bulletin have now been solved. You will have a very complete professional TRs course released in book form in the near future.

Meantime, the materials exist and are available on which to train students in TRs and do so very effectively.

Therefore, this issue is your license to include on any current checksheet which calls for auditor TRs the materials and actions covered herein.

The data is being given you for your immediate use. So I'll expect to see you turning out crops of auditors with flawless TRs!

It *can* be accomplished by getting in the five points covered in this bulletin alone.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:dr.fa.sep.gm

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 7 AUGUST 1983

Remimeo  
Professional TR Course  
TR Supervisors  
Cramming Officers  
TR Students

**ROBOTIC TRs**

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

**ANATOMY OF A ROBOT**

It can be said of robots that:

1. They don't know what a comm cycle is.
2. They have never really passed OT TR 0.
3. They have never really passed TR 0.
4. They have never really passed TR 0 Bullbait.
5. They don't do TR 1 in a new unit of time each time they give it, so they all sound alike and they probably have TR 3 mixed up with TR 1, or they are stuck in an unflat 0 series (OT TR 0, TR 0, TR 0 BB).
6. They don't realize their TRs are addressed to the person in front of them but are probably addressed to the Instructors for a pass.

And so, with a combination of the above, these students and auditors will look like robots. They would never get the product of a pc interested in his own case and willing to talk to the auditor. And it's possible that they don't know that that *is* their product.

The point is that it would be almost impossible for any student or auditor to go on looking like a robot if he actually *did* the TRs.

**REMEDY**

The remedy for robotic TRs is to put the student back onto restudy of the basics of ARC and the ARC triangle, the cycle of communication and the valuable final products of TRs. (Ref: HCOB 24 Dec. 79, TRs BASICS RESURRECTED) He then *redrills* the TRs from OT TR 0 ON UP, each one this time to a real pass.

The answer for any auditor who looks like a robot is to do the above steps and fully complete the Professional TR Course.

His pcs will be very glad that he did.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:iw.gm

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 8 AUGUST 1983

Remimeo  
Course Checksheets  
Professional

TR Course TR Supervisors

**CYCLING THROUGH TRs ON  
A PROFESSIONAL TR COURSE**

Cycling through TRs on a Professional TR Course has been given a new definition and action. Newly defined, cycling on TRs means A STUDENT DRILLS THE TRs, EACH TO A PASS, UNTIL HE STICKS AND THEN HE IS PUT BACK ON THE LOWER TR HE DIDN'T PASS. One reason for this is IT HAS BEEN FOUND CONCLUSIVELY THAT WHEN A STUDENT IS FLUNKING ON A LOWER TR, HE CANNOT DO AN UPPER TR.

The obvious handling, then, is to get him standardly through the lower TR and *then* graduate him up to the next one.

Originally, cycling through TRs meant the student went up through the TRs one by one, getting familiar with them and getting a little bit of a win on each TR before going to the next one. Then he went back to the beginning and cycled through the TRs in this fashion again and again until he achieved a full pass on all the TRs. The gradient of toughness was supposed to be increased each time through.

That system, however, opened the door to permissiveness and resulted in students taking interminable lengths of time on TR courses. Permissiveness has no place on any Professional TR Course. Nor does it require months to learn to do TRs correctly.

The time-honored way it was done even earlier when TRs were being rapidly passed was to simply get a student through each TR itself. Students do make it when hammered through each TR in turn until they get a full pass on that TR before going on to the next TR.

That is the rough, tough way it was done earlier with success and it has also proven successful more recently.

There is another vital factor upon which this hinges, however, and that is that the student **MUST** have an understanding of the ARC triangle and the cycle of communication and he **MUST** have done the full comm cycle in clay.

With those basics in and each TR then drilled and passed in turn, we get results.

Thus, we arrive at a new definition for cycling through TRs and we arrive at the following rules:  
ON PROFESSIONAL TRs, DONE THE HARD WAY, STUDENTS DRILL EACH TR TO A PASS, ONE AT A TIME.

IF A STUDENT HAS TROUBLE AND HANGS UP AND CAN'T PASS AN UPPER TR, HE HASN'T MADE IT ON A LOWER TR. PUT HIM BACK ON THE LOWER TR HE DIDN'T PASS AND GET THROUGH IT TO A REAL PASS. HE THEN RE-DRILLS EACH TR FROM THAT POINT UP, EACH COMPETENTLY TO A PASS.

IF STUDENT HANGS UP ON THE LOWER TRs, PUT HIM ALL THE WAY BACK TO RESTUDY ARC AND THE CYCLE OF COMMUNICATION AS THERE IS SOMETHING THERE HE HASN'T GRASPED.

This regimen is simplicity itself. And it works. It is the way to fast, successful Professional TR Courses and auditors with natural, easy, flubless TRs.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:pm.iw.gm

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 5 JULY 1989

Remimeo  
Supervisors  
Cramming Officers  
Professional TR Course

**COACHING TRs 0-4**

*Refs:*

|                                    |  |
|------------------------------------|--|
| HCOB 16 Aug. 71R II<br>Rev. 5.7.78 | TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED                       |
| HCOB 24 May 68                     | COACHING   |
| HCOB 8 Aug. 83                     | CYCLING THROUGH TRs ON A PROFESSIONAL<br>TR COURSE |
| Technical Training Film            | <i>The Professional TR Course</i><br>Number TR-4   |

The subject of coaching is covered thoroughly in HCOB 24 May 68, COACHING, but there is additional data on the coaching of TRs 0-4 which Professional TR Course students and Supervisors should know.

**OT TR 0**

OT TR 0 is mostly coached by the Course Supervisor. It is an actual waste of time to have two students coaching each other on it as there is very little to do. The Supervisor can cover a whole classroom of OT TR 0, simply spotting student twitches, etc., and flunking them. It is very easy—all he does is keep them at it. Even if the Supervisor ignores a person twitching and just insists that the class go on doing it, the person will come on through the TR.

You occasionally get some isolated student who has not passed OT TR 0 even though the rest of the class has gone on to the later TRs. The Supervisor would keep his eye on this student in spite of whatever else he was doing in the room. If the student went to sleep or started boiling off or departed from correct OT TR 0 in some other way, he would be given a flunk and gotten back to doing the drill. With a student who has obviously flunked, it is also up to his twin to assist the Supervisor in getting him through the drill. It is only after a student has been returned to OT TR 0, when the rest of the class is doing something else, that the twin does a lot of coaching.

**"BLINKLESS" TR 0 AND TR 0 BULLBAIT**

When a student gets really good on TR 0, he is said to have "blinkless TRs." However, a blink is not a flunk on TR 0 and "blinkless" is not a requirement. Nobody has a right to put any attention on whether somebody is blinking—it is whether or not he is confronting.

Blinking is really a symptom when one is confronting with his eyeballs.



What is required for a pass on TR 0 is two hours of good, acceptable confront. Totally blinkless, wide-open, staring-eyed TR 0 and TR 0 Bullbait are not a requirement for pass but any truly competent auditor can do it.

**PROFESSIONAL TR COURSE STUDENTS  
WITH NO EARLIER TR EXPERIENCE**

Most auditors entering a Professional TR Course have already done lower-level TR courses, where they learned TRs 0-4 by going through them several times, getting tougher each time. If a Professional TR Course student hasn't done this on an earlier course, he can start his drilling on the Professional TR Course by going through the TRs from OT TR 0 to TR 4 a few times and getting tougher each time, and then move on to TRs the hard way per HCOB 8 Aug. 83, CYCLING THROUGH TRs ON A PROFESSIONAL TR COURSE. This is not the only way for such a student to start off on the Professional TR Course; it is *a* way to do it.

This data should be known and applied by the Supervisor and all students wearing the hat of coach on the Professional TR Course.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

Compilation assisted by  
LRH Technical Research  
and Compilations

LRH:RTRC :rw.sk.gm

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 5 APRIL 1973  
REINSTATED 25 MAY 1986

Remimeo  
HAS Course

**AXIOM 28 AMENDED**

AXIOM 28

COMMUNICATIN IS THE CONSIDERATION AND ACTIN OF IMPELLNG AN IMPULSE OR PARTICLE FROM SOURCE-POINT ACRESS A DISTANCE TO ERCEIPT-POINT, WITH THE INTENTIN OF BRINGIN INTO BEING AT THE RECEIPT-POINT A DUPLICATION AND UNDERSTANDONG OF THAT WHICH EMANATED FROM THE SOURCE-POINT.

The formula of communications is cause, distance, effect, with intention, attention and supplication WITH UNDERSTANDING.

The component parts of communication are consideration, intention, attention, cause, source-point, distance, effect, receipt-point, duplication, understanding, the velocity of the impulse or particle, nothingness or somethingness. A non-communication consists of barriers. Barriers consist of space, interpositions (such as walls and screens of fast-moving particles) and time. A communication, by definition, does not need to be two-way.

When a communication is returned, the formula is repeated, with the receipt-point now becoming a source-point and the former source-point now becoming a receipt-point.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:nt.fa.sep.gm

## Alphabetical List of Titles

Anti-Q and A Drill  
Axiom 28 Amended  
Coaching  
Coaching TRs 0-4  
Communication Course  
Confront  
Confront Tech-Has to Be Part of the TR Checksheet  
Cycling Through TRs on a Professional TR Course  
Dummy Auditing Step Four: Handling Originations  
Dummy Auditing Step Three: Duplication  
Dummy Auditing Step Two: Acknowledgment  
Keeping Scientology Working  
Mood Drills  
More Confronting  
More on Training Drill Two  
Mutter TR  
Q and A  
Q & A, The Real Definition  
Robotic TRs  
Technical Degrades  
Tone of Voice—Acknowledgment  
Tone Scale in Full  
Training Drills Remodernized  
TRs and Cognitions  
TRs Basics Resurrected  
TRs Clay Table Processing:  
Instructions for the Student Auditor

## PRECLEAR ORIGATION SHEET

I have a pain in my stomach.  
The room seems bigger.  
My body feels heavy.  
I had a twitch in my leg  
I feel like I'm sinking.  
The colors in the room are brighter.  
My head feels lopsided.  
I feel wonderful.  
I have an awful feeling of fear.  
You are the first auditor who ever paid attention to my case.  
I think I've backed up from my body.  
I just realized I've had a headache for years.  
This is silly.  
I feel all confused.  
That was a very good session yesterday.  
I've got a sharp pain in my back.  
When are we going to do some processing?  
I feel lighter somehow.  
I can't tell you.  
I feel terrible—like I'd lost something, or something.  
WOW—I didn't know that before.  
The room seems to be getting dark.  
Say, this really works.  
I feel awfully tense.  
You surely are a good auditor.  
That wall seems to move toward me.  
If you give me that command again, I'll bust you in the mouth.  
I feel like something just hit me in the chest.  
You surely have a nice office here.  
I feel warm all over.  
By the way, I won that tennis tournament yesterday.  
My head feels like it has a tight band round it.  
When are you going to get a haircut?  
I seem to see the wall behind my body.  
This processing is worth the fee.  
I feel like I was all hemmed in somehow.  
Who is going to win the Cup Final?  
It seems like I'm as tall as this building.  
This chair is so comfortable I could go to sleep.  
I feel like I could just suddenly break something.  
I keep thinking about that copper who blew his whistle at me this morning.  
I can see facsimiles better.  
Things suddenly look a lot brighter.

Aren't we finished with this yet?  
I feel like I'm floating.  
It looks like the wall is caving in on me.  
That wall looks real thin.  
WOW!!! W-O-W!!!!!!!  
How long do we have to do this processing?  
OUCH! OH, OUCH!  
My face tingles.  
I'm getting sleepy.  
This is the first time I have ever really been in session.  
I'm starving. Let's go to lunch.  
I remember a time when I fell down and hurt my zorch.  
Can I have a cigarette?  
What does this have to do with religion?  
Suddenly, I'm so tired.  
Everything is getting blurry.  
What time do we get through?  
I thought we were going to use Dianetics.  
Is this room rocking?  
How much longer do we have to run this process?  
You are by far the worst auditor I've ever had.  
Your eyes stink.  
I just realized how wrong I've been all my life.  
Do these processes work differently on men than on women?  
I feel like there is a spider's web on my face.  
My left knee hurts.  
I feel so light!  
Isn't it getting hotter in here?  
I just remembered the first time I went swimming.  
My back has been aching like this for years.  
How much do you weigh?  
Are you Clear?  
Can you make your body rise up in the air?  
I kind of ache all over. That's a somatic, isn't it?  
How many engrams have you had run out?  
What is this "assist" I keep hearing about?  
What does Scientology say about ghosts?  
Have you ever seen an Operating Thetan?  
How are you going to prove to me that I have a soul?  
I feel like killing myself.  
How long will it take me to get Clear?  
I just realized how terrible my mother actually was.  
Are you married?  
Hold my hand. I feel so lonesome.  
How many hours have you been processed?  
I feel like I can't talk.

My body is starting to shake all over.  
My ribs hurt.  
I feel just like the time I got run over by that car.  
Everything seems to be getting dark.  
Could we stop and talk for a little while?  
Don't you get tired of listening to someone like me?  
Can you make my hair curly?  
How long will it take me to lose twenty pounds?  
Kiss me.  
You are my reincarnated husband of 20,000 years ago.  
Why are you talking so much?  
That last process isn't flat.  
I'm sick.  
You're dead.  
I'm dead too.  
We are all dead.  
I love death.  
Kill me.  
Beat me.  
No—no, no, no, NO!!!!!!  
Moo Gum Guy Pan.  
Sum Gum War Sue Up.  
Fizzie Wizzle Bum Crum.  
I am going to vomit on you if you don't stop.  
I absolutely love the way you handle originations.  
You are sweet.