

# PTS-SP COURSE

Colour, Print (suitable for print) (CP, Colour, Print)  
Compiled 2. February 2022



### **a) Table of Contents, in Checksheet order:**

1.	65-02-07	KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING .....	1
2.	65-02-14	SAFEGUARDING TECHNOLOGY .....	9
3.	70-06-17	TECHNICAL DEGRADES.....	11
4.	70-10-26	OBNOSIS AND THE TONE SCALE .....	15
5.	60-02-06	EFFECT SCALE .....	19
6.	67-09-18	SCALES .....	23
7.	71-09-25	TONE SCALE IN FULL .....	27
8.	59-12-23	RESPONSIBILITY .....	29
9.	60-01-21	JUSTIFICATION .....	31
10.	60-03-31	THE PRESENT TIME PROBLEM .....	35
11.	61-10-05	CLEAN HANDS MAKE A HAPPY LIFE .....	39
12.	78-12-31	EDUCATING THE POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE, THE FIRST STEP TOWARD HANDLING: PTS C/S-1 .....	43
13.	65-08-07	SUPPRESSIVE PERSONS, MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF .....	51
14.	53-11-15	ON HUMAN BEHAVIOR .....	55
15.	65-09-29	THE CONTINUING OVERT ACT .....	61
16.	66-01-28	SEARCH AND DISCOVERY DATA HOW A SUPPRESSIVE BECOMES ONE .....	65
17.	66-02-05	S&D WARNING .....	69
18.	66-08-25	THE ANTISOCIAL PERSONALITY.....	71
19.	66-09-27	THE ANTI-SOCIAL PERSONALITY THE ANTI-SCIENTOLOGIST .....	91
20.	67-08-15	DISCIPLINE SPS AND ADMIN HOW STATISTICS CRASH .....	99
21.	66-02-00	PSYCHOTICS.....	101
22.	70-11-28	PSYCHOSIS .....	107
23.	65-11-08	SUPPRESSIVES AND HIDDEN STANDARDS .....	113
24.	65-11-24	SEARCH AND DISCOVERY .....	115
25.	66-12-26	PTS SECTIONS, PERSONNEL AND EXECS .....	121
26.	67-03-22	ALTER-IS AND DEGRADED BEINGS.....	125
27.	68-03-12	MISTAKES, ANATOMY OF .....	127
28.	68-05-20	OVERT-MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE .....	129
29.	69-08-16	HANDLING ILLNESS IN SCIENTOLOGY .....	133
30.	72-04-20	SUPPRESSED PCS AND PTS TECH .....	137
31.	72-05-10	ROBOTISM .....	139
32.	71-12-09	PTS RUNDOWN, AUDITED .....	145
33.	72-06-03	PTS RUNDOWN, FINAL STEP.....	155
34.	65-10-14	BRIEFING OF REVIEW AUDITORS.....	159
35.	68-06-18	ETHICS .....	177
36.	68-06-29	ENROLLMENT IN SUPPRESSIVE GROUPS .....	179
37.	68-10-21	CANCELLATION OF FAIR GAME .....	181
38.	68-11-15	CANCELLATION OF DISCONNECTION.....	183

39.	69-05-07	POLICIES ON "SOURCES OF TROUBLE" .....	185
40.	82-04-16	MORE ON PTS HANDLING .....	189
41.	71-08-16	TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED .....	191
42.	73-03-30	STEP FOUR – HANDLING ORIGINATIONS .....	199
43.	79-01-31	MOOD DRILLS .....	203
44.	72-04-05	PTS TYPE A HANDLING .....	205
45.	77-11-11	HANDLING PTS SITUATIONS .....	209
46.	76-10-20	PTS HANDLING.....	211
47.	76-10-20	PTS DATA .....	215
48.	66-08-02	SUPPRESSIVES AND GAES .....	217
49.	74-11-01	ROCK SLAMS AND ROCK SLAMMERS.....	239
50.	76-08-10	R/SES, WHAT THEY MEAN .....	243
51.	64-10-27	POLICIES ON PHYSICAL HEALING, INSANITY AND POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES ....	249
52.	65-04-07	HEALING POLICY IN FIELD .....	255
53.	65-04-05	HANDLING THE SUPPRESSIVE PERSON THE BASIS OF INSANITY .....	257
54.	65-04-05	THE NO-GAIN-CASE STUDENT .....	269
55.	65-08-16	COLLECTION FROM SPS AND PTSS.....	275
56.	65-07-30	PRECLEAR ROUTING TO ETHICS .....	277
57.	65-10-14	POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE ROUTING .....	279
58.	65-12-30	PTS AUDITING AND ROUTING .....	281
59.	67-11-09	REVISION OF REMEDY A, REMEDY B, AND S&DS .....	283
60.	65-12-23	SUPPRESSIVE ACTS SUPPRESSION OF SCIENTOLOGY AND SCIENTOLOGISTS.....	287
61.	65-05-18	ORGANIZATION AND ETHICS .....	297
62.	67-10-01	USES OF ORGS.....	319
63.	67-10-16	SUPPRESSIVES AND THE ADMINISTRATOR HOW TO DETECT SPS AS AN ADMINISTRATOR .....	321
64.	66-03-03	ATTACKS ON SCIENTOLOGY SEX AND ORGANIZATIONS .....	325
65.	71-02-09	EXECUTIVE MISBEHAVIOUR .....	327
66.	72-05-03	ETHICS AND EXECUTIVES.....	329
67.	74-07-22	POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE .....	335
68.	72-05-12	PTS PERSONNEL AND FINANCE.....	337
69.	66-01-21	S&D ERRORS .....	341
70.	66-06-10	S & D – THE MISSED ITEM .....	343
71.	66-07-20	THE TYPE TWO PTS .....	345
72.	72-04-05	PTS TYPE A HANDLING .....	347
73.	77-11-11	HANDLING PTS SITUATIONS .....	351
74.	72-04-24	PTS INTERVIEWS.....	353
75.	73-08-10	PTS HANDLING.....	355
76.	73-12-15	THE CONTINUOUS MISSED W/H AND CONTINUOUS OVERT WITH DATA ON DEGRADED BEINGS AND FALSE PTS CONDITIONS .....	359
77.	72-04-20	PRODUCT PURPOSE AND WHY AND WC ERROR CORRECTION.....	363

78.	74-03-17	TWC CHECKSHEETS TWC, USING WRONG QUESTIONS .....	367
79.	72-04-17	C/SING A PTS RUNDOWN .....	369
80.	72-01-20	PTS RD ADDITION.....	373
81.	72-04-16	PTS RD CORRECTION LIST .....	375
82.	76-07-27	PTS RUNDOWN AND VITAL INFO RD POSITION CORRECTED .....	379
83.	78-12-31	EDUCATING THE POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE, THE FIRST STEP TOWARD HANDLING: PTS C/S-1 .....	381
84.	69-05-07	SUMMARY OF HOW TO WRITE AN AUDITOR'S REPORT, WORKSHEETS AND SUMMARY REPORT, WITH SOME ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.....	389
85.	72-11-06	THE SUMMARY REPORT FORM .....	393
86.	72-11-06	THE WORKSHEETS .....	395
87.	71-11-03	AUDITOR'S WORKSHEETS .....	399
88.	72-11-06	THE AUDITOR'S C/S.....	401



## **b) Table of Contents, in chronological order:**

1.	53-11-15	ON HUMAN BEHAVIOR .....	55
2.	59-12-23	RESPONSIBILITY .....	29
3.	60-01-21	JUSTIFICATION .....	31
4.	60-02-06	EFFECT SCALE .....	19
5.	60-03-31	THE PRESENT TIME PROBLEM .....	35
6.	61-10-05	CLEAN HANDS MAKE A HAPPY LIFE .....	39
7.	64-10-27	POLICIES ON PHYSICAL HEALING, INSANITY AND POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES ....	249
8.	65-02-07	KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING .....	1
9.	65-02-14	SAFEGUARDING TECHNOLOGY .....	9
10.	65-04-05	HANDLING THE SUPPRESSIVE PERSON THE BASIS OF INSANITY .....	257
11.	65-04-05	THE NO-GAIN-CASE STUDENT .....	269
12.	65-04-07	HEALING POLICY IN FIELD .....	255
13.	65-05-18	ORGANIZATION AND ETHICS .....	297
14.	65-07-30	PRECLEAR ROUTING TO ETHICS .....	277
15.	65-08-07	SUPPRESSIVE PERSONS, MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF .....	51
16.	65-08-16	COLLECTION FROM SPS AND PTSS .....	275
17.	65-09-29	THE CONTINUING OVERT ACT .....	61
18.	65-10-14	BRIEFING OF REVIEW AUDITORS .....	159
19.	65-10-14	POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE ROUTING .....	279
20.	65-11-08	SUPPRESSIVES AND HIDDEN STANDARDS .....	113
21.	65-11-24	SEARCH AND DISCOVERY .....	115
22.	65-12-23	SUPPRESSIVE ACTS SUPPRESSION OF SCIENTOLOGY AND SCIENTOLOGISTS .....	287
23.	65-12-30	PTS AUDITING AND ROUTING .....	281
24.	66-01-21	S&D ERRORS .....	341
25.	66-01-28	SEARCH AND DISCOVERY DATA HOW A SUPPRESSIVE BECOMES ONE .....	65
26.	66-02-00	PSYCHOTICS .....	101
27.	66-02-05	S&D WARNING .....	69
28.	66-03-03	ATTACKS ON SCIENTOLOGY SEX AND ORGANIZATIONS .....	325
29.	66-06-10	S & D – THE MISSED ITEM .....	343
30.	66-07-20	THE TYPE TWO PTS .....	345
31.	66-08-02	SUPPRESSIVES AND GAES .....	217
32.	66-08-25	THE ANTISOCIAL PERSONALITY .....	71
33.	66-09-27	THE ANTI-SOCIAL PERSONALITY THE ANTI-SCIENTOLOGIST .....	91
34.	66-12-26	PTS SECTIONS, PERSONNEL AND EXECS .....	121
35.	67-03-22	ALTER-IS AND DEGRADED BEINGS .....	125
36.	67-08-15	DISCIPLINE SPS AND ADMIN HOW STATISTICS CRASH .....	99
37.	67-09-18	SCALES .....	23
38.	67-10-01	USES OF ORGS .....	319

39.	67-10-16	SUPPRESSIVES AND THE ADMINISTRATOR HOW TO DETECT SPS AS AN ADMINISTRATOR .....	321
40.	67-11-09	REVISION OF REMEDY A, REMEDY B, AND S&DS .....	283
41.	68-03-12	MISTAKES, ANATOMY OF .....	127
42.	68-05-20	OVERT-MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE .....	129
43.	68-06-18	ETHICS.....	177
44.	68-06-29	ENROLLMENT IN SUPPRESSIVE GROUPS .....	179
45.	68-10-21	CANCELLATION OF FAIR GAME .....	181
46.	68-11-15	CANCELLATION OF DISCONNECTION.....	183
47.	69-05-07	POLICIES ON "SOURCES OF TROUBLE" .....	185
48.	69-05-07	SUMMARY OF HOW TO WRITE AN AUDITOR'S REPORT, WORKSHEETS AND SUMMARY REPORT, WITH SOME ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.....	389
49.	69-08-16	HANDLING ILLNESS IN SCIENTOLOGY .....	133
50.	70-06-17	TECHNICAL DEGRADES.....	11
51.	70-10-26	OBNOSIS AND THE TONE SCALE .....	15
52.	70-11-28	PSYCHOSIS .....	107
53.	71-02-09	EXECUTIVE MISBEHAVIOUR .....	327
54.	71-08-16	TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED .....	191
55.	71-09-25	TONE SCALE IN FULL .....	27
56.	71-11-03	AUDITOR'S WORKSHEETS .....	399
57.	71-12-09	PTS RUNDOWN, AUDITED .....	145
58.	72-01-20	PTS RD ADDITION.....	373
59.	72-04-05	PTS TYPE A HANDLING .....	205
60.	72-04-05	PTS TYPE A HANDLING .....	347
61.	72-04-16	PTS RD CORRECTION LIST .....	375
62.	72-04-17	C/SING A PTS RUNDOWN .....	369
63.	72-04-20	PRODUCT PURPOSE AND WHY AND WC ERROR CORRECTION.....	363
64.	72-04-20	SUPPRESSED PCS AND PTS TECH .....	137
65.	72-04-24	PTS INTERVIEWS.....	353
66.	72-05-03	ETHICS AND EXECUTIVES.....	329
67.	72-05-10	ROBOTISM.....	139
68.	72-05-12	PTS PERSONNEL AND FINANCE.....	337
69.	72-06-03	PTS RUNDOWN, FINAL STEP .....	155
70.	72-11-06	THE AUDITOR'S C/S.....	401
71.	72-11-06	THE SUMMARY REPORT FORM .....	393
72.	72-11-06	THE WORKSHEETS .....	395
73.	73-03-30	STEP FOUR – HANDLING ORIGINATIONS .....	199
74.	73-08-10	PTS HANDLING.....	355
75.	73-12-15	THE CONTINUOUS MISSED W/H AND CONTINUOUS OVERT WITH DATA ON DEGRADED BEINGS AND FALSE PTS CONDITIONS .....	359
76.	74-03-17	TWC CHECKSHEETS TWC, USING WRONG QUESTIONS .....	367
77.	74-07-22	POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE .....	335

78.	74-11-01	ROCK SLAMS AND ROCK SLAMMERS.....	239
79.	76-07-27	PTS RUNDOWN AND VITAL INFO RD POSITION CORRECTED .....	379
80.	76-08-10	R/SES, WHAT THEY MEAN.....	243
81.	76-10-20	PTS DATA .....	215
82.	76-10-20	PTS HANDLING.....	211
83.	77-11-11	HANDLING PTS SITUATIONS .....	209
84.	77-11-11	HANDLING PTS SITUATIONS .....	351
85.	78-12-31	EDUCATING THE POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE, THE FIRST STEP TOWARD HANDLING: PTS C/S-1 .....	43
86.	78-12-31	EDUCATING THE POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE, THE FIRST STEP TOWARD HANDLING: PTS C/S-1 .....	381
87.	79-01-31	MOOD DRILLS .....	203
88.	82-04-16	MORE ON PTS HANDLING .....	189



### **c) Table of Contents, in alphabetical order:**

1.	67-03-22	ALTER-IS AND DEGRADED BEINGS.....	125
2.	66-03-03	ATTACKS ON SCIENTOLOGY SEX AND ORGANIZATIONS .....	325
3.	71-11-03	AUDITOR'S WORKSHEETS .....	399
4.	65-10-14	BRIEFING OF REVIEW AUDITORS.....	159
5.	72-04-17	C/SING A PTS RUNDOWN .....	369
6.	68-11-15	CANCELLATION OF DISCONNECTION.....	183
7.	68-10-21	CANCELLATION OF FAIR GAME .....	181
8.	61-10-05	CLEAN HANDS MAKE A HAPPY LIFE .....	39
9.	65-08-16	COLLECTION FROM SPS AND PTSS.....	275
10.	67-08-15	DISCIPLINE SPS AND ADMIN HOW STATISTICS CRASH .....	99
11.	78-12-31	EDUCATING THE POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE, THE FIRST STEP TOWARD HANDLING: PTS C/S-1 .....	43
12.	78-12-31	EDUCATING THE POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE, THE FIRST STEP TOWARD HANDLING: PTS C/S-1 .....	381
13.	60-02-06	EFFECT SCALE .....	19
14.	68-06-29	ENROLLMENT IN SUPPRESSIVE GROUPS .....	179
15.	72-05-03	ETHICS AND EXECUTIVES.....	329
16.	68-06-18	ETHICS.....	177
17.	71-02-09	EXECUTIVE MISBEHAVIOUR .....	327
18.	69-08-16	HANDLING ILLNESS IN SCIENTOLOGY .....	133
19.	77-11-11	HANDLING PTS SITUATIONS .....	209
20.	77-11-11	HANDLING PTS SITUATIONS .....	351
21.	65-04-05	HANDLING THE SUPPRESSIVE PERSON THE BASIS OF INSANITY .....	257
22.	65-04-07	HEALING POLICY IN FIELD .....	255
23.	60-01-21	JUSTIFICATION .....	31
24.	65-02-07	KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING.....	1
25.	68-03-12	MISTAKES, ANATOMY OF .....	127
26.	79-01-31	MOOD DRILLS .....	203
27.	82-04-16	MORE ON PTS HANDLING .....	189
28.	70-10-26	OBNOSIS AND THE TONE SCALE .....	15
29.	53-11-15	ON HUMAN BEHAVIOR.....	55
30.	65-05-18	ORGANIZATION AND ETHICS .....	297
31.	68-05-20	OVERT-MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE .....	129
32.	69-05-07	POLICIES ON "SOURCES OF TROUBLE" .....	185
33.	64-10-27	POLICIES ON PHYSICAL HEALING, INSANITY AND POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES ....	249
34.	65-10-14	POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE ROUTING .....	279
35.	74-07-22	POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE.....	335
36.	65-07-30	PRECLEAR ROUTING TO ETHICS .....	277
37.	72-04-20	PRODUCT PURPOSE AND WHY AND WC ERROR CORRECTION.....	363
38.	70-11-28	PSYCHOSIS .....	107

39.	66-02-00	PSYCHOTICS.....	101
40.	65-12-30	PTS AUDITING AND ROUTING.....	281
41.	76-10-20	PTS DATA .....	215
42.	76-10-20	PTS HANDLING.....	211
43.	73-08-10	PTS HANDLING.....	355
44.	72-04-24	PTS INTERVIEWS.....	353
45.	72-05-12	PTS PERSONNEL AND FINANCE.....	337
46.	72-01-20	PTS RD ADDITION.....	373
47.	72-04-16	PTS RD CORRECTION LIST .....	375
48.	76-07-27	PTS RUNDOWN AND VITAL INFO RD POSITION CORRECTED .....	379
49.	71-12-09	PTS RUNDOWN, AUDITED .....	145
50.	72-06-03	PTS RUNDOWN, FINAL STEP.....	155
51.	66-12-26	PTS SECTIONS, PERSONNEL AND EXECS.....	121
52.	72-04-05	PTS TYPE A HANDLING.....	205
53.	72-04-05	PTS TYPE A HANDLING.....	347
54.	76-08-10	R/SES, WHAT THEY MEAN.....	243
55.	59-12-23	RESPONSIBILITY.....	29
56.	67-11-09	REVISION OF REMEDY A, REMEDY B, AND S&DS .....	283
57.	72-05-10	ROBOTISM.....	139
58.	74-11-01	ROCK SLAMS AND ROCK SLAMMERS.....	239
59.	66-06-10	S & D – THE MISSED ITEM .....	343
60.	66-01-21	S&D ERRORS .....	341
61.	66-02-05	S&D WARNING .....	69
62.	65-02-14	SAFEGUARDING TECHNOLOGY .....	9
63.	67-09-18	SCALES.....	23
64.	66-01-28	SEARCH AND DISCOVERY DATA HOW A SUPPRESSIVE BECOMES ONE .....	65
65.	65-11-24	SEARCH AND DISCOVERY.....	115
66.	73-03-30	STEP FOUR – HANDLING ORIGINATIONS .....	199
67.	69-05-07	SUMMARY OF HOW TO WRITE AN AUDITOR'S REPORT, WORKSHEETS AND SUMMARY REPORT, WITH SOME ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.....	389
68.	72-04-20	SUPPRESSED PCS AND PTS TECH.....	137
69.	65-12-23	SUPPRESSIVE ACTS SUPPRESSION OF SCIENTOLOGY AND SCIENTOLOGISTS.....	287
70.	65-08-07	SUPPRESSIVE PERSONS, MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF.....	51
71.	66-08-02	SUPPRESSIVES AND GAES.....	217
72.	65-11-08	SUPPRESSIVES AND HIDDEN STANDARDS .....	113
73.	67-10-16	SUPPRESSIVES AND THE ADMINISTRATOR HOW TO DETECT SPS AS AN ADMINISTRATOR .....	321
74.	70-06-17	TECHNICAL DEGRADES.....	11
75.	65-04-05	THE NO-GAIN-CASE STUDENT.....	269
76.	66-09-27	THE ANTI-SOCIAL PERSONALITY THE ANTI-SCIENTOLOGIST .....	91
77.	66-08-25	THE ANTISOCIAL PERSONALITY.....	71

78.	72-11-06	THE AUDITOR'S C/S.....	401
79.	65-09-29	THE CONTINUING OVERT ACT.....	61
80.	73-12-15	THE CONTINUOUS MISSED W/H AND CONTINUOUS OVERT WITH DATA ON DEGRADED BEINGS AND FALSE PTS CONDITIONS.....	359
81.	60-03-31	THE PRESENT TIME PROBLEM.....	35
82.	72-11-06	THE SUMMARY REPORT FORM.....	393
83.	66-07-20	THE TYPE TWO PTS.....	345
84.	72-11-06	THE WORKSHEETS.....	395
85.	71-09-25	TONE SCALE IN FULL.....	27
86.	71-08-16	TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED.....	191
87.	74-03-17	TWC CHECKSHEETS TWC, USING WRONG QUESTIONS.....	367
88.	67-10-01	USES OF ORGS.....	319



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 FEBRUARY 1965  
Reissued 15 June 1970

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

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

*ALL LEVELS*

**KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING**

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

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

The only thing now is getting the technology applied.

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

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

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

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

Getting the correct technology applied consists of:

- One: Having the correct technology.
- Two: Knowing the technology.
- Three: Knowing it is correct.
- Four: Teaching correctly the correct technology.
- Five: Applying the technology.
- Six: Seeing that the technology is correctly applied.
- Seven: Hammering out of existence incorrect technology.
- Eight: Knocking out incorrect applications.
- Nine: Closing the door on any possibility of incorrect technology.
- Ten: Closing the door on incorrect application.

One above has been done.

Two has been achieved by many.

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

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

Five is consistently accomplished daily.

Six is achieved by instructors and supervisors consistently.

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

Eight is not worked on hard enough.

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

Ten is seldom done with enough ferocity.

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

The reasons for this are not hard to find. (a) A weak certainty that it works in Three above can lead to weakness in Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten. (b) Further, the not-too-bright have a bad point on the button Self-Importance. (c) The lower the IQ, the more the individual is shut off from the fruits of observation. (d) The service 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 South East Asian jungles with stone idols and corpses, and democracy has given us inflation and income tax.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Do them and we'll win.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

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



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

Remimeo  
All Hats  
BPI

## SAFEGUARDING TECHNOLOGY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Squirreling is today destructive of a workable system.

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

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:jw.jp.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 17 JUNE 1970R  
Revised 9 April 1977

(Revision in this type style)

Remimeo  
Applies to all SHs and  
Academies  
HGCs  
Franchises

**URGENT AND IMPORTANT**

**TECHNICAL DEGRADES**

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Abbreviating an official course in Dianetics and Scientology so as to lose the full theory, processes and effectiveness of the subjects.
2. Adding comments to checksheets or instructions labeling any material "background" or "not used now" or "old" or any similar action which will result in the student not knowing, using, and applying the data in which he is being trained.
3. Employing after 1 Sept 1970 any checksheet for any course not authorized by myself and the SO Organizing Bureau Flag.
4. Failing to strike from any checksheet remaining in use meanwhile any such comments as "historical", "background", "not used", "old", etc. or **verbally stating it to students**.

5. Permitting a pc to attest to more than one grade at a time on the pc's own determinism without hint or evaluation.
6. Running only one process for a lower grade between 0 to IV, where the grade EP has not been attained.
7. Failing to use all processes for a level where the EP has not been attained.
8. Boasting as to speed of delivery in a session, such as "I put in grade zero in three minutes." etc.
9. Shortening time of application of auditing for financial or laborsaving considerations.
10. Acting in any way calculated to lose the technology of Dianetics and Scientology to use or impede its use or shorten its materials or its application.

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

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

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

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


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

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

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:nt.rd.lf.jg

# HUBBARD CHART OF ATTITUDES





HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 26 OCTOBER 1970  
Issue III  
Reissued 19 September 1974

Remimeo  
Students  
Course Super's Hat  
Auditor's Hat

## **OBNOSIS AND THE TONE SCALE**

The following is extracted from the Advanced Clinical Course Preparatory Manual for Advanced Students in Scientology. It was published in 1957.

### **OBNOSIS AND THE TONE SCALE**

Somewhere in your possession, in your desk, or tucked into a bookcase, are two large pieces of paper. They are covered closely with data invaluable to an Auditor. You have pored over them, and quoted from them many, many times. They are, of course, the Chart of Human Evaluation and the Chart of Attitudes. The data in them is a large part of an Auditor's stock in trade, and every Auditor in the world is, in some degree, familiar with them.

But how about getting the data off the charts and applying it to life, to some real person? It's not hard to do casually, for some acute tone. "Joe was on a 1.5 kick last night." Sure, he turned red as a beet, and threw a book at your head. Simple. Mary breaks into sobs, and grabs for the Kleenex. Couple of Auditors on the scene exchange looks, nod sagely. "Hmm. Grief!" But how about chronic tone, with that thin, shiny veneer of social tone slicked over it? How sharp and how certain are you about that? Now, take a pc that you are familiar with. What, exactly, is his chronic tone? If you don't know, you had better read on. If you do, read on, and learn more about it.

The title of this article starts with an odd word: obnosis. It's been put together from the phrase, "observing the obvious". The art of observing the obvious is strenuously neglected in our society at this time. Pity. It's the only way you ever see anything; you observe the obvious. You look at the isness of something, at what is actually there. Fortunately for us, the ability to obnose is not in any sense "inborn" or mystical. But it is being taught that way by people outside of Scientology.

How do you teach somebody to see what is there? Well, you put up something for him to look at, and have him tell you what he sees. That is what is done in an ACC class, the earlier in the course, the better. A student is asked to stand up in the front of the classroom and be looked at by the rest of the students. An instructor stands by, and keeps asking, "What do you see?" The first responses run about like this: "Well, I can see he's had a lot of experi-

ence." "Oh, can you? Can you really see his experience? What do you see there?" "Well, I can tell from the wrinkles around his eyes and mouth that he's had lots of experience." "All right, but what do you see?" "Oh, I get you. I see wrinkles around his eyes and mouth." "Good!" The instructor accepts nothing that isn't plainly visible. A student starts to catch on and says, "Well, I can really see he's got ears." "All right, but from where you're sitting can you see both ears right now as you're looking at him?" "Well, no." "Okay. What do you see?" "I see he's got a left ear." "Fine!" No conjectures, no tacit assumptions will do. Nor are the students permitted to wander in the bank. For example, "He's got good posture." "Good posture by comparison with what?" "Well, he's standing straighter than most people I've seen." "Are they here now?" "Well, no, but I've got pictures of them." "Come on. Good posture in relation to what, that you can see right now." "Well, he's standing straighter than you are. You're a little slouched." "Right this minute?" "Yes." "Very good." You see what the goal of this is? It is to get a student to the point where he can look at another person, or an object, and see exactly what is there. Not a deduction of what might be there from what he does see there. Not something the bank says ought to go in company with what is there. Just what is there, visible and plain to the eye. It's so simple, it hurts.

Along with this practice in observing the obvious about people, the students receive a lot of information about particular physical and verbal indications of tone level. Things very easy to see and hear, by looking at a person's body and listening to his words. "Thetan-watching" has no part in obnosis. Look at the terminal, the body, and listen to what's coming out of it. You don't want to get mystical about this, and start relying on "intuition". Just look at what's there.

As examples: You can get a good tip on chronic tone from what a person does with his eyes. At apathy, he will give the appearance of looking fixedly, for minutes on end, at a particular object. Only thing is, he doesn't see it. He isn't aware of the object at all. If you dropped a bag over his head, the focus of his eyes would probably remain the same. Moving up to grief, the person does look "downcast". A person in chronic grief tends to focus his eyes down in the direction of the floor a good bit. In the lower ranges of grief, his attention will be fairly fixed, as in apathy. As he starts moving up into the fear band, you get the focus shifting around, but still directed downward. At fear itself, the very obvious characteristic is that the person can't look at you. Terminals are too dangerous to look at. He's supposedly talking to you, but he's looking over in left field. Then he glances at your feet briefly, then over your head (you get the impression a plane's passing over), but now he's looking back over his shoulder. Flick, flick, flick. In short, he'll look anywhere but at you. Then, in the lower band of anger, he will look away from you, deliberately. You know, he looks away from you; it's an overt communication break. A little further up the line, and he'll look directly at you all right, but not very pleasantly. He wants to locate you – as a target. Then, at boredom, you get the eyes wandering around again, but not frantically as in fear. Also, he won't be avoiding looking at you. He'll include you among the things he looks at.

Equipped with data of this sort, and having gained some proficiency in looking at the isness of people, the ACC students are sent out into the public to talk to strangers and to spot them on the tone scale. Usually, but only as a slight crutch in approaching people, they are given a series of questions to ask each person, and a clipboard for jotting down the answers,

notes, etc. They are public-opinion poll-takers from the Hubbard Research Foundation. The real purpose of their talking to people at all is to spot them on the tone scale, chronic tone and social tone. They are given questions calculated to produce lags and break through social machinery, so that the chronic tone juts out. Here are some sample questions, actually used: "What's the most obvious thing about me?" "When was the last time you had your hair cut?" "Do you think people do as much work now as they did fifty years ago?" At first, the students merely spot the tone of the person they are interviewing – and many and various are the adventures they have while doing this! Later, as they gain some assurance about stopping strangers and plying them with questions, these instructions are added: "Interview at least 15 people. With the first five, match their tone, as soon as you've spotted it. The next five, you drop below their chronic tone, and see what happens. For the last five, put on a higher tone than theirs."

What does an ACC student gain from these exercises? A willingness to communicate with anyone, for one thing. To begin with, students are highly selective about the sort of people they stop. Only old ladies. No one who looks angry. Or only people who look clean. Finally, they just stop the next person who comes along, even though he looks leprous and armed to the teeth. Confrontingness has come 'way up, and he's just somebody else to talk to. They become willing to pinpoint a person on the scale, without shilly-shallying. They say, "He's a chronic 1.1. Social tone 3.5, but real phony." That's the way it is, and they can see it. They also become quite gifted and flexible at assuming tones at will, and putting them across convincingly. Very useful in many situations, and lots of fun to do. They grow adept at punching through a comm lag in an informal situation. At sorting out apparencies from realities. The rise in certainty of communication, and in ease and relaxation of manner while handling people, in the students who have been run through this mill, is something which must be seen or experienced to be believed. The one most often repeated request in every ACC Unit is: "Can't we please have some more obnosis this week? We haven't had enough of it yet." (This statement is very funny to the ACC instructors, because these same students said at the beginning, "If you make me go out there, I'll walk out on the course.") Obnosis is quite important, and should be learned as thoroughly as possible by all Scientologists.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:nt.rd



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 6 FEBRUARY 1960

CenO

(Originally issued as Sec E.D. in Washington DC)

## EFFECT SCALE

(for use in Academy instruction)

The way a preclear receives an effect (effect tolerable on self) and the way he acts toward others, including the auditor (effect believed necessary on others) can be observed by an auditor and used to spot the preclear's Tone level, either chronic or temporary, on any or all dynamics.

These are some examples of what might be observed at different Tone levels.

### *Enthusiasm*

**Effect Tolerable On Self:** Can receive large effects on self (the man who loses his fortune and bounces back). He is willing to receive other people's opinions, can accept large changes, he knows he has had a case change and is willing to change. He can accept defeats and will persist. Does not compulsively prevent effect on self.

**Effect Believed Necessary On Others:** He has considerable ability to create effects on others but is not under compulsion to create effects, he is not compelled to affect other people's lives, he grants beingness, can tolerate differences in people.

### *Conservatism*

**Effect Tolerable On Self:** Not very willing to receive effects that change the status quo. Not willing to be questioned on some subjects, not willing to have other people's attention directed to him such as being pointed out in a crowd, wearing outstanding clothes, etc.

**Effect Believed Necessary On Others:** Believes effects which preserve the status quo are necessary. Somewhat cautious about creating an effect, withholds those things he thinks might hurt your feelings, or that you might not approve of. Believes he should not create too much effect but should be "one of the crowd". Should respect the privacy of others.

### *Boredom*

**Effect Tolerable On Self:** Will receive any effect which produces a pleasant randomness, wants to be entertained but otherwise doesn't like to be shifted. Can't be bothered with most ideas and puts off any action.

**Effect Believed Necessary On Others:** Doesn't need to do anything about anything, no compulsion to do or not to do (no action either).

### *Antagonism*

**Effect Tolerable On Self:** Can tolerate effects on self up to a point. May be critical of changes, resent things happening to him. Doesn't want to be effect of certain things, others' opinions, actions, etc. and hurls back these effects from self by being critical.

**Effect Believed Necessary On Others:** Feels he must make others the recipient of their own effects, compulsively must threaten others to protect self.

### *Anger*

**Effect Tolerable On Self:** Can't receive an effect on self and is fighting to ensure this. PC stuck in an anger incident may manifest this in his inability to receive changes, affinity, others' reality, communication, etc.

**Effect Believed Necessary On Others:** Must destroy anything that tries to create effect on him.

### *Covertiness*

**Effect Tolerable On Self:** Cannot tolerate much effect on self. Tries to slip out of being an effect by covert means. Gives the impression of taking an order, etc., while holding a destructive intent, and no intention to actually do it.

**Effect Believed Necessary On Others:** Believes a large effect is necessary to handle others, is incapable of doing this in any other than a covert way. Must cause an effect but is unwilling to be known as the cause of bad effects. If accused of having created bad effects he will claim his intention was good. This PC will make excuses, will make all sorts of "conditions" in doing a process, will try to give an answer that will satisfy the auditor, without actually doing the command.

### *Fear*

**Effect Tolerable On Self:** This person can take so little effect that he runs from the slightest thing, jumps at a door slam, etc. A PC in **fear** will manifest this by stiffness, leaning back in his chair, whistling during a session (whistling in the dark), he may turn pale, shake, cold sweat, avoid answering questions, squirm, laugh nervously, try to get out of session, etc.

**Effect Believed Necessary On Others:** Believes the effect he would have to create to overcome those things which overwhelm him is huge - so huge that he would rather go elsewhere than confront it. May make a lot of logical excuses to get out of being an effect (going upscale to covertness).

### *Propitiation*

**Effect Tolerable On Self:** Very little, does "favors" to protect himself against bad effects. Will try to appease the auditor to avoid continuing the process.

**Effect Believed Necessary On Others:** Propitiative actions.

### *Grief*

**Effect Tolerable On Self:** Tolerable effect would be the acquisition of tokens of a better time. PC with grief "just under the surface" may not be able to tolerate direct questioning on his problem without getting a lump in his throat or being brought to tears. Someone else's grief might be enough effect to cause him to cry. A rough word might not be tolerable.

**Effect Believed Necessary On Others:** Believes that a large effect would have to be created to overcome his overwhelming opposition, but the idea of creating an effect on others produces the idea of loss and though he must create vast effects, he is very close to the idea that he cannot create **any** effect, thus the only thing he can do about it is cry.

### *Apathy*

**Effect Tolerable On Self:** Can accept even less effect here. This is the "no effect case". Believes that everything is useless anyway, therefore nothing could make any difference on him. He will tell you that nothing is workable (apathetically).

**Effect Believed Necessary On Others:** Believes that an infinite amount of effect must be created to get anything done. (That's why he is in apathy.)

This is the general outline of the Sub-Zero Scale:

**Sub-Apathy:** A state of disinterest, no affinity, no reality, no communication. There will be social machinery, valences, circuits, etc. but the pc himself will not be **there**.

As one proceeds down the Sub-Zero scale there is an increasing state of hallucinatory cause, wherein the thetan considers that he is actually being more cause. This is the exact reverse of the situation. He is becoming more and more effect. Thus the mystic who is "causing" things far away, etc.

In Sub-Apathy a person can tolerate considerable effects, **apparently**. This can fool you. The effects are not real and he does not experience them. While he believes all his effects must be created for him, he is unwilling to receive any.

As a person descends on the scale and becomes more and more in the state of Must-Create-Effects—Must-Receive-None, his ability to do either dwindles out.

**Regret**, on the Sub-Zero scale could be expressed as "trying to undo effects", thus being less effect.

**Blame**, "effects done are wrong".

**Shame**, "effects one creates are unworthy, shouldn't have done it".

### **Effect Tolerable On Self**

40.0 Infinite, any effect tolerable on self.



0.0 None.

**Effect Believed Necessary On Others** (i.e. to have reality on having created an effect)

40.0 Non compulsive. Knows he can create effects.



0.0 Has to create total effect to have reality on creating any effect.

**Sub-Zero:**

**Effect Tolerable On Self**

0.0 No effect tolerable on self.



-8.0 No effect on self is real (i.e. perceived) but al causes *do* affect self. (Mockery of 40.0)

**Effect Believed Necessary On Others**

0.0 Must cause total effect (although *can* cause little or no effect).



-8.0 Can actually cause nothing but "cause everything" (unreality). E.g. "I caused the death of Pope Pius", when speaker was 1.000 miles away.

Peter Hemery  
HCO Secretary WW  
for L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:mg.js.rd

HUBBARD KOMMUNIKATIONSBURO  
 Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
 HCO BULLETIN OF 18 SEPTEMBER 1967  
 Correcting HCOB 3. Feb 1967

Remimeo  
 Tech Personel  
 Qual-Personel  
 Students


Corrected 4 April 1974  
 (Corrections in this type style)

## SCALES

(HCOB 10 May 1960, "Scales" Revised)

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

### EMOTIONAL TONE SCALE



### **C-D-E-I-SCALE**

Interest  
Desire  
Enforce  
Inhibit  
Unknown

### **C-D-E-I-SCALE EXPANDED**

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

### **SCALE OF IDENTIFICATION**

Differenciate  
Associate  
Identify  
Disassociate

### **EFFECT SCALE**

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

### **SCALE OF KNOWINGNESS**

Know  
Not-Know  
Know About  
Forget  
Remember

## EXPANDED KNOW TO MYSTERY SCALE

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

## HAVINESS SCALE

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

## REALITY SPOTTING BY E-METER

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

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

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

The above chart of correlations applies in two ways:

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

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jp.rd.ams.rd

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

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 25 SEPTEMBER 1971RB

Revised 1 April 1978

Revision in this type style

Remimeo  
PR Hats  
D of P Hats  
Auditors

## TONE SCALE IN FULL

### TONE SCALE EXPANDED

SERENITY OF BEINGNESS  
POSTULATES  
GAMES  
ACTION  
EXHILARATION  
AESTHETIC  
ENTHUSIASM  
CHEERFULNESS  
STRONG INTEREST  
CONSERVATISM  
MILD INTEREST  
CONTENTED  
DISINTERESTED  
BOREDOM  
MONOTONY  
ANTAGONISM  
HOSTILITY  
PAIN  
ANGER  
HATE  
RESENTMENT  
NO SYMPATHY  
UNEXPRESSED RESENTMENT  
COVERT HOSTILITY  
ANXIETY  
FEAR  
DESPAIR  
TERROR

40.0  
30.0  
22.0  
20.0  
8.0  
6.0  
4.0  
3.5  
3.3  
3.0  
2.9  
2.8  
2.6  
2.5  
2.4  
2.0  
1.9  
1.8  
1.5  
1.4  
1.3  
1.2  
1.15  
1.1  
1.02  
1.0  
.98  
.96

### KNOW TO MYSTERY SCALE

KNOW  
NOT KNOW  
KNOW ABOUT  
LOOK  
PLUS EMOTION  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
MINUS EMOTION

NUMB	.94	
SYMPATHY	.9	
PROPITIATION – (HIGHER TONED – SELECTIVELY GIVES)	.8	
GRIEF	.5	
MAKING AMENDS – (PROPITIATION – CAN'T 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	-1.5	EFFORT
EFFORT PROTECTING BODIES	-2.2	
OWNING BODIES	-3.0	THINK
APPROVAL FROM BODIES	-3.5	
NEEDING BODIES	-4.0	SYMBOLS
WORSHIPPING BODIES	-5.0	EAT
SACRIFICE	-6.0	SEX
HIDING	-8.0	MYSTERY
BEING OBJECTS	-10.0	WAIT
BEING NOTHING	-20.0	UNCONSCIOUS
CAN'T HIDE	-30.0	
TOTAL FAILURE	-40.0	UNKNOWABLE

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ams.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 23 DECEMBER AD9

BPI

## RESPONSIBILITY

If the definition of operating thetan is knowing and willing cause over all dynamics then we can see at once that responsibility must go hand in hand with making an operating thetan.

One cannot as-is act for which one is taking no responsibility, but for which one is really responsible.

The reason one gets amnesia on his past lives or even denies their existence lies with responsibility. He or she is unwilling to take responsibility for having been this or that other identity. This keys in in present time and closes one down every time one stops taking responsibility for one's fellows. Fighting 'other identities' in present time one ceases to be responsible for other identities. Therefore those he has had in the past become 'other people' and one dramatizes his own past identities because he cannot take responsibility for them.

When one falls away from responsibility on the various dynamics he can then become less and less able to influence those dynamics and therefore becomes a victim of them. One must have done to other dynamics those things which other dynamics now seem to have the power to do to him. Therefore one can be injured. One can lose control. One can become in fact a zero of influence and a vacuum for trouble.

The way one becomes separate from others is by his own overt acts against them. These overt acts become withholds and the person then individuates very strongly. You have seen this happening in auditing. The more overt acts the Auditor pulls on the pc the less willing the Auditor is to audit that pc. Further, the more overt acts the pc pulls on the Auditor the less willing he is to stay in session. It only looks as though cause and effect is at work. Actually all life consists of opposed causes where it is aberrated.

The way a person blows out of session or blows out of an organization or blows out of Scientology is a simple one. He withholds information and hides his overts. After a while he blows himself off. Show me a pc blowing session and I will show you a pc who has not levelled with his Auditor and who is guilty of undeclared overts against the dynamics and the Auditor. Show me a staff member who is blowing the Organization and I will show you a staff member who is guilty of undeclared overts against the Organization.

It is fatal to audit anyone unless full two-way comm is established between the Auditor and the pc. A person who goes on being audited without asserting his responsibility for what he has done is a person who will make no auditing gains or whose auditing gains will slump. As most of the human race has undeclared overts this fact alone assumes gigantic pro-

portions in forwarding Scientology and for that reason alone we will have to give it a lion's share of attention from here on out.

Of course you will see that many people at first will not come near us for fear of what we will find out. But as this is better understood you will find that the people who come to us will come with a willingness to bare their guilt to us and get it sorted out.

As this is so much the case we must then therefore have amongst us none with undeclared overts against the dynamics which would prevent their getting gains in processing or who would render a person's confidences liable to use for less pure purposes.

Along with this technical discovery then goes the administrative must that our noses must be clean and our hearts cleared. Our strength will be the strength of a billion if we have nothing to hide.

This may or may not be popular. I don't care about that. It is effective. I do care about that.

And remember that whenever a person discloses to view discreditable overts and withholds we must run what part of that act or incident could you be responsible for.

You're going to see more case gains than you've ever seen before – providing you have the stamina to get over this first hump.

So here we change from irresponsible to responsible, from guilt to strength and all in the twinkling of an eye.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 21 JANUARY AD10

Fran Hldrs  
HCO Secs  
Assn Secs  
HCO and HASI Staffs

## JUSTIFICATION

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

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

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

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

Withholds are a sort of overt act in themselves but have a different source. Oddly enough we have just proven conclusively that man is basically good – a fact which flies in the teeth of old religious beliefs that man is basically evil. Man is good to such an extent that when he realizes he is being very dangerous and in error he seeks to minimize his power and if that doesn't work and he still finds himself committing overt acts he then seeks to dispose of himself either by leaving or by getting caught and executed. Without this computation Police would be powerless to detect crime – the criminal always assists himself to be caught. Why Police punish the caught criminal is the mystery. The caught criminal wants to be rendered less harmful to the society and wants rehabilitation. Well, if this is true then why does he not unburden himself? The fact is this: unburdening is considered by him to be an overt act. People withhold overt acts because they conceive that telling them would be another overt act. It

is as though Thetans are trying to absorb and hold out of sight all the evil of the world. This is wrong-headed, by withholding overt acts these are kept afloat in the universe and are themselves as withholds entirely the cause of continued evil. Man is basically good but he could not attain expression of this until now. Nobody but the individual could die for his own sins – to arrange things otherwise was to keep man in chains.

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

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

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

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

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

And remember, by and by, that if you make your pc write these overts and withholds down and sign them and send them off to me he'll be less reluctant to hold on to the shreds of

them – it makes for a further blow of overts and less blow of pc. And always run responsibility on a pc when he unloads a lot of overts or just one.

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

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 31 MARCH 1960

Fran Holders

## **THE PRESENT TIME PROBLEM**

Everybody has present time problems at times. They come up unexpectedly. They happen, between intensives. They pop up between sessions. They, indeed, occur within sessions. And the auditor who neglects to handle them when they arise will get little auditing done.

It's the present time problem that sticks the graph, makes it register no change. (It's ARC breaks that drop one.)

What is a "PTP", as the auditors write it in their reports?

It is basically the inability to confront the dual terminal nature of this universe.

It is an inability to span attention and denotes that the pc who is having lots of PTPs has his attention very fixed on something.

The definition of a problem is intention v. intention or "two or more opposing and conflicting views on the same subject".

If the pc has problems with wife or husband, we can be sure that they have divergent views on some basic thing in life. Thus the auditor who has a pc who always has PTPs with one, the same, person, had better run O/W (overt-withhold) on that terminal in a specific form (George) and then responsibility on the general form (a husband). Thus a PTP is as good as an assessment. Find what terminals the pc has PTPs about and handle that terminal as above. Indeed this is more than a trick – it's a great time-saver. One can waste hours on a pc who repeatedly comes up with a PTP on the same person. But that person in the PTP is often the current clue to the case. "Grace the wife" leads to "a wife" leads to "a woman".

Present time problems are not always concerned with the world outside auditing. Auditors can be a PTP to the pc, especially when the pc has big withholds!

## **PROCESSES ON PTPS**

Present time problem processes are many. The earliest was two-way comm. A later one was "Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to....." But this one of course is a create type process and is therefore very limited.

Still another process was "Tell me your problem." "How does it seem to you now?" This almost runs the whole case.

A recent one that has workability is "What problem could you confront?" This finds out for the pc that he can't *confront* a problem at first without doing something about it. *That* isn't confronting the problem. This is an amusing, effective and educative process.

Problems tend to snap in on the pc. The mechanism here is that he cannot confront them so, of course, they snap in upon him. When he invents a few the first problem he had visibly moves away from him. This last is now a demonstration, not a process, because of the create factor.

The fastest current process is "Tell me your problem." "What part of that problem have you been responsible for?" This is an alternate question process. You will find the problem changes and changes. It runs the whole case.

A general process on problems, which is a very healthy process, is "What problem have you been (or might you have been) responsible for?"

The easiest process on problems to run, if slower, is "Tell me your problem." "What part of that problem could you confront?"

### CONFUSION AND THE STABLE DATUM

Problems are nasty case stickers because in a problem one has an old solution causing new problems. This is the principle of confusion and the stable datum. The confusion (two or more opposed views or actions) stays in position because it is hung on a single fixed point. If you want to see a pc go into confusion ask him what solution he could confront. (This is not a good process, it's a demonstration.)

A preclear is sometimes chary of motion in the bank. He seizes upon fixed particles to avoid moving particles. A very top scale process that does some fabulous things to a pc also illustrates this: "What motion have you been responsible for?" This truly sets a bank whizzing, particularly black cases or stuck picture cases. Running this, it is possible to discharge pc liability to problems.

### THE DUAL UNIVERSE

The basic unit of this universe is *two* not one.

The less a pc can confront *two* things, the more he fixes on *one*. This is the highly individual person, also the self-auditing case.

This is probably the basic trap of a thetan. He is a single unit that has not cared to confront dual units and is therefore subject to the persistence of all dual things. As he does not seem to care as much for *two* as he does for *one* that which is not admired tends to persist and we have a persisting dual universe.

Also, when he is with somebody else, he tends to confront the other person but not to confront himself. "What about you could you confront?" is a murderous process. It is all right

to run. It picks up the times when his attention was off self and yet self was creating. This is the genus of a reactive bank. It is probably what pain is.

However, a better and more spectacular process that demonstrates this and gets to the heart of problems is "What two things can you confront?" This increases ability and reduces one's liability to problems. I suppose one could go gradiently up in number and have at last a pc that could tolerate any motion or number.

It is quantity not quality which makes a bank. Thus running significances is of little worth. A thetan gets ideas of too many and too few. He cannot have, at length, anything that becomes too scarce – one of the old important rules of havingness given in *Scientology 8-8008*.

### OUT OF SESSION

A pc is in session when (a) he is willing to talk to the auditor and (b) he is interested in his own case.

The primary violation of part (a) is overts and withholds – the pc is afraid to talk or talks to cover up.

The second violation (b) occurs when the pc's attention is "over there" in present time, fixed on some concern that is "right now" somewhere in the physical universe. Technically a *present time problem* is a special problem that exists in the physical universe now on which the pc has his attention fixed. This violates the "in session" rule part (b). The pc's attention is "over there" not on his case. If the auditor overlooks or doesn't run the PTP then the pc is never in session, grows agitated, ARC breaks, etc. And no gains are made because the pc is not in session. Hence the unchanged graph when the pc has a PTP that is overlooked or not properly handled.

PTPs are easy to handle. If you, the auditor, become impatient at having to "waste time" handling a PTP or if the pc considers it a waste of time to handle it, a mistake is being made. So long as a PTP falls on a meter even slightly, it had better be handled until it no longer falls when checked.

If the same type of PTP keeps coming up, use it as a case assessment and run it out-out-out as given above, using O/W and responsibility.

And if the pc *always* has problems, better note he *also* has motionless pictures, is only-one and self-audits heavily and get him used to motion and two particles as given in processes above and he'll be a better case very soon indeed.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 5 OCTOBER 1961

Franchise

## CLEAN HANDS MAKE A HAPPY LIFE

For the first time in the soggy stream that's history to the human race, it's possible that happiness exists.

This goal, repeated many times and sought so heavily, has been ungraspable as sun motes, unattainable as a loved one's sigh.

What makes Mankind, basically good beings all, such strangers far to happiness?

The rich man geysers out his wealth. The poor man peers in every crack. But wealth buys nought and crevices are bare. The child hopes he will realize it when grown and, grown, wishes he were happy as a child.

We grasp it but like gossamer, it's nought. We marry a most perfect girl or man and then throughout our lives weep to make the other make us glad.

Often sought, but seldom found, there are no riches, gems or palaces as valued as mere happiness.

But listen! Here is happiness, just at our finger tips, awaiting only magic words "Start Session" to begin its quest.

But like we walk through rain toward a banquet ball, our happiness in processing is gained by passing through the phantom shadows of our "sins".

What has made all Man a pauper in his happiness?

Transgressions against the mores of his race, his group, his family!

We care but little what these mores were or are. It was transgression did the trick.

We agree to fixed moralities and then, unthinking, we transgress, or with "good cause" offend, and there we are, the first dull bars of misery draw stealthily behind us.

And as we wander on, transgressing more, agreeing to new mores and then transgressing those, we come into that sunless place, the prison of our tears and sighs and might-have-beens, unhappiness.

---

Mutual action is the key to all our overt acts. Agreement to what ought to be and then a shattering of the troth works all the spell that's needed for a recipe of misery.

There must be pain. So we agreed. For pain restrains and warns, shuts off, forbids. But goodness now must then consist of bringing in no pain.

Mutual motion is agreed. And then we disagree and part and so are tied no more – tied not save back there in our minds, with scars of broken faith. The faith we broke, and said it had to be.

We all agree to feel the sun and then protest it burns. We all agree to kiss and love and then are startled that such pain can follow in that wake.

Mutual motion is all right – until we act in cruelty to the rest.

Tied by agreements and co-actions, we dare be cruel to that to which the hard steel clasps of promises have bound us.

And so in being cruel to part of self-extended self as in a couple or a group – we then find pain in self with great surprise.

The overt act sequence is simple now to grasp. The scope is limited. But it began when we first had a cruel impulse to others bound to us by mores or co-acts.

Why does one suffer pain in his own arm when he or she has struck another's limb?

Because the cruel impulse has been a break of bond with others where pledge once lived.

The only overt act that can bring pain to self is that cruel act which then transgresses things to which we had agreed.

Share action with a group or person in your life, agree to mutually survive by some specific code and then be cruel to them and so transgress and you'll have pain.

---

All Mankind lives and each man strives by codes of conduct mutually agreed. Perhaps these codes are good, perhaps they're bad, it's only evident they're codes; Mores bind the race.

Co-action then occurs. Thought and motion in accord. A oneness then of purpose and survival so results.

But now against that code there is transgression. And so because the code was held, whatever code it was, and Man sought comfort in Man's company, he held back his deed and so entered then the bourne in which no being laughs or has a freedom in his heart.

So down the curtains come across the brightness of the day and dull-faced clouds en-mist all pleasant circumstance. For one has evilly transgressed and may not speak of it for fear *all* happiness will die.

And so we shut ourselves from off the light and enter grey-faced gloom. And seal within our deepest vault the reasons why we dare not face our friends.

And afterwards we go on making others guilty with the rest, when like some scrawny scarecrow of a priest whose tattered filthy robes are rough with sacrificial blood, we point the way to hell for those who kill.

And deep within us secret gnawings ache. And then at last we cannot even cry.

---

The road to hell – Man's very good at painting ugly signs that point its course and way.

The road to heaven – Man's often sent but never yet arrived – more like he found the "other place".

But now a road that's wide has opened up – in Scientology.

The meter and the process check, when done by auditors with skill, can open up transgression's rush and loose a cascade out until hell's spent.

And day will once more have a drop of dew upon the morning rose.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jl.vmm.rd



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 31 DECEMBER 1978  
Issue III

Class III and above  
Auditors  
Word Clearers  
HCO  
Tech/Qual  
C/Ses  
PTS/SP Detection,  
Routing and Handling  
Course  
Ethics Officers  
Class IV Grad Check-  
sheet

**EDUCATING THE POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE,  
THE FIRST STEP TOWARD HANDLING: PTS C/S-1**

Ref:	BPL 5 Apr 72RC I	PTS TYPE A HANDLING
	BTB 11 Nov 77	HANDLING PTS SITUATIONS
	HCOB 24 Apr 72 I	PTS INTERVIEWS
	HCOB 10 Aug 73	PTS HANDLING
	HCOB 27 Sep 66	THE ANTI-SOCIAL PERSONALITY THE ANTI-SCIENTOLOGIST
	HCOB 28 Nov 70	PSYCHOSIS
	HCOB 24 Nov 65	SEARCH AND DISCOVERY
	HCOB 12 Mar 68	MISTAKES, ANATOMY OF
	HCOB 9 Nov 67	REVISION OF REMEDY A. REMEDY B AND S AND Ds
	HCOB 5 Feb 66 III	S AND D WARNING
	HCOB 9 Dec 71RC	PTS RUNDOWN, AUDITED
	HCOB 20 Jan 72R	PTS RUNDOWN ADDITION
	HCOB 3 Jun 72RA	PTS RUNDOWN, FINAL STEP
	HCOB 29 Dec 78	THE SUPPRESSED PERSON RUNDOWN
	HCOB 30 Dec 78	SUPPRESSED PERSON RUNDOWN – PROBLEMS PROCESSES
	HCOB 31 Dec 78 II	OUTLINE OF PTS HANDLING

When you find you have a potential trouble source on your hands the very first thing you must do is educate him on the fundamentals of PTS/SP tech.

*Do not* begin any other PTS handling on any PTS person until he has completed the basic education steps of the PTS C/S-1 given in this HCOB.

In the absence of education into the basics of PTS tech you will have PTS students and pcs asserting they're not PTS, you will have upsets. protest, recurrences of "once handled" PTSness. PTSes will not cognite, will not take action to handle the antagonistic terminal, will

not recover. Failure to educate simply doesn't work. So a very thorough job must be done at this point to guarantee the success of any PTS handlings which follow.

Now people and circumstances and PTS sits vary, and you may wish to carry the education steps of the PTS person beyond what is given here before you begin any other handling on him. I will leave that to your educated judgment. However, the steps of the PTS C/S-1 given in this HCOB must be done on all PTS students and pcs *before any sort of PTS Interview or 10 August handling or any PTS auditing is undertaken.*

The person should, of course, study the complete PTS/SP Detection, Routing and Handling Course so that he understands the full mechanics that had been upsetting his life, but the PTS C/S-1 will give sufficient data and understanding so that he or she can begin handling the PTS scene.

### PTS C/S-1

The following PTS C/S-1 is not a long action and can and should be accomplished speedily. Its purpose is to give to any PTS student or pc the necessary data and R-Factor on the basics of PTS/SP tech so that he understands and is able and willing to successfully handle his PTS situation. It can be done by an auditor, in session, or in the course room under the supervision of the Word Clearer and Course Supervisor.

Note: Some pcs and students who have been trained or who have in the past received PTS handling may protest that they know the terms and issues. If this happens acknowledge with excellent TRs and without invalidation or evaluation and tell them that this action is intended to make PTS handling effective for all and is a required step of the handling. If the auditor or Word Clearer uses excellent TRs and a good R-Factor, no ARC breaks will occur and the person will have tremendous wins.

The auditor or Word Clearer should be fully familiar with this issue as well as all issues in the PTS/SP Course pack. He will need to take a very thorough look at what has to be covered with the pc in this C/S-1 and know his materials very well and have them ready for reference and clearing any misunderstands or questions the pc may have.

The following will be needed:

- Technical Dictionary
- Admin Dictionary
- A good English Dictionary
- A good dictionary in the pc or student's native language, and for a foreign language case a dual dictionary (English-to-foreign language and foreign language itself).
- PTS and SP Definitions Sheet – Attachment No. I of this issue
- Demo kit

A. Have the pc define each term, using the reference. (Note: you don't ask: "Do you know what this word means?" You ask: "What is the definition of ?")

When the pc has told you the definition, have him give you a sentence or two using the term correctly. Where it applies, have him give you examples, using his experiences or those of others. Have him demo with a demo kit. Cover by exact definition all terms used and take each term defined to an F/N.

- B. Check for any questions (or misunderstandings) as you go along and ensure any such get handled so the pc or student winds up with a clear understanding of the word.

Don't settle for glibness that does not show understanding, but on the other hand, don't overrun or put duress on the pc or student, either.

Ensure each word cleared is taken to F/N.

### PTS C/S-1 PROCEDURE

1. Give the R-Factor that you are going to clear the basic words and concepts concerning PTSness.
2. Clear the word **Affinity**. Have the pc or student demo its meaning.
3. Clear the word **Reality**. Have the pc or student give you sentences and examples showing his understanding.
4. Clear the word **Communication**. Have the pc or student demo its meaning.
5. Clear **ARC Break**. Have the pc or student demo what an ARC break is.
6. Clear **Problem**. Have the pc or student demo a problem.
7. Clear **Withhold**. Have the pc or student give you an example of a withhold.
8. Clear **Missed Withhold**. Have the pc or student demo a missed withhold.
9. Clear **Postulate**. Ask the pc or student if he's ever postulated anything. Have him tell you about it.
10. Clear **Counter** (the prefix).
11. Have the pc or student demo several examples of a postulate and a counter-postulate.
12. Clear **hostile. Antagonism**.
13. Clear **Suppress**. Have the pc Or student demo several different examples of how someone or something could be suppressed.
14. Clear **Suppression**. Have the pc or student give you examples of suppression from movies he's seen or books he's read or suppression he's seen or experienced.
15. Clear **Suppressive Person**. Have the pc or student demo the definitions.
16. Clear **Suppressive Groups**.
17. Clear **Roller-Coaster**. Have the pc or student demo roller-coaster. Ask him if he's ever been around anyone who roller-coastered. Let him tell you about it briefly if he wishes.

18. Clear **Potential Trouble Source** (PTS). Have the pc or student demo this well. (If this step is being done by a Word Clearer in the course room, end off at this point and send the pc or student to the Examiner. Then, get him started on the Study Section. If being done in session, the auditor may continue with the Study Section. )

### STUDY SECTION

19. The following issues are to be read by the PTS student or pc, word cleared Method 4 and starrated. This may be done in a course room, under the super-vision of the Course Supervisor or in session with an auditor.

HCOB 27 Sep 66	THE ANTI-SOCIAL PERSONALITY THE ANTI-SCIENTOLOGIST
HCOB 28 Nov 70	PSYCHOSIS
HCOB 24 Nov 65	SEARCH AND DISCOVERY
HCOB 12 Mar 68	MISTAKES, ANATOMY OF
BPL 5 Apr 72RC I	PTS TYPE A HANDLING
BTB 11 Nov 77	HANDLING PTS SITUATIONS
HCOB 24 Apr 72 I	PTS INTERVIEWS
HCOB 10 Aug 73	PTS HANDLING

20. End off and send the pc or student to the Examiner. Route the pc's folder with all worksheets to the C/S who will examine them for thoroughness and completeness and then order the person's next step.

---

Educating a PTS person is the key to putting him at cause over the PTS sit. Do this PTS C/S-1 thoroughly and well. It is not to be considered a substitute for the full PTS/SP Detection, Routing and Handling Course, but will set up the PTS student or pc for a highly successful PTS handling. These you get him signed up for the course.

PTS tech is highly effective and powerful. Get the most out of it by applying it properly, with **education** as the first step.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:jk

## PTS C/S-1 DEFINITIONS SHEET

### ***AFFINITY***

Degree of liking or affection or lack of it. Affinity is a tolerance of distance. A great affinity would be a tolerance of or liking of close proximity. A lack of affinity would be an intolerance of or dislike of close proximity. Affinity is one of the components of understanding; the other components being reality and communication. (Dianetics Today, Glossary)

### ***REALITY***

The degree of agreement reached by two ends of a communication line. In essence, it is the degree of duplication achieved between cause and effect. That which is real is real simply because it is agreed upon, and for no other reason. (Tech Dict)

### ***COMMUNICATION***

"The interchange of ideas or objects between two people or terminals. More precisely the definition of communication is the consideration and action of impelling an impulse or particle from source point across a distance to receipt point, with the intention of bringing into being at the receipt point a duplication and understanding of that which emanated from the source point." "The formula of communication is: Cause, Distance, Effect, with Intention, Attention and Duplication with Understanding." "Communication by definition does not need to be two-way. Communication is one of the component parts of understanding." (Tech Dict; HCOB 5 Apr 73 Reiss. 19 Sep 74 AXIOM 28 AMENDED; Dianetics Today, Glossary)

### ***ARC BREAK***

A sudden drop or cutting of one's affinity, reality, or communication with someone or something. Upsets with people or things come about because of a lessening or sundering of affinity, reality, or communication or understanding. It's called an ARC break instead of an upset, because, if one discovers which of the three points of understanding have been cut, one can bring about a rapid recovery in the person's state of mind. It is pronounced by its letters A-R-C break. (Tech Dict)

### ***PROBLEM***

Anything which has opposing sides of equal force; especially postulate-counter-postulate, intention-counter-intention or idea-counter-idea; and intention-counter-intention that worries the preclear (Dianetics Today Glossary)

### ***OVERT***

1. ... An aggressive or destructive act by the individual against one or more of the eight dynamics (self, family, group, mankind, animals or plants, mest, life or the infinite). (Dianetics Today, Glossary)

2. That thing which you do which you aren't willing to have happen to you. (Tech Dict)

### ***WITHHOLD***

An undisclosed harmful (contra-survival) act. (Dianetics Today, Glossary)

### ***MISSED WITHHOLD***

An undisclosed contra-survival act which has been restimulated by another but not disclosed. This is a withhold which another person nearly found out about, leaving the person with the withhold in a state of wondering whether his hidden deed is known or not. (Dianetics Today, Glossary)

### ***POSTULATE***

1. To conclude, decide or resolve a problem or to set a pattern for the future or to nullify a pattern of the past. (Tech Dict)

2. That self-determined thought which starts, stops or changes past, present or future efforts. (Tech Dict)

3. In Scientology the word postulate means to cause a thinkingness or consideration. It is a specially applied word and is defined as causative thinkingness. (Tech Dict)

### ***COUNTER***

1. Opposition, as in direction or purpose; for example countermarch, counteract. (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language)

### ***HOSTILE***

1. Of or pertaining to an enemy. (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language)

2. Feeling or showing enmity; antagonistic. (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language)

### ***ANTAGONISM***

1. Mutual resistance; opposition; hostility. (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language.)

2. The condition of being an opposing principle, force or factor. (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language)

### ***SUPPRESS***

1. To squash, to sit on, to make smaller, to refuse to let reach, to make uncertain about his reaching, to render or lessen in any way possible by any means possible, to the harm of the individual and for the fancied protection of a suppressor. (Tech Dict)

### ***SUPPRESSION***

1. Suppression is "a harmful intention or action against which one cannot fight back." Thus when one can do anything about it, it is less suppressive. (Tech Dict)

### ***SUPPRESSIVE PERSON***

1. A person with certain behavior characteristics and who suppresses other people in his vicinity and those other people when he suppresses them become PTS or potential trouble sources. (Tech Dict)

2. A person who has had a counter-postulate to the pc you are handling. (Tech Dict)

3. Is one that actively seeks to suppress or damage Scientology or a Scientologist by suppressive acts. (Tech Dict)

### ***SUPPRESSIVE GROUPS***

1. Are defined as those which seek to destroy Scientology or which specialize in injuring or killing persons or damaging their cases or which advocate suppression of mankind. (Tech Dict)

### ***ROLLER-COASTER***

1. A case that betters and worsens. A roller-coaster is always connected to a suppressive person and will not get steady gains until the suppressive is found on the case or the basic suppressive person earlier. Because the case doesn't get well he or she is a potential trouble source to us, to others and to himself. (Tech Dict)

2. Gets better, gets worse, gets better, gets worse. (Tech Dict)

### ***POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE***

1. Somebody who is connected with an SP who is invalidating him, his beingness, his processing, his life. (Tech Dict)

2. It means someone connected to a person or a group opposed to Scientology. It is a technical thing. It results in illness and roller-coaster and is the cause of illness and roller-coaster. (Tech Dict)

3. The PTS guy is fairly obvious. He's here, he's way up today and he's way down tomorrow and he gets a beautiful session and then he gets terribly ill. That's the history of his life. (Modern Management Technology Defined)

4. The mechanism of PTS is environmental menace that keeps something continually keyed-in. This can be a constant recurring somatic or continual, recurring pressure or a mass. The menace in the environment is not imaginary in such extreme cases. The action can be taken to key it out. But if the environmental menace is actual and persists it will just key-in again. This gives recurring pressure unrelieved by usual processing. (Modern Management Technology Defined)

### ***SEARCH AND DISCOVERY***

1. Search and discovery of suppression is called an "S and D." It locates the suppressive on the case. (HCOB 9 Nov 67, REVISION OF REMEDY A, REMEDY B AND S AND Ds)

"Remember that the real suppressive person (SP) was the one that wove a dangerous environment around the pc. To find that person is to open up the pc's present time perception or space. It's like pulling a wrapping of wool off the pc.

"The SP persuaded or caused the pc to believe the environment was dangerous and that it was always dangerous and so made the pc pull in and occupy less space and reach less.

"When the SP is really located and indicated the pc feels this impulse not to reach diminish and so his space opens up.

"The difference between a safe environment and a dangerous environment is only that a person is willing to reach and expand in a safe environment and reaches less and contracts in a dangerous environment.

"An SP wants the other person to reach less. Sometimes this is done by forcing the person to reach into danger and get hurt so that the person will thereafter reach less.

"The SP wants smaller, less powerful beings. The SP thinks that if another became powerful that one would attack the SP.

"The SP is totally insecure and is battling constantly in covert ways to make others less powerful and less able." (HCOB 5 Feb 66 S AND D WARNING)

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 AUGUST 1965

Remimeo  
Ethics Hats  
Executive Hats

**SUPPRESSIVE PERSONS,  
MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF**

It is interesting in the detection of Suppressive Persons that they use "policy" to prevent purpose.

In one org which went into a serious decline a Suppressive Person was in a high position.

Every time org personnel returned from Saint Hill and proposed that the org get going, they were told by this SP that their proposals were "against policy".

Not one of these people, hearing this, ever alerted to a glaring fact. The SP in this case was renowned for never being able to pass a bulletin, tape or policy letter!

So how would that person have known **what** was against policy for that person **never** was known to pass a hat check!

So that person's statement that, "it's against policy" was obviously false since the person was incapable of passing hat checks or bulletins and wouldn't ever have known what any policy was for or against anything.

Thus we see one of the characteristics of an SP is:

- 1. The negation of policy without knowing it and the use of "policy" to prevent success in Scientology is the primary tool of the SP against orgs.**

---

Dissemination is a prime target of the SP.

Magazines ordinarily have half a dozen SPs on their lines. These people write in and complain about ads. If you don't watch it these half dozen become "everybody" and the mag is beaten down into not advertising.

"Soft sell" is another recommendation of the SP.

And "build it quietly" and "get only decent people" are all part of this.

When somebody is demanding less reach, that person is an SP.

Therefore we have another characteristic:

- 2. SPs recommend ineffective dissemination and find fault with any being done.**
- 

A Suppressive will try to sell off the property or buildings of an org and in one case tried to give them away when temporarily in charge.

- 3. A suppressive will try to get rid of an org.**
- 

Good staff members are a prime target for SPs. In one org where an SP got a foothold 60% of the staff was gotten rid of and the org almost crashed.

They do it by making people too dissatisfied to produce and so make it impossible for the org to earn.

- 4. An SP will seek to upset and get rid of the best staff members.**
- 

Bad news, particularly if false, is the only comm line of the SP.

The executive who is getting bad news as a steady diet on his lines has SPs about.

- 5. Entheta is the sole stock in trade of the SP.**
- 

The triumph an SP feels in not getting rid of things the auditor has tried to ease is quite malevolent.

- 6. An SP is satisfied with auditing only when he gets worse.**
- 

7. SPs are happy when their pcs get worse and sad when their pcs get better.
- 

- 8. An SP in an examiner post will only declare released the bad result cases and will not pass actual releases but will ARC break them.**
- 

9. Covert invalidation is the level of an SP's social intercourse.
- 

An SP can only restimulate another, he has no power of his own.

10. An SP deals only in restimulation, never easing or erasing.
-

11. The persons around an SP get so restimulated they can't detect the real SP.
- 

The whole rationale of the SP is built on the belief that if anyone got better, the SP would be for it as the others could overcome him then.

He is fighting a battle he once fought and never stopped fighting. He is in an incident. Present time people are mistaken by him for past, long gone enemies.

Therefore he never really knows what he is fighting in present time, so just fights.

12. The SP is sure everyone is against him personally and if others became more powerful they would dispose of him.
- 

The SP usually commits continuing overtacts. These are hidden.

I have had two or three SPs blow up and shout or snarl at me. When I investigated I found, in these cases, they were committing daily crimes of some magnitude.

13. An SP commits hidden overtacts continuously.
- 

14. Back of a crime you will find SP characteristics.
- 

15. Because an SP uses generalities in his speech "everybody" "they", etc., the SP is hard to detect.
- 

SPs have an experiential track that is poor. SPs know how to needle and commit overtacts and hold others back.

When released, the SP has so little decent background experience that he or she has a very hard time.

16. Releasing an SP does not make a worthwhile person. It only makes a person who can now learn to get along in life.

"A cleared cannibal is a cleared cannibal."

---

SPs don't get case gains. Sometimes they pretend them. They are held back by their continuing overtacts. If we were found by them to be decent, their past conduct would swell up and engulf them.

They are in a continued PTP of their fight with Mankind. And they follow the rule that pcs with PTPs get no case gains.

---

Real SPs comprise about 2½ per cent of the population. By restimulating others they make another 17½ per cent into Potential Trouble Sources. Therefore about 20% of the population is Ethics type.

We must not allow this 20% to prevent the 80% from crossing the bridge.

We are no enemy of the SP. But he can't have friends, can he?

So we handle the SP and his PTS's and carry on with our job.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:mh.cden

**P.A.B. No. 13**  
**PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN**

**From L. RON HUBBARD**

Via Hubbard Communications Office  
163 Holland Park Avenue, London W.11

---

[1953, ca. mid-November]

**ON HUMAN BEHAVIOR**

It greatly facilitates the work of the auditor to know the most aberrated and most aberrative types of personality.

Kraepelin in Germany a long time ago made a long and varied psychotic classification. This has been refined and made, if anything, even more unwieldy in modern times. It is valueless since it does not lead to the immediate remedy of the situation. Further, we are not very interested in types. There is really no such thing as a special type of psychosis or neurosis, beyond those types which are quite aberrative around the preclear.

If we could isolate a particular set of traits as being the most aberrative traits, we could more quickly process the preclear by using Acceptance Level Processing or Viewpoint Processing on such people.

Probably the truly aberrative personalities in our society do not number more than five or ten percent. They have very special traits. Where you find in the preclear's bank a person with one or more of these characteristics, you will have the person who most thoroughly tried the preclear's sanity.

What we will call the aberrative personality does the following things:

1. Everything bad that happened to the preclear was (a) ridiculous, (b) unimportant, (c) deserved.
2. Everything the preclear and others did to the aberrative person was (a) very important, (b) very bad, (c) irremediable.
3. Those things which the preclear could do (a) were without real value, (b) were done better by the aberrative personality or by others.
4. Sexual restraint or perversion.
5. Inhibition of eating.

Such people would be better understood if I called them the "merchants of fear." The most degraded control operation of which the GE is capable is utilized by these people for their sole method of getting on in the world. They have lost all ability themselves to create, they cannot work themselves, they must either amass money which is never to be spent or

must prevent others from amassing money. They produce nothing, they must steal one way or another, and then devalue whatever they obtain. They speak very sternly of honesty or ethics and put on a formidable front of complete legality. They are impartial, which is to say they are incapable of decision but ride continually a maybe. They close terminals easily with courts, for courts are, sad to say, more or less of this disposition themselves. They feel called upon at no pretext to become adjudicative on subjects where their opinion has not been invited.

Probably a society could be cleared and allowed to bloom if these people were simply rounded up and removed from contagion with the remaining populace, for they are not numerous. Yet they are in sufficient number that it is doubtful if your preclears who are more seriously badly off have not had at least one in their past. It is particularly true of the occluded case that he has been victimized by one of these "merchants of fear."

Although there are many characteristics which are undesirable in such aberrative people, it is remarkable that only those listed above are aberrative. These wind sinuously as a threatening thread through all of their conversations. Such people are a mixture of paradoxes to the observer who does not understand the basic ingredients of human character.

Such people are themselves a continuous maybe, and therefore will be found very easily in the bank, for they appear most often. Where you find one, two or three people appearing almost continuously in the preclear's bank, or his lamenting conversation, you will find that these people answer the above-numbered characteristics.

The method of processing these people is to have the preclear mock them up in large masses with the certainty that they are there, and then, with them unmocked, with the certainty they are not there. Then, mocked up again, with the certainty that they will be in the future, and, unmocked, with the certainty they will not be in the future. One also runs the above concepts in masses and in brackets.

A case cannot be said to be well so long as these aberrative personalities continue to reappear in his thoughts and processing. Therefore the auditor will find it extremely profitable to use all available means to process these people out of the preclear's bank. When the auditor has succeeded in doing this, he will find that the preclear now believes himself to be very much better than before and, indeed, he will be.

It should be remembered that such people have invited many overt acts. The "merchants of fear" specialize in being offended themselves and, even though the overt acts against them are slight, these have become magnified in the preclear's bank until such people, on the overt act phenomenon alone, occupy a major role in the preclear's thinking.

It will often be discovered by the auditor that the preclear has "swapped terminals" with these aberrative persons. The weight of aberration is such that the preclear has been swung into the valence of such people, for they have obviously won.

The truth of the matter is: such people never win. If one traces out these people, as I have done occasionally after processing a preclear, he will discover that the aberrative personality is very close to the brink of a crack-up, has a very low survival level, and quite commonly goes insane.

It should be understood that anyone going down tone scale in moments of anger is apt to use the above-numbered steps one way or another. But this is a momentary thing; the above steps belong, of course, on the tone scale and are significant of a level on the tone scale. Thus, one going down tone scale into anger or into apathy, is inclined to use these operations momentarily. This is quite different from the aberrative personality. The aberrative personality is at work with this operation 24 hours a day. Ceaselessly, relentlessly, calculatingly, with full knowingness, the aberrative personality continues this onslaught against those around him.

The entire computation of this aberrative personality is that he is worthless, he himself knows himself to be completely worthless. One might feel a little pity if the harm were not so great, for there is nothing more terrible than this knowledge. The aberrative personality feels he cannot succeed unless he drives others away from him with fear, preferably with terror. He assumes aspects of ugliness in matters of clothing; he is quite prone to ugliness. Very often this personality does not bathe, his breath is very often foul, his feet become odorous, the endocrine system has failed one way or another, the person has considerable bowel trouble. Other people than the aberrative personality occasionally manifest these difficulties; unfortunately, it all stems from the same idea – to drive other people away.

The communication lag of the aberrative personality is his easiest clue. These people are slow to respond, they are very thoughtful about what they say. They "think twice before speaking once," if they speak at all. When they do speak it is very often not on the subject. Their favorite phrase is "You do not understand." They preface their statements with, "Well, I don't know but..." There is no decision in such people; they do not know whether to go up the street or down the street. Put into a certain routine and forced into that routine they will carry on, but they do not themselves produce anything, they are entirely parasitic. This parasiticism is gained either by the inheritance or other accumulation of money or by a direct and forthright nullification of those around them into the status of slaves. For this person knows above all other things that he cannot produce an honest day's work.

Now in case you err and try to apply this classification too widely, there is one definite characteristic you must not overlook. This characteristic makes the difference between the aberrative personality and run-of-the-mill human beings. The secrecy computation is the clue. The best index to a secrecy computation is a refusal to be audited. Because of this factor of the secrecy computation, and for no other factor, it chances to follow that the aberrative personality can be known by his refusal to have any auditing of any kind, or, if he has any auditing, accepts it very covertly and will not permit it to have any effect upon him. He will not have a second session. He has all manner of excuses for this such as "altitude", but in any way, shape or form he escapes auditing. If your preclear's unwilling to be audited, he himself may fall into this classification.

Because justice in this society prides itself upon impartiality, these impartial people – the aberrative personalities – are quite often listened to by those around them. The pose of being impartial is an effort to escape decision. People who get things done or who are worth anything to the society make decisions. The impartial people make no decisions if they can possibly avoid them, and at the very best put off decisions as long as possible, as in the case of a court of law. These people, being well downscale, are very close to MEST and have a very solid agreement with MEST.

Very often you will find aberrative personalities addicted to religion, but the addiction will not be accompanied by any belief in the human spirit. Just how this paradox is accomplished a professed avowal of Christianity and a complete unwillingness to accept any effort to heal or help the human spirit as opposed to the body – is just another one of this bundle of paradoxes which mark the aberrative personality. For, you see, the person is such a complete maybe that anything about him is indecisive, and people trying to make up their minds about this person, of course, fall into the state of maybe, because that is the clue to the personality. Impartial personality – the maybe personality – and the "merchant of fear" are more or less of the same order and are alike aberrative.

Men in the field of the arts are very often victimized by these aberrative personalities. The "merchant of fear" closes terminals rapidly with any area which contains a great deal of admiration. Since the person is actually incapable of decision, this is a mechanical closure. The presence of admiration around anyone else begins to dissolve some of the completely stultified bank of the "merchant of fear" and this finds him very close to the source. Orchestra leaders, painters, writers are always having the terrible misfortune of closing terminals with such personalities. There is hardly a man of art or letters who does not bear on him the scar of having associated with a "merchant of fear," for these are vampire personalities. They are themselves so starved of admiration and of sensation that they drink out of others around them any possible drop of admiration in any form. Where a woman becomes a "merchant of fear," sexual starvation is continually attempting satiation and all the while the "merchant of fear" will protest and, to all visible signs, follow a life of complete celibacy.

While it is not my purpose here to revile, I wish to impress upon the auditor that the "merchant of fear" is extremely dangerous, both to creative impulses and to sanity. One could say airily, "Why don't we just audit these people upscale, since they are so few," but these people will never present themselves for auditing and will discourage anyone else from having any auditing. A solution to the "merchant of fear" probably does not lie in the field of auditing.

The society at large is so accustomed to association with MEST and the "merchant of fear" so closely approximates some of the characteristics of MEST – the maybe, for instance – that the public quite commonly misassigns strength to such aberrative personalities and thinks of them as strong people or as wise people. They are neither strong nor wise, and before an even indifferently forceful attack quickly capitulate. They live their whole lives in terror of attack.

One often finds these characteristics in company with paresis or hears the aberrative personality has actually contracted a dreadful disease to add to his repulsiveness.

The auditor should not err in thinking that these people always present a repulsive appearance; repulsive conduct precedes a repulsive appearance. At first they operate only mentally in trying to make everyone afraid. Then this begins to show up more and more in their own MEST and finally will demonstrate itself in their personal appearance. Thus one can mark the state of decay of these aberrative personalities.

Now and then some violent man in one country or another has undertaken programs to rid a society of these points of contagion. Kings in olden times handled the problem by de-

capitating people who continually brought them bad news – this was a very wise measure. In more recent times it has been said that Gomez, late dictator of Venezuela, discovered that the contagion point of leprosy in the country was the beggar. He found that the beggars of Venezuela were using leprosy in order to beg. People would pay in order to have the ugly thing taken away from them (the basic philosophy of the beggar is to be paid to go away). Gomez had the beggars told that they were going to be taken to a very fruitful part of Venezuela and given a colony of their own; he had them collected on a river bank and loaded aboard two large river boats. The river boats proceeded into midstream, their crews left them in skiffs and the boats blew up with a resounding explosion. This was the end of leprosy in Venezuela. I am not telling you this to advocate the immediate slaughter of the "merchants of fear"; I am merely giving you an historical note. The extreme impatience of people trying to get something done in a society will eventually center upon those who will not work and, in the case of kings or tyrants, such people have very often been done away with. Thus the precedent is very old of a society cleansing itself by removing from its ranks the non-workers.

Revolutions very often have this as an objective. The French Revolution recognized in the existing aristocracy a state of will-not-work, and saw in these people the character of the "merchant of fear," and for several years there in France, shortly after America became free, the tumbrils formed an assembly line to the guillotine. People in societies are extremely punitive about those who will not work and about those who depend on fear for their sustenance. But society going downscale can become more and more apathetic toward the "merchant of fear" until the "merchant of fear" predominates as a class.

Just as the king or the society revolted against the "merchant of fear," so has your pre-clear tried to get the "merchant of fear" to work and to contribute something besides bad news. This effort, of course, was bent toward an organism which was already rotten at the core. Whether the "merchant of fear" used money or beauty to excuse his own lack of labor, only added to the maybe. The law forbade the pre-clear to use the measure of the tyrant or the Gomez, for the law is utterly infatuated with such people and defends them at every turn just as such people use almost exclusively the law. As your pre-clear was balked in his natural impulse to clear the way he was brought into staring recognition of the fact that the necessary act – murder – was halted by the existence of police and courts. This brought the pre-clear to the point where he conceived himself to be put upon by the society and the law. Many of your pre-clears, as a result of this, are startled to find, when it is run on them, that they believe themselves under arrest, even though any arrest they have been subjected to was as minor as a traffic pick-up. I am not advocating, again, violence; I am merely trying to explain to you the state of mind of the pre-clear and the most aberrative person he has confronted. He wanted to, and didn't, kill these people. If your pre-clear is of the kind who produces or creates or who works and makes his way in the world in general, you can find the aberrative personality in his bank immediately by asking him – with an E-Meter, of course, because he probably won't tell you direct – if he wanted to kill anyone. The E-Meter will say that he did, and on discovery of this identity the auditor will find the aberrative personality. This even follows through with women, although women go more quickly into apathy when confronted with an aberrative personality than do men.

You should understand that the aberrative personality has not become an aberrative personality by being confronted by another aberrative personality. You are not getting here the pattern of stimulus-response, you are getting the decay of a human spirit to complete inactivity so that the entire *modus operandi* becomes that of the body itself, and a body, in the case of the aberrative personality, which itself is too deteriorated or exhausted to work. Not all bodies becoming so exhausted and unable to work turn into aberrative personalities, but the aberrative personality is born entirely out of the decline of the ability of the individual to produce. When the individual really recognizes his utter worthlessness to the society, he becomes an aberrative personality. Many people who cannot work physically turn to other lines of progress. They are getting on one way or another. The aberrative personality is so badly off that he can lead only a parasitic existence. You will understand, then, that people going down tone scale do not immediately and automatically become aberrative personalities, in our definition as here used. People become aberrative personalities out of a malevolence which insists on a high level of survival without the production of anything.

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 29 SEPTEMBER 1965  
Issue II

Remimeo  
Franchise  
Students  
BPI

*All Levels*

**THE CONTINUING OVERT ACT**

Pity the poor fellow who commits daily harmful acts.

He'll never make it.

A criminal pilfering the cash box once a week has himself stopped cold as far as case gains are concerned.

In 1954 I counted some noses. I checked up on 21 cases who had never had any gains since 1950. 17 turned out to be criminals! The other 4 were beyond the reach of investigation.

That gave me my first clue.

For some years then, I watched for no-gain cases and carefully followed up those that I could. They had major or minor criminal backgrounds.

This gave the 1959 breakthrough on the meter checks (Sec Checking).

Following it further since 1959 I have finally amassed enough histories to state:

**The person who is not getting case gains is committing continuing overts.**

While this sounds like a very good "out" for us, we assume that the auditor at least tried *something* sensible.

Today – the running of a pc by grades is a saving grace for merely "tough cases". Directors of Processing are doing well with the modern graded process approach, level by level, and the DofP Washington has just told me they were cracking cases with the lowest grade processes DC had never been able to handle well before.

So, given processing by Grades (the best case approach we've ever had), we crack the rough ones.

But will that be *all* cases?

There's still one. The case who continually commits overts before, during and after processing.

He won't make it.

One thing helps this, however.

You have seen the Ethics Codes appear.

By putting a bit of control in the Scientology environment we have enough threat to restrain dramatization.

The phenomena is this: The reactive bank can exert stress on the pc if it is not obeyed. Discipline must exert just a shade more stress *against* dramatization than the bank does. This checks the performance of the continual overt long enough to let processing bite.

Not everyone is a continuous overt committer by a thousand to one. But this phenomenon is not confined to the no-gain case.

The *slow* gain case is also committing overt the auditor doesn't see.

Therefore a little discipline in the environment speeds the *slow* gain case, the one we're more interested in.

The no-gain case, frankly, is one I am not panting to solve. If a fellow wants to sell his next hundred trillion for the sake of the broken toy he stole, I'm afraid I can't be bothered. I have no contract with any Big Thetan to save the world complete.

It is enough for me to know:

1. Where bottom is, and
2. How to help speed slow gain cases.

Bottom is the chap who eats your lunch apple and says the children did it. Bottom is the fellow who sows the environment with secret suppressive acts and vicious generalities.

The slow gain case responds to a bit of "keep your nose clean, please, while I apply the thetan-booster."

The fast gain case does his job and doesn't give a hoot about threatened discipline if it's fair. And the fast gain case helps out and the fast gain case can be helped by a more orderly environment. The good worker works more happily when bad workers see the pitfalls and desist from distracting him.

So we all win.

The no-gain case? Well, he sure doesn't deserve any gain. One pc in a thousand. And he yaps and groans and says "Prove it works" and blames us and raises hell. He makes us think we fail.

Look down in our Sthil files. There are actually thousands upon thousands of Scientologists there who each one comment on how wonderful it is and how good they feel. There are a few dozen or so who howl they haven't been helped! What a ratio! Yet I believe some on staff think we have a *lot* of dissatisfied people. These no-gain characters strew so much en-theta around that we think we fail. Look in the Saint Hill files sometime! Those many thousands of reports continue to pour in from around the world with hurrah! Only the few dozen groan.

But long ago I closed my book on the no-gain case. Each of those few dozen no-gains tell frightening lies to little children, pour ink on shoes, say how abused they are while tearing the guts out of those unlucky enough to be around them. They are suppressive persons, every one. I know. I've seen them all the way down to the little clinker they call their soul. And I don't like what I saw.

The people who come to you with wild discreditable rumours, who seek to tear people's attention off Scientology, who chew up orgs, are suppressive persons.

Well, give them a good rock and let them suppress it!

I can't end this HCO B without a confession. I know how to cure them rather easily.

Maybe I'll never let it be done.

For had they had their way we would have lost our chance. It's too near to think about.

After all, we have to earn our freedom. I don't care much for those who didn't help.

The rest of us had to sweat a lot harder than was necessary to make it come true.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml.rd



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 28 JANUARY 1966

Remimeo  
Tech Hats  
Qual Hats  
All students Level IV  
and above

(Edited from a taped Conference with  
Saint Hill Tech and Qual Personnel – 20 Dec 1965)

*LEVEL IV*

**SEARCH AND DISCOVERY DATA**  
**HOW A SUPPRESSIVE BECOMES ONE**

Search and Discovery is being made and auditors are finding on one person and another "Myself". Well, just amongst us girls, of course, you are going to find it. One of the best reasons you are going to find it is that it is part of the R6 bank. The other reason you are going to find it is that after a person is totally overwhelmed by a Suppressive he assumes the valence of the Suppressive. And a person you would find that on has actually been pretty suppressive.

What you're doing is, you are pushing S & D to a point where you are clearing suppression. It wasn't intended to go that far.

If you were to ask the listing question however, "Name 'Myself'" or "Give 'Myself' a name", you would then get the Suppressive.

But this is getting very adventurous, because it is part of the R6 bank. It is getting very adventurous to do anything about it. We seem to be happy about having "Myself". I would just let them go right on being happy about it. With skill you probably could bring out the identity of this person whose valence had come over them. It would all depend on the auditor who is doing it. If I were doing it, I'd go ahead and break it down. But not a Class III auditor who is not sure what he is going up against, who is repeating the word several times, repeating the question, trying to check it to make sure the listing question is clean. Don't you see, you are never going to get that listing question clean. That I assure you. That question can't be listed out.

That is the mechanism of suppression overwhelming a person. Oddly enough you will only find it on persons who are suppressive and of course you've walked into the real mechanism of how does a Suppressive become a Suppressive? He becomes a Suppressive by taking over the valence of a Suppressive.

Then when you list it out you get "Myself" and this is compounded by the fact that it's part of the R6 bank so you don't dare do much with it but it will let a bunch of steam off the case.

With some very, very, very, very upstage auditing, very careful indeed, give them the auditing question once, then say, "Go on and answer the question" but never repeat it, never

check the thing to find out if it's a clean list – you probably would get at least one recent SP out of that combination. How we do that at that stage when I've not worked with it technically I would not be able to tell you, but I just know that it would be very risky. It makes me feel like maybe I shouldn't do anything about it at all because it's too risky, but I can see somebody getting messed up.

### THE MAIN TROUBLE IN S & D

Your main trouble in S & D is much worse than that – it is simply an inability to assess\*. And auditors since time immemorial have had trouble assessing. They have two troubles in assessing. They underlist and they overlist. It's almost an accident that an auditor ever lists the right lists the right way. I'm not saying that sarcastically but it has been my experience in teaching auditors to assess that they have two faults, they underlist and they overlist.

If they do either one of these things, they are going to ARC Break the pc and then the list isn't going to be nullable because the pc is not responding to the auditor's voice as well, and it quite often was the first one on the list which is where they never looked. More fundamental than that is simply the problem of reading an E-Meter. Those technical facts are in the road of S & D.

### ASSESSING AN S & D

Actually an auditor who can assess can pass off an S & D so fast it would be like dealing cards done by a Monte Carlo Vingt-et-Un player; he could just roll them off left, right and centre. There's no real trouble in it. It's a very fast action. It all depends on how much you want to keep the pc under tension in the action, because an assessment isn't auditing to begin with.

You would start Session with, "Sit down, I'm going to assess you now. Do you have some answers to this question. Brr. Brr. Brr." And the pc says, "I want to tell you about..." "All right, good, I'm glad you're going to tell me about that but right now I want some answers to this question." See? Then "brrrrr" on down and then you'll notice your needle relax. Then you say, "All right, now I'm going through this list." Ratatat, etc. "That's it, all right. Thanks very much." Pc cognites 10 minutes. Pc cognites and the Meter blows up and good indicators come in, and you've done an S & D. There is nothing more complicated than that.

You've got auditors who were trying to do an S & D in a session. You got them that are afraid the pc has already given it on the list. You got them that haven't learned how the Meter reacts when you've got a complete list. (A Meter just falls flat when you've got a complete list. The needle goes clean.) And you've got them that aren't sure that they've got any SP, and they just didn't see that the Meter did a surge on one of them. Then you get somebody who has overlisted and he's just ploughed the guy in, so he can't assess it back easily.

---

\* Editor's note: At that time, "assessment" and "nulling" were not as clearly distinguished as later. See e.g. Technical Dictionary, "Assessment", Def. 4.

Then you get the fellow who had four of them fall. Certainly if you've got four falling there's two things that can be wrong at this point which makes it very difficult to run back. In one you have passed it. It's above the four which are falling. You've missed it, and the pc is simply discharging on it. And actually you can ask the pc which one was it and he'll say, "Well, it was Joe, of course." That's above the four. Practically every one after the right one will read, because it's actually blowing down all the time. He's no longer paying any attention to the auditor.

Then the other thing is you just haven't completed the list.

You have to make an opinion as to whether or not you've overlisted or underlisted. You can also pick up a dirty needle and an ARC Broken pc or protesty pc if you've gone by the right one.

Here are the evils of listing, and here are the evils of assessment showing up on S & D. They are simply auditor goofs – it's just lack of experience on the part of the auditor and lack of understanding of what he's supposed to be doing. But an auditor who can really assess can knock these things off. I'd spot what auditors can assess reliably, and I'd give them specialized jobs of that character that require listing. This is a very, very highly skilled action. You save a lot of time by pulling such an auditor back into specialty.

## REVIEW ACTION

In Review you have to do it sometimes when it's been done. So you have the additional answer of "How do you patch up an assessment that's already been goofed?" And "Where is the list that was lost?" You've got the problem of the list that was completed out of session. "And I got home and was lying in bed..." and so forth. So in Review you always assume the pc continued the list after the session. If the pc is there as a flat ball bearing, you just automatically assume the pc thought of it afterwards or something. It isn't that the Tech auditor always got it.

I'll give you a tip in Qual. If you assume automatically that standard technology has not been applied, as your first gambit, in anybody that you're putting back together again, you'll about 99% be right. Somehow or other it slipped by in Tech. It slipped by. Somebody thought he did it. Somebody thought it was on the report. And therefore it looked like it didn't work or something. Something was there. And in all of my D of Ping I have not found it possible to detect all departures from tech by auditors. I've never been able to bat 1000 on that. Naturally, it's nearly impossible.

Technically, what you have to do doesn't mean that you have to invent technology because there are very standard answers to all these things.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml.rdl



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 5 FEBRUARY 1966

Remimeo  
Tech Div Hats  
HGC Auditors  
Qual Div Staff  
Franchise

*Level III*

**S&D WARNING**

Search and Discovery, done incorrectly (incorrect SP found) can make a preclear ill within a week or two after.

Assessment is a very proper skill. There is a great deal written on it and many tapes.

The common errors of assessment (aside from the usual Gross Auditing Errors) are:

1. Too short a list
2. Too long a list
3. Clumsy or improper meter handling
4. List getting suppressed
5. Item getting invalidated
6. Pc being allowed too much Itsa
7. Pc getting ARC Broken by under- or over-listing
8. Auditor not letting the pc have his item
9. Whole list going live because the item was by-passed earlier on the list
10. Auditor not looking for good and bad indicators to see if he was correct in his assessment.

When the right SP is found the good indicators flood in *and* the pc does not cave in in 36 to 72 hours.

The bug in S&D is that one can *almost* get the right item. An item can be found that is *nearly* the right one. If the nearly right one is accepted the pc will be doubtfully more cheerful and may insist this is *it*. The pc however is still not quite sure. Inevitably that is the sign of a *nearly* right item.

The real reaction to the correct person is an "Of Course!" no doubt about it reaction.

It is the action of *nearly* finding the right one that may make the pc ill in the next few days or a week. One has restimulated the by-passed charge of the right one without finding it.

Remember that the real Suppressive Person (SP) was the one that wove a dangerous environment around the pc. To find that person is to open up the pc's present time perception or space. It's like pulling a wrapping of wool off the pc.

The SP persuaded or caused the pc to believe the environment was dangerous and that it was *always* dangerous and so made the pc pull in and occupy less space and reach less.

When the SP is really located and indicated the pc feels this impulse not to reach diminish and so his space opens up.

The difference between a *safe* environment and a *dangerous* environment is only that a person is willing to reach and expand in a safe environment and reaches less and contracts in a dangerous environment.

An SP wants the other person to reach less. Sometimes this is done by forcing the person to reach into danger and get hurt so that the person will thereafter reach less.

The SP wants smaller, less powerful beings. The SP thinks that if another became powerful that one would attack the SP.

The SP is totally insecure and is battling constantly in covert ways to make others less powerful and less able.

Scientology flies into the teeth of an SP. One will go to the most extraordinary lengths to try to injure Scientologists or an organization or a staff member.

But SPs existed long before Scientology and finding the basic SP around the pc just because of Scientology or the pc is a Scientologist is in actual fact unlikely.

Childhood is the most fertile area in which to locate *the SP* on the case. A child is weak and at the mercy of adults. It is this fact alone that gave *all* the cures Freud ever stumbled onto. The analyst accidentally located an SP when his work was successful. But then he proceeded to overrun and restimulate the patient without erasing. In other words he would not let the patient have his item. An hour with a meter in the hands of an expert auditor who *can* assess correctly will produce everything the analyst or Freud ever hoped to achieve and will do it invariably compared to the small results analysts did achieve.

But if you get one *almost* right, and not get the really correct SP, then you get the same phenomena that dogged the analyst – the pc gets better for a moment and collapses.

I am not saying you can permanently injure persons. The analyst techniques operated far more restimulatively than our S&D. They made the person talk about it for years!

But you can still give a pc a nasty cold if you miss on an S&D.

So don't miss.

Do it correctly.

Find the correct SP.

It's all correct if you assess by the book – complete list, not too long or too short. Correct item on the list. Good indicators then in. And no relapse for at least 2 weeks.

That's how a *real S&D* is done.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml:rd

# The Antisocial Personality

A lecture by L. Ron Hubbard

given on the 25 August 1966

How are you today?

*Audience: Good. Fine.*

And this is the what?

*Audience: 25th of August AD 16.*

By George, you're right. Twenty-fifth of August AD 16, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

And... I don't have any notices of any kind, means somebody's been loafing. [laughter]  
So we can have right at it.

This article, this article and lecture – you will see something of an article on this later – is not necessarily dedicated to a government, any particular government. And it is not really dedicated to the East Grinstead Urban District Council and I would not say that it was, you see. And any similarity – you know they put this on the beginning of books, you see – any similarity between actual individuals and this lecture are totally accidental. [laughter]

And the name of the lecture is "The Antisocial Personality." [laughter]

Now, I told you I would keep you advised on such ethics matters as might concern an auditor. And this is one of those lectures. I've sat down and I've very, very carefully made up what must be a complete list of all of the characteristics of a suppressive person, and put this together on the basis of the interrelationship between that individual and the society around him, that individual and the auditor and that individual and himself. And I hope you can see some benefit from this.

Now, ethics, as you know, has as its basic purpose getting in technology. That is its primary purpose and it doesn't have any object of social betterment. And it goes this far in getting in technology: that if people are going to advance casewise, they must do so in a relatively unsuppressive environment. And you can't have people advancing casewise when they are in a suppressive environment, and suppressives don't advance casewise. So you might say ethics and the idea of suppressive persons and the idea of potential trouble sources, the idea of a rolly coaster – what makes a person get better and then get worse and get better and get worse – these things are, all of them, part and parcel to an auditor's bag of tricks. If an auditor

doesn't know about this and doesn't pay any attention to this, then he very soon breaks his heart.

I just had a long letter from an intern here giving me a bunch of data on what auditing a suppressive-type person had done to him personally. That was interesting, you see – not what it had done to the suppressive, but what it had done to him. Well, he very soon had begun to believe, you see, well, Scientology didn't really work and he wasn't getting anyplace and his ideas were wrong and that he really couldn't audit, and all of these things began to creep up on him, you see.

He was auditing somebody who was *yak-yak-yak-yak-yak-yak*, invalidate, invalidate, and you know had eighty thousand hours of auditing and he'd never gotten any gain, and so forth. And he knew that his father was suppressive but he had murdered his father last year and – with hot flatirons, but that hadn't done him any good, either, so ethics didn't work.

And this auditor felt like a gooney bird. He was flopping around with no goals left, you see. He'd come up against this brick wall. Well, if he'd really known his ethics and really known what his characteristics were of suppressive persons, he would have taken one look at his case assessment form as he began the pc – or he would've done one – and the person had been eight thousand hours in auditing and had been audited in Milwaukee, Mexico, North Pole and hadn't ever gotten over his sciatica; and had been audited in Los Angeles and New York, but somehow or another he kept at it even though it had cost him a great deal of money. And he'd never had any improvement, particularly in his sciatica and so on, but he'd kept at it because he was – well, he just kind of wanted to show people it didn't work, you know.

And the auditor at that moment would have exercised any HGC auditor's prerogative which is simply not to audit the pc. That's the least he would have done. See, any HGC auditor can say, "I don't care to audit this pc, period." And that's it. And it's been that way for many, many years. Every once in a while Ds of P get enthusiastic and say, "Well, that may be the custom but here we don't really exercise that," you see and kid the auditor in and get him in there pitching again. Actually, it's a bad thing if he does so because it's enforced help, you see, and so on. And they won't get a very good result on the pc.

Do you know that you'll get a better result on a pc if you simply take the auditor and run O/W on him, regardless of his grade of release – just run a little O/W with him on that pc. You ought to make it as a little experiment someday if you're in an executive auditing position – you know, your lower-grade type auditors – and just run a little bit of O/W on the pc before they audit them. Pc will make marvelous gains. It's fantastic.

So the auditor in this particular case, had he been able to have – been able to call off what are the characteristics of a suppressive – *bing-bing-bing-bing-bing!* – why, he wouldn't have sat there getting his anchor points punched in. Now, it's one thing to have a critical pc and another thing to be trying to audit a suppressive pc or a pc who is a potential trouble source. These are quite different things.

The critical pc – of course, a pc can become critical simply by having a withhold or an overt on the auditor. That's the first thing you check. You don't sit there and take it on the chin. Pc was all right yesterday. Today he says, "Well, are – are you sure you – you've – you've gotten your – ever gotten a classification for..." and so forth.

I never would say anything – it would astonish me if I saw an auditor do otherwise than say, "All right, is there anything being withheld? Have you committed...? That's it. That's it. That's it. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. What?" [laughter] That would just be that, see. Well, fellow would give it to you and say, "*Hmp-hmp*." [laughter] And if you – if the fellow just went on nattering and complaining about having been audited thousands of hours and not having gotten any case gain and not having – been shoved into it because of his wife and proving to her that Scientology didn't work and that sort of thing. I wouldn't sit there and take that, not as an auditor.

You see, I'm – personally I have never done anything in the universe that I owe anybody Scientology. See, I don't owe anybody Scientology. That's why we've made that much progress, which is a remarkable fact that when you are too propitiative, far, far too propitiative – you know, you feel that you've been mean to people and you're trying to make it up and all of that sort of thing – why, you get into all kinds of reactive complications. All kinds of them. And you get so that you really can't help people. But the main thing that you get into is the fact that you then do *anything* – you don't do proper actions; you do anything to help them – and you let them get away with anything and you exert no control of any kind whatsoever. So you really don't have a very good run in it.

But I never owed anybody Scientology. And I trust you didn't either. So there isn't any reason to take a knocking around. One of the first pc-control techniques there was... This sounds very rough. We didn't know at that time, you see, that it was a withhold that made the person critical. And the person would get choppy and refuse to do what you said and refuse to go back through it again – old Dianetic-type auditing. And the control technique was simply to get up and say, "Well, when you decide you're going to, why, I will come back and audit you" and walk out of the room. I vividly remember it. That was actually in force before the official publication date of the first book. So that goes way back into pc control.

Now, in view of the fact at that time I was getting my first psychoanalytic-type pcs – you know, pcs who had been into psychoanalysis and were now swinging in toward Dianetics – and got a tremendous number of failed cases, a tremendous number of roughed-up people. It was interesting, you see, that I, in scouting around in an average level of the society, was not in actual fact running into the failed psychoanalytic patient or some of the very, very, very rough cases that the society had. I was running into and had acquaintance with some criminals and some insane and so on; but not the people who had been – let me be more explicit – had been roughed up by psychotherapy, whose actions and behavior had been more or less confirmed or perverted by psychotherapy, you see. They're a special, very special type of case. And it was this type of case, on which an auditor could easily fail, that we got a tremendous number of in the first Foundation. And they were very, very hard to handle, and today I would recognize pretty well what the bulk of them were.

They were either SPs or PTS. But one of the things that they were PTS on was, of course, the psychoanalyst and the psychiatrist. Now, let's be more explicit here so that nobody gets adrift on this. You all know this but I'll give you the datum.

What we call a suppressive person is a person with certain behavior characteristics which we will cover here and who suppresses other people in his vicinity. And those other

people, when he suppresses them, become PTS or potential trouble sources. And they are called potential trouble sources because they really do make trouble. They rolly coaster. They natter. They go up in smoke.

Now, because a person is raising the devil does not make him a suppressive person. The suppressive may be sitting back there with a covert Mona Lisa smile. And the PTS is busy going up in smoke or running around and doing weird things – PTS is active. PTS might be going insane, being put in the local asylum or something like that. You haven't got the source of the social difficulty. You've just got the PTS. And this person is PTS, a potential trouble source, simply because they are intimately associated with a suppressive.

Now, if you recognize that all by itself, a tremendous burden would come off of your auditing. You would know what you were looking at. Joe is okay today, he's gone bad tomorrow. I remember a notable case of this. I put a – one psychoanalyst, a very prominent psychoanalyst in New York City, very well known – I took this psychoanalyst, just in a demonstration, and sent this psychoanalyst right straight up into seventh heaven. See, the psychoanalyst was in beautiful condition. Got rid of her "schiosis" or whatever else she had. She felt terrific, you know. I just erased the secondary, actually, necessary to resolve her case. Felt fabulous. She'd been trying to get at this for years in psychoanalysis and couldn't... She was in Jungian analysis, by the way, and couldn't find it in having been a Druid.

Anybody says to you, "Well, Scientology is weird because it believes in past lives," why, look at them rather oddly and say, "Aren't you familiar with the subject of psychotherapy?" Be mean, you know.

And they say, "Well, yes. Oh, yes. I'm a professor of Uptygup, you know." [Laughter]

And say, "Well, why is it that you didn't know that one of the primary branches of psychoanalysis and so forth – that of Professor Jung – believed implicitly in returns to druidism. See, we're not being new at all."

I don't know whether it's in his immediate textbooks or not, but I remember this case vividly, and that was what she had been jumping around in. She had been jumping around trying to pretend she was painted blue, living in trees in her past lives. This is Jung. And there is – Jung and Adler were the principal squirrels in psychoanalysis. And she just went right up to the top of the Tone Scale, man. She was in beautiful shape. She stayed that way for three days and she crashed harder than anybody I've ever seen crash. Terrible shape – sick, miserable, moaning around. And in those days I took the psychoanalytic explanation. It wasn't that we were doing psychoanalysis, it was just – if you understand what I'm talking to you about on this – was because we accidentally were getting into psychoanalytic patients and practitioners. They were moving in our direction.

And we used to attribute it to the fact that she'd not been benefited but had just hit a manic. Get that phrase: "hit a manic" – had become manic for three days. Therefore one could say it was very dangerous that she was processed and all this. I know today exactly what happened to her, all these ages afterwards. She hit an SP, man, and he plowed her through the wall. I even know the guy's name. It's Art Sapose – I wouldn't want to publicly vilify anybody. [laughter] She maybe hit more than one. But boy, she sure went through the wall. And that was simply a rolly coaster: better-worse.

There is no such thing as a manic – a person gets on an enthusiastic euphoria that life is great. It's just that psychiatrists *hate* people in that condition. And so they promptly caved them in. They go *bow!* The guy says, "Wow, at last I realize I can be sane, and isn't the world wonderful!"

"Oh, my God! You're in a manic. We've got to give you eighteen extra shocks and transorbital leukotomies and *throwhkhhr!*" [laughter]

So there has arisen this thing known as a "manic condition," which is very harmful. And there's a thing called "euphoria" which is *very bad*. That's so if anybody says he got any benefit or did anything good, why, they can plow him in quick. There are no such conditions. See? The guy got better. They couldn't stand it and they caved him in. Bang! Whoever was in his vicinity that was suppressive caved him in quick.

Now, when you as an auditor see that sort of thing, know what you're dealing with! Don't be a reasonable idiot! You're in this field, no other field at all. You're in the area that I'm talking about in this lecture. You are not in some new factor which has just arisen. I want to be very positive about it because if they developed such a thing as a "manic personality" to explain away somebody feeling good or getting better, then they will develop this theory again. And I say "they," I mean suppressive-type psychotherapists. They will develop it again. And they will develop it individually for you, and give you lots of reasons why it really didn't work and why the guy caved in, and how it's very dangerous to process somebody because this happens. And this is the only mechanic of it happening.

Now, I have trouble impressing even executives in this organization. Every once in a while they'll think, "Well, there's some other reason why a person has a worsened condition." And the weeks go by and the weeks go by and I will repeat it several times and all of a sudden they throw away the rest of them, and they to their own satisfaction have isolated the fact that it is contact with a suppressive which has worsened the pc's case. It was *not* the auditor, it was *not* the Case Supervisor, it was *not* this and *not* that and all the other thousand things that can be blamed!

Now, you hear of somebody going along all right and then getting worse in, let us say, the Poughkeepsie Foundation, see. And you have a tendency to say, "Well, they don't know much about auditing in the Poughkeepsie Foundation and so made the person worse." No! No! No! No! Give your fellow Scientologist a break. He was trying, too – *always!*

Don't blame the auditor. Don't blame the past auditor. Don't blame the past HGC. Get *off* of it! There is only *one* reason it happens. And maybe in this HGC there was an SP. That's very doubtful, but maybe there was. But that isn't that *HGC*. Do you follow? That was an SP, a suppressive person. And honest, please, it's the *only* reason. There aren't no others.

You will hear this and hear this from pcs that come in and say, "Well, I was out in Portland and they ruined me out there. They audited me on processes they shouldn't have audited me on." And he's learned some patter you know – like "They overran it," you know; and they did this and they did that. And he's learned this various patter line, and he'll give you these explanations and so forth. Well, I know he's right there and I know he's very persuasive. But please, for my sake, don't buy it, because there isn't a word of truth in it.

What is true is that after his case improved he encountered a suppressive, roly-coastered, and is now actually an ethics-type pc. And you've got no business doing anything with him at all! He belongs to the EO – Ethics Officer. Owned property – and belongs to nobody else. And you say, "Well, our Ethics Officer's no good, and so forth. Because, after all, he's been to see the Ethics Officer and his case didn't immediately improve." Well, I don't care whether his case improved or not. If he's an ethics-type person, he's at least off the technical lines.

If ethics did no more than that we would all make it. Even *those* people would eventually make it, do you see? But as long as they stay on the lines knocking around, you have in actual sober fact a situation where people are in many respects caving in simply because we have let ethics-type personnel along in our lineup. We put them in the technical lineup not the ethics lineup. Do you see?

And if Ethics was just a place to put them, at least the rest of us would make it. And if there was no place to put them at all, I assure you that we would *not make it at all!* – that serious.

Now, I speak from the vast gold mine of experience of the first Foundation. Never talked to you too much about the first Foundation. I didn't have control of this organization – just by dint of personality and shouting. And it wasn't in operation twenty-four hours before it started to squirrel, right in its own internal actions. People were being told that auditing was *not* a scientific type activity – auditing was *not* a scientific type activity. Being told it was an art, that it could not be learned, that it was a sort of a knack you had.

And they were being told this by Mr. Joe Winter – Doctor; the late. And his overt was that he and the publisher had arranged it – because I was "too hard to do business with" – they had arranged it to do a more agreeable book by Joe Winter on the subject of Dianetics which would get the medical doctors interested in the subject. That was his overt. He did – he wrote such a book. It was, I think, *A Doctor Looks at Dianetics*.

And there were people around there galore, and they were just *tearing* Standard Procedure to pieces. People that I had trained just prior to that activity were actually still able to get results. And people around there couldn't get results. And I couldn't hold in technology. Because I, one, didn't have control of it and, two, didn't have ethics. And we could never hold in technology until we finally got ethics.

So curse ethics if you want to; think it's terrible, but here we are who owe the rest of the world our services, being mean, too; and deplore it all you want to, but realize that it has great value. And if you as an auditor are in great disagreement with ethics and so forth, then you must also be in disagreement with auditing people and getting gains that stay there.

Because if you go into a practice of auditing suppressive persons or continuing to audit a person that you recognize as suppressive, you're going to get your heart broken because he isn't about to go anyplace, man.

That's our biggest source of losing auditors, see, tie into and try to audit a suppressive, don't recognize it and there they go. And the other one is they must be able to recognize a case gain and a loss of case gain and recognize in those two actions – remember you've got to

be able to recognize a case gain before you can recognize a loss of case gain – and to see in those actions an ethics situation, *not an auditing situation*.

It's perfectly all right for the individual auditor to turn around and put on his ethics hat. If he hasn't got an Ethics Officer closer than eighteen thousand miles or something like that, why, let's put on his own hat, put it on himself and become the Ethics Officer. But he has to be an Ethics Officer when he's an Ethics Officer and an auditor when he's an auditor. They're two different guises.

If he sees a suppressive or a PTS situation and does not realize – recognize them and realize what to do about them, he will not last very long as an auditor or if he does his own case and progress will be completely stopped. I speak the truth. This is what we learned in the first Foundations – dearly bought.

It isn't whether there are good guys in the universe and bad guys in the universe. It just so happens that there are guys in the universe who – really no different than other guys, if a little bit weaker and stupider – are more susceptible to not being here at all and who think they are someplace else, being fought by people or things that aren't there either, and behave like a bunch of northbound horses, you know, and make a horrible mess out of their lives because they're fighting things that aren't there for reasons that don't exist! And they look like a bunch of apes – worse than that. If you could see with an inside view the visio of an SP, it would startle you half to pieces because you wouldn't know there was anything quite that gaudy.

He doesn't see the world around him. He sees a three-dimensional motion picture of enemies always attacking him. Now, once in a while you have run into somebody who didn't have a wall there who had a picture of a wall. You run into these people every now and then. It's very funny. I don't know how they even manage to walk in and out of doors, but it's absolutely true. The wall isn't there, but a picture of the wall is. And it frightens them half to death when you start auditing them or running reach and withdraw on walls or something like that, because the wall shakes and it looks like it's going to go to pieces. And you think they're going OT because they can now erase matter. No, they didn't have a wall there, you see? Notice that the wall isn't erasing for you. If the guy was OT, it would.

Now therefore, this is where the universe is really a mock-up. It's really just a very thin, flimsy mock-up. Of course, it is a mock-up, but to you and me it has solidity. Now, this other bird, he doesn't have the wall there that you and I have. He has another wall there entirely. Now, that person isn't necessarily a suppressive person. This is what we call dub-in, using the phrase out of the motion picture industry of putting a soundtrack on top of something that isn't there.

Now, that guy when he starts to run one of our contact processes gets into huge cognitions and gains because he finds out that his mocked-up wall isn't the wall that's there; that the wall that's there is the wall you and I see. And this brings him tremendous relief. Well, that does not make him suppressive. That is not even one of the characteristics of a suppressive, particularly. We're not interested in that characteristic as a suppressive characteristic. All I'm trying to tell you about is: as that wall is a mock-up for this person, so is every one of us a

mock-up for that suppressive. We aren't there. In the places we're standing, God knows what's standing there – pink alligators, Martians, FBI agents – *something else*.

Now, somebody will say, "Well, he's just taken paranoia and specialized on it, and so forth, as a primary source of the thing. And of course, we know paranoia and we've always known paranoia" – just dismiss the whole thing. Hell, what they hold up and call a paranoid is such a mild version of what I'm talking about that we haven't any interest in it at all. A paranoid simply believes people are against him. Sometimes people are against somebody so they say he's a paranoid. You see. Works both ways. There's homicidal maniacs and so on.

No, this has nothing to do with psychiatric classification because it really, mostly looks totally sane. Once in a blue moon you get one of these boys in an institution – once in a blue moon. But I really think he would look so normal to the average psychiatrist that he'd be let out at once.

Now, they know that there is somebody who believes people are against him. Well, this is not as simple a definition as that. It is a person who is surrounded by identities which are different than those others see. And others have different intentions. They don't have the intentions you and I have noticed in people. They have entirely different intentions.

This is an interesting point of view because it's sort of like the fellow lives in a sort of Cinerama. He's in a cave filled with Cinerama, except we are the dramatic personnel when we walk in and out of his lives. Now, you see a paranoid usually is delusive. He has fictional people walking in and out of his lives, in that he doesn't have to have anybody walk into and out of the room to have somebody in the room. Do you follow? No, in this particular case of the suppressive you really have to have somebody walking in and out of the room for him to have been confronted by one of his fictional people.

This is a very, very, very hard thing for a sane person to envision, that somebody could go through life fooling everybody on this whole line. But they exist.

The exact anatomy of what's wrong with their case is they're stuck on the time track. They are stuck somewhere in life in some activity where they're in a very tight spot and are being surrounded, badgered, tortured or injured in some way by a people or a group. And whereby that has happened to all of the rest of us at some time or another, we have moved on up the track. Well, the suppressive *never has*. He has never gone another inch beyond there. He is there *totally*. Today is that point on the track. It is always ten o'clock. Do you see?

Time does not move for this person. To get him to run an engram is next to impossible, because a person has to have a concept of motion on the time track in order to get from one end of an engram to another. And you have to be able to go *over* something in order to erase it on the time track. And of course, this person is not about to go *over* anything because he is in no place else but this precise, pinpricked instant in time.

Now, all of us in an aberrated state can find a point on the track where we're (quote) "stuck." In other words, we have for long time had an incident there we didn't notice before. Now, that's not the same thing. The suppressive, for a long time, has had the world there and didn't notice. See? There's the difference.

Now, this person is simply in that condition. There he is. Only he's sitting right here amongst us, being a revolutionary, being put down by the Spanish Inquisition, and we're all priests. And I don't know, but I think he even sees us in robes. And he says weird, out-of-contextish statements to us, every now and then, which he hastily covers up, because he's also learned that he mustn't be told that he's wrong. And that's his world. So of course, he butchers everybody.

Now, you'd have to know something about the mind before you could know anything about the anatomy of a suppressive. That, of course, lets psychiatry and psychoanalysis out.

Now, let me give you, in rather rapid order, the actual attributes, one right after the other in a very machine-gun fashion. And this is the "antisocial personality," I've called this. That's because you, in speaking of it and so on, actually marry up with old technology, because they've looked for this fellow called the antisocial person for a very long time. Freud uses the term. Psychologists use the term. It's been used for a very long time. They know there is such a thing as an antisocial personality. And this is the personality for which they were groping. We're calling it a suppressive because it's more explicit.

But if you were speaking of this broadly or generally, why, you'd be very clever to say, "Well, an antisocial-type person." You're on technical firm ground. Now, this in actual fact is quite adequate as a discovery of some magnitude. The attributes of the antisocial personality would, in psychology, be an isolation study and a discovery of considerable magnitude to the psychologist. He'd be terribly interested in this. He runs into them all the time and doesn't know what he's looking at.

Out of this, by the way, you could make up a type of personality-analysis test that would isolate these birds at once. You would just have as many columns as I have attributes here. Make up a gradient scale on that column, see where the person is and you would – if he rode low on the resultant graph, why, you had one; and if he rode high, why, you didn't. It's almost worth doing.

But it would be of only great value if you were trying to go through a firm fast, and straighten it out. You've got the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company on your hands, and in the line of organization, why, he's asked you as a Scientologist – because the Scientologists seem to be very well organized and succeeding – what you would do. Well, if you had a personality test of this character, it would be of great value to you. You'd just deal them out and those people that flunked them, why, you would set those aside and get them off the assembly belts and the firm would promptly recover – just like that. *Bang!* Of course, there's always the danger that it's the GM. Anyway... Not if he's asking you for help.

And this is the first attribute: This person speaks only in generalities and that is the first first thing we noticed about them. They never spoke in anything but generalities. It wasn't "Henry said it" – ever. It was always "Everybody said it." Such a person will get one letter in, criticizing the magazine, out of seven thousand avid readers and will immediately report, "The readers all think..." One instance becomes every.

Now, every human being has this tendency to some slight degree. But this person pushes it home too hard. Any piece of bad news becomes an "everybody." It's what the community thinks of you, you see? See? One casual remark dropped someplace or another be-

comes immediately the total public opinion of England, you see. But it's this generality – the use of generalities to a totality – that give us the hallmark that was first noticed of a suppressive. They use this to pieces.

Now, it affects PTSes, so PTSes will echo it. When you hear somebody says, "Well, everybody in this community just hates Scientology." You know you're talking to a PTS or a suppressive – immediately. And you don't have to further qualify it. Now, if you want to find out if it's a PTS, it's somebody told him. And if it's a suppressive, he dreamed it up.

And this is one of the hallmarks of an ethics-type personality and is this antisocial personality. Now, of course, it has – people just haven't been doing this since *we've* been around. They've been at this for a long time. I imagine they were busy telling Nero – such suppressive persons as he had in his vicinity would hear one whisper from one guard and immediately this became the opinion of the population of the entire empire. "The people of Rome," or "All the people of the empire believe..." see? Some pish-tush that was uttered by some little goose that was down in the fifth corridor who's just stubbed her toe, you know, and this becomes public opinion.

Now, the newspaper tries to bring about a public opinion, and you very often find newspapers dealing in sweeping generalities they ought to be shot for. Now, I'll show you a borderline generality which you might not think is a generality sometimes, but "865 dead on holiday" – banner headlines, you see. You know, I think if that many people took a holiday that was not the news story. I think that dealt with the minority. You get my point? The newspaper's got a headline there about the people that died in accidents on this holiday which unfortunately involved some twenty-seven or twenty-eight million people. And they speak of the eight hundred in a certain way, so it looks like holidays are sort of dangerous or roads are dangerous.

Airplanes have been catching it of recent years, and yet the airplane has a better safety statistic than the railroad. What they did was continue to carry more and more and more and more people, you see. So when they did have an accident it was very spectacular indeed, but statistically and so on was less accident per passenger mile than the railroads had and is, I think, a better statistic by the way by far than some of the other means of transport man uses.

But the statistic on steamer passengers being carried, and so on, is very much on the decline, because you don't have very many steamers carrying very many passengers anymore. It's not a high traffic volume anymore. So if one steamer went up in smoke per year they would have more casualty statistic than the entire airline history for that year. Do you follow? Passengers carried – very small numbers.

Newspaper doesn't bother to explain all of this, but the newspaper itself is, of course, itself a generality.

There is certain types of governments – the communist state these days is a generality. It is *the* people. Everybody tearing around, "*the* people". Doing something for *the* people. I can make these people really upset by seemingly intelligently trying to isolate the people, trying to find the people that are being helped, because everybody I see is being shot.

So if there is some abstract image here called "the people" that have [has] nothing whatsoever to do with the people. Communism is one of the finest methods of government ever developed by suppressives.

They don't ever govern anybody who is there. They only govern "the people" or "the masses". And they don't ever have anything to do with the people and masses. Nobody ever finds "a masses". Big, beautiful abstract that sits out there. And as you get into these super-high powered collective-type civilized philosophies and so on, so-called civilized philosophies, you are just getting in suppressive philosophies.

Now, this generality is a big factor. Now, it doesn't make a person who simply says, "Well, they're mad at me," inspecifically – that doesn't make him a suppressive person. But if he's using it to push things down your throat, it rather tends to. "Everybody at school believes you're no good." "They," "all" – these sweeping things connected with bad news.

There's great value in knowing this. Because the rebuttal of course is, "Who is 'they'?" "What is 'everybody's' name?" And the guy – he's either PTS and has simply just been told this, and therefore he isolates it and makes him feel better or he's suppressive and is mad as the dickens because he's been trapped.

All right. That's the first characteristic: deals in generalities.

Second characteristic: Such a person deals mainly in bad news, critical or hostile remarks, invalidation and general suppression. Now, of course we know *that*. But did you ever know anybody who never said anything good about anybody ever? Well, that person was a suppressive. There's no further qualification is necessary. That person was a newspaper – I mean, a suppressive.

There's the hallmark of the suppressive because that is the extent of the operation in actual fact. They also do bad things to people, but there certainly – there isn't anybody good anyplace, anywhere, you know, ever. And it's just they deal mainly in bad news, critical or hostile remarks, invalidation and general suppression. And that's their stock in trade.

Now, if you told this person to tell Bill that you certainly appreciated his bringing you home last night, that person will never so tell Bill. Never, never, never relay a complimentary remark. Never relay good news, period. Good news does not pass. It might become an outright lie. The good news won't pass. But it might become an outright lie and somehow or another become *bad* news. But they will pass bad news but altered, worsened.

Number three: (This is the characteristic of which I was just speaking.) The antisocial personality alters to worsen communication when he or she relays a message or news. Good news stopped and only bad news, often embellished, is passed along. Now, that is just a common – that's a common characteristic to that type of personality. It isn't that you gave them good news or you gave them bad news. This is not this, now. This is the other one. The other one is this:

Whatever passes through their hands is altered. They alter the communication. If they say it's two – three. If you said it was Tuesday, it becomes Thursday, you see? There's always an alteration of a communication. The communication does not duplicate, the communication alters.

Now, if you had this old test that they use in the army of they have a whispered message passed along through a dozen men, you know, to find out what comes out the other end. Well, actually, in the British Army they commonly drill them and – not as a demonstration and so forth – they get them so they actually will pass on a relayed communication. But if you were to go down that twelve men you would find only, at the outside, one or two of them had altered the communication and you would have your hands on people who were either PTS or suppressive.

The altered communication: They usually worsen the gist of the communication, but they certainly alter it, do you get the idea? That's a distinct difference from "the person *deals* in bad news." See? This person alters communications that flow through him.

And the next characteristic is a fact that a suppressive, the antisocial personality, does not respond to treatment, reform or psychotherapy. No response.

Now, you actually never deal with the serious ones. They're running the London *Daily Mail* and things of this character. They're running the great banks of the world – the serious suppressives. They're not, they're not in actual sober fact accessible to you. They're the insane ones. I mean, the insane one is not really accessible to any psychotherapy. He's so batty that his close staffs normally know it, but when he's moved up in a position in the world and so on, he's quite able to make this the norm – makes this the normal circumstance of existence.

You see, he would shoot at you, only. I mean, the real bad one. It isn't that you won't get one in the auditing chair. But the real bad one – he really never does come and sit down in the auditing chair, do you understand? And he, and the people he influences, are the only people on the planet who won't.

So he's not open to being audited. I'm finding it a little bit hard to make the point, because you say no case gain and so forth, this sort of thing; yes, that is the characteristic. But I just wanted to point out to you that you don't get this guy in the auditing chair – the worst ones. You don't get him in the auditing chair at all. He's back there screaming someplace about you. But he would never come in and sit down in the auditing chair.

So we, of course, knowing enough about the mind, can sandblast these people and blow them up with Power Processes used in various ways. And we could blast through with CCHs. And somehow or another, we could undoubtedly do something for them – if we had to. But that's today. That's today. And it's only because we know the anatomy of what they consist of and we know the rest of these things. We could do something for them today.

But it would take very, very, very heavy teamwork. It would take an organization, and it would take one preferably who had an institutional access to really take on this line of country. And what this is meant by, is that the person who comes along who hasn't been helped by auditing – well, we can modify that and say, well, if he hasn't been helped by lower-grade auditing, if he hasn't been helped by the usual or ordinary approaches of auditing and so on, then that person is an SP. So we can say that he isn't benefited by psychotherapy because we're not in that business. He does not respond to treatment, that is for sure. He does not reform, that is for sure. And the psychoanalyst never came within a thousand miles of him. And the psychologist doesn't even recognize him.

Let me give you that characteristic again: He does not respond to treatment or reform or psychotherapy. No response. No change.

Now, if you say auditing – then auditing is not psychotherapy and is not a normal human activity at all – but he won't respond to the lower forms of auditing. He won't respond to grade auditing up to, let us say, IV.

Now, a very skilled auditor in an organization and so forth can undoubtedly take these people and blast them to pieces if he could get them to stand still. But if you started picking up every one there was, you would need an institution.

It's not that this fellow has acted insane in the society; it's the fact that he would go insane the instant anybody looked like he was going to do anything to him mentally. The one thing this fellow can't do is confront his own mind! Now, recognize that as one of the motivations of his activities with regard to Scientology. He does not *dare* confront his own mind! He would go into trembling fits! He would go into piercing screams that they would have to put him in a padded cell for years if he took one tiny little look at his own mind. You understand?

And that's why you when you come along and you say we're going to audit people, we're going to process people and we're going to do something with the mind, that's why these guys go *mad*! You follow it?

They're right up there to the heads of states saying, "You've got to shoot these people! You've got to kill these people! You've got to do something about these people! *Auhhhhr!*" You know, they talk sanely, like that. And of course, a state that would listen to them has that type of person in charge of it. I wouldn't mention any names – Bolte\* down in Victoria; Smith, Rhodesia. I don't want to get any libelous remarks out here, so I'll simply deal in truth. You got the idea?

The second they deal in their mind, those spooks that they carry with them all the time move slightly. And they just go, "*Zyaahhhhhhh*!"

So it isn't what you're doing. You're just wasting your time to explain to these people that you're not doing anything bad, all you're doing is helping people with their minds. It's the thought that anything has anything to do with the mind of any kind whatsoever that drives them into screaming terror! That's the kind of nut in the back of this newspaper chain up here. They got one like this on the East Grinstead Town and Country Planning Committee.

Recognize what you're *dealing* with. Don't be *reasonable*! You can't talk to these fellows about psychotherapy or about the mind or reason with them in any way. The second you've lifted the tiniest curtain of the subject, they've gone into irrational, screaming fits. They would want nothing less than your execution. And your crime is not what they say your crime is. Your crime is the fact that you have almost made them confront something that they cannot and do not *dare* confront! And you've almost exposed them because they – see, they're not under good control, and they recognize that if they lose control they will undoubtedly be put away. They know they're that close to insane. And that's why they get mad at you particularly.

---

\* EDITOR'S NOTE: SIR HENRY EDWARD BOLTE \*1908, 1955-1972 PRIME MINISTER OF THE AUSTRALIAN STATE VICTORIA.

Now, that was the fourth characteristic.

And the fifth characteristic is: Surrounding such a personality we find cowed or ill associates or friends who, when not actually driven insane, are yet behaving in a crippled manner in life, failing and not succeeding.

The people in this person's vicinity just fail. You say, "Well, there's a family and they always had bad – they always had bad luck, you know. They lost a boy and then the other one flunked in school, the other one's in prison and – and so forth. Then there was Jessie Ann. And Jessie Ann, of course, well, she's been in the insane asylum for some time and..." Family looks awfully unlucky. Get smart. This family isn't unlucky, this family has got a suppressive in the middle of it.

Now, they make trouble for others. Now, when you try to treat those people in the vicinity of the suppressive – and here's what's very important – they don't recover. They get a little bit better and they get worse, and they get a little bit better and they get worse, and then they really get worse. And then when it looks like they're really going to recover then they *die*. Suppressive couldn't stand that; he just wiped them out then.

This is what you're up against. You have a broad familial pattern of sickness or something like that, and you don't do anything ethicswise about it and so on, why, you're not going to get any success on any member of that group, unless you handle it from an ethics viewpoint.

Therefore, if you didn't know that you could make an awful bust out of processing people. When you have a group of people who are commonly a rolly coaster bunch or kind of sick and unlucky and all that sort of thing, and you don't suspect there's a suppressive in amongst them and that they're all PTS, and that you've got some other explanation like "They lived in the swamps, and of course they were fever stricken." I don't know. Who the hell was making them live in the swamps? [laughs]

And number six is something which is a saving grace. The antisocial personality habitually selects the wrong target – habitually. They're always selecting the wrong target. Now, this is – becomes very funny. If a tire went flat they would blame their companion. But they wouldn't connect it on the basis that the tire went flat. The tire went flat, so they got mad at their companion. Now, you say, well, that's a human characteristic. Well, human beings do tend to get mad at the things around what they're mad at, and so on. But this would be on the basis of a disassociate. The tire is flat. Now, being mad at the companion has nothing whatsoever to do with the tire being flat.

And it'd go to a point of the icebox is making a dreadful racket in the kitchen – see, *rat-a-tat-tat* and so on – so they go upstairs and fix the pipes in the attic to the hot water system. And you, very often, will see these people and you consider that they are ineffectual on the job. They're ineffectual on the job that if they *did* notice anything was wrong they would fix something else.

If they were served a notice by the Salvation Army they would go down and report to the jailhouse or something. They can never quite figure out where what was which, see? And this goes in reverse. If they want to straighten out something in the society, then they will

attack the people who aren't doing it. When you get a government going like this you know *exactly* what you're dealing with. For instance, we're not messing up the insane; the psychiatrists are. They're attacking us, see, and they're not attacking the psychiatrist. Do you see?

You get the tremendous gap there. It's a wrong target situation but they'll get enthusiastic on a wrong target the like of which you never heard of! This isn't defensive as far as we are concerned; this is just remarkable because it's a saving grace. Because they attack a wrong target they don't succeed very well. That means they're ineffectual. They're kind of goony. And you needn't be anywhere near as afraid of them as people have become. Because there's that one fact – that one fact – that sixth characteristic: wrong target. You can absolutely count on it.

When you've got a suppressive general and he's got a ridge that has to be cleaned out and so forth, why, he sends all of his troops into the valley. If he has to, to win the battle, knock out all the artillery emplacements and so on, why, he will have the enemy's water supplies polluted. It's as wrong target as that. If he should shoot at A, he shoots at B.

And you will see this person as a – well, as a woman in the middle of a family, something like that. She will spot the wrong reasons for things and then settle these wrong reasons. And it gets pretty goony if you listen to it after a while. "Well, let's see, Bill failed at college." And you expect some remark, "Therefore, we won't send Pete to college. We will send them something else," you know. "We should go on a diet." There's a disassociation involved in these things which is sometimes hard to catch, because you don't catch it to what was going on. But you get them lined up. But you watch for this wrong target. But it serves you in very good stead because he'll never attack the right thing.

And here's another saving grace in dealing with these people: They don't complete cycles of action. If they start to put an apple on a shelf; it will only get halfway there, that's for sure. If they start a war in Zanzibar, it won't be completed. That incomplete cycle of action – that's just a total dramatization. They didn't ever complete those cycles of action. If they completed one, they'd find it out, then they would redo it. They mustn't arrive and they don't arrive and this is because their time sense is loused up. They don't have ideas of consecutive events. And so they don't, therefore, complete cycles of action.

These, by the way, are all empirical; these are not theoretical. I didn't tell you that. These are not just theoretical extrapolations where I sat down and figured out what would be this personality and so on. No. This winnows out just thousands and thousands of hours of observation, shaking down the common characteristics. The characteristics these people have in common. These things are not necessarily themselves associated with one another. These are just things that you know that these were the characteristics which were common to all of them. There are a lot of other characteristics that you could equally apply, you see, but you wouldn't necessarily... They aren't necessarily common to all these suppressives. Some have them, some don't. And this is empirical – that is to say, picked up by actual observation and experience in life.

And that's one of the wildest things to watch you ever had anything to do with is can't finish a cycle of action. You watch a suppressive trying to finish a cycle of action and so on, he changes his mind and goes over on a wrong target. They'll shift between wrong target and

cycle of action, you see? They start to finish a cycle of action, why, then they will shift the target to something else. There'll be some reason why they can't finish that cycle of action; they've got to do something else and you just – suddenly you'll look at them and you say, "Hey, that hasn't got anything whatsoever to do with what you were doing, and you don't have to do that in order to do something else," and they just know you're wrong, man.

Now, number eight: Many antisocial persons will freely confess to the most alarming crimes – when forced to do so, will have no faintest sense of responsibility for them. That is when such a person does confess to crimes you will find out, "Oh, yes. I killed the baby. Yes, yes. Yes, I murdered all the policemen, you know. *Bluh-uh-bluuh, bluh, bluh.*" And you say, "Well, what was the baby doing to you, you had to blow its head off with a .45?" "Well, I really don't know. Don't know. Very sorry for it, yep. You got any more babies to shoot?" You know? No sense of responsibility at all. They drive you mad.

They drive a policeman mad when they try to interrogate such fellows and so on. The fellow will confess to all the crimes under the sun, you know. And reformers go mad on this, you know, because after the fellow's confessed to all these crimes, he says, "So what?" The idea of crime is – well, you think they're a crime; he doesn't. They don't have any classification of behavior, different types of behavior – that there's such a thing as good behavior and bad behavior, nice behavior and pleasant behavior. There aren't different types of behavior. And they certainly take no responsibility for some of the wildest crimes and this is one thing that shows up. And when you hear this, boy – because maybe the guy has fooled you right up to that point, see. You hear about how he murdered his wife and corrupted all of his family. And he's sitting there; he's got a pleasant smile on his face and so on. *Oooh!* Hey, wait a minute. That is a suppressive characteristic, and you'll find the rest of the details then, unobserved before, will now start to fill in. No responsibility for committed acts.

That sort of thing happens. It can go off into any branch of crime by the way. It isn't one type of crime or another type of crime or one type of behavior or another type of behavior. It's interesting that they explain kleptomania by "the hand wandered over and took something and put it in the pocket." And they stand back and watch the hand detachedly do this. It's marvelous. "Yes, well, they took all of the money out of the cash register. Yes, yes, yes, yes." And if you pin it down, why, what they actually did, was observe their hands take the money out of the cash register and put it in their pockets. And they did so with a little bit of surprise and maybe even a faint feeling of reproof like their hand shouldn't be doing that. But they don't have anything to do with it. It's marvelous.

Now, the antisocial personality supports only destructive groups and rages against and attacks any constructive or betterment group. If you knew a person was a suppressive and so on, you could forecast at once what his reaction would be to a decent group or to a criminal group. And if you had one, for instance, in a parliament or a congress and you wanted to know what type of group they would try to legislate against, you could pick it up like that, because any group that is a betterment group they will legislate against and riots – smiots. "So they're all rioting and killing each other out in Cleveland. Well, that's no reason to do anything about the I Will Arise Society in Cleveland. But you say the police department there in Cleveland – you say that they were attempting to preserve property and so forth. Well, shoot

them." Do you get the idea? "And that there were some ministers around and that they were actually counseling moderate action and so forth. Well, we'll have them investigated."

It's a reverse. It's the negative of the positive. It's what you would have normally been led to expect as law and order, they will reverse. You know, you support the rioters and you attack the people who are trying to prevent riots, you know. You support the wage earners, and you put the bums into the millionaire class if you possibly can, see. You reward down statistics, we would put it, consistently and continuously.

Now actions, regardless of the group character of, the actions which are approved by this type of personality are destructive actions. Well, it was a good thing – he walked in and blew his head off with a shotgun. And that was a bad thing – she made a cake and gave it to the kids.

So that if you have a good action and a person approves of it, he's probably not suppressive. But if he – a person seems to be disapproving all the time good actions, you can't quite figure out what this is all about. Well, don't be so far adrift. You're talking to a suppressive.

These good-bad actions – you know, these actions: "Well, it was probably a good thing that the atom bomb hit Hiroshima because now they've been able to... The war was a good thing because the scientists were able to invent so many new things..." What's that? You know. Well, what that is, is suppression. It's the approval of a destructive action and the inhibition of constructive actions.

Now, they, by the way, will attach themselves to constructive people to try to smash them. They will go that far. You find it in Hollywood. Boy, oh boy, man. If you ever started to clean out Hollywood, you'd have a ball.

And the eleventh one: Helping others is an activity which drives the antisocial personality nearly berserk. Activities, however, which destroy in the name of help are closely supported. Really, anything that helps somebody is bad. And things that don't help are good. But if you've got a real mixed-up mess, whereby you've got the witch doctors are uniformly killing off all the villagers, but making a big play out of what a good thing this is, why, they'll support those witch doctors down to their last penny and ounce of energy. "Yeah, those guys are great!" See?

The idea is to get rid of everybody. You can more or less extrapolate these characteristics. If everybody became miserable, then you could get rid of them all and they would all disappear and then they'd all die and this fellow would then be safe, you see. Well, that works out fine except the people around him aren't the people who are around him, so of course it won't work out, ever.

And then the last one: The antisocial personality has a bad sense of property and conceives that the idea that anyone owns anything is a pretense made up to fool people. Nothing is ever really owned. And you listen to these guys sometimes; they really just pretend that people own things and so on. You watch that characteristic, it becomes almost pathetically amusing.

The reason they took the car and smashed it up and the reason they smashed your car up is because it isn't your car. You bought it and paid for it and sweat yourself to pieces paying for the thing and you've safeguarded it and taken care of it and so on, but it's not your car. You're just pretending that it's your car.

Now, you could say that there are a couple of others of these – there could be two or three more. And you could say that it is a tremendous feeling of importance or dominance and so forth had to do with this. Well now, they've assigned those characteristics to the paranoid personality, but they do not belong.

That a fact that some guy thinks he's terribly important and another guy thinks he's unimportant and so forth has nothing whatsoever to do with suppression.

It's another characteristic of the personality, and some guys are rather ridiculous on the subject of importance. But if you ever really want to see important blokes, why, go down and talk to some ditch diggers or some charladies or something like that. Now, they are very important people! And you think these people, because of their station in life, would think of themselves as unimportant people. Well, it goes almost inversely, that the lower down a fellow is the more he has to assert his importance. If you ever want to see somebody bridle about importance, you want to take somebody who is not really very important, and then he becomes *very important*.

As far as dominance is concerned, they have dominance in the society totally mixed up with suppression. There's nothing wrong with dominance. Well, I say there's nothing right, wrong otherwise – it's just dominance is dominance, you know. George dominates his business. He dominates his family or she dominates something or other – so what? See? It's what do they do with this domination that counts. That they dominate has nothing to do with anything. Do you follow?

Now, though a person thinks he's important or doesn't think he's important – they've assigned that as characteristics of paranoia. And I have seen some people who did think they were outrageously important – fantastic – and harped on it all the time. But that was just a crazy psychosis in the middle of it. You won't find that all suppressives conceive they are important. It's not a common denominator. So there are many other characteristics which you will find in this field. But I do not think that you will find them as common denominators.

I've just given you a dozen common denominators by which they can be *recognized*. These will hold true. Now, on top of these, there will be all kinds of wild idiosyncrasies – wild idiosyncrasies, odd differences, personal quirks and peculiarities. You'll find these things galore. But they don't hold across the boards. Don't think when you've met one who thinks that he has to have a green hat on all the time and he'd be safe, then that all SPs have to have green hats, because they don't. This was this peculiar SP.

But the other dozen characteristics which I've just given you, I think you will find hold pretty true throughout any and all of these suppressives. Now, you watch these things and you'll... They are things, by the way, which are very startling to auditors. He gets some overts off this guy, and this guy has robbed his little brother's piggy bank and hit his sister on the head with a hammer and he's just sitting there, you know, talking. Wife owns some property and so he lost it in a gambling game; she's been destitute ever since. He left her in Omaha.

You look for some reaction on this meter, see. You look for this guy to cognite; you look for something to happen. You've gotten fantastic overts off this guy and you're getting no tone arm action either. Well, the pathetic part of it is the overts probably aren't even true. He's probably just trying to horrify you. He might have done them, he might not have done them. But if he did do them he had no responsibility for them. You watch these kind of things.

So you should know those various characteristics, see? You should know what they consist of. And if you know them as common denominators, when you see one of them, this doesn't prove too much until you've got it married up with two or three more. Now you know. And you say, "*Ahhhhh, ahhhhh, ahhhhh! No wonder Josie Ann rolly coasters all the time,*" you see. "Look at this guy, Pete." You know, whatever it is.

Anyhow, an auditor's skills depend upon his recognition of the situation he is auditing. And when you have some isolated series of characteristics which give you a certain expectancy they become valuable. And if you have a dozen characteristics which when you have perceived them in a pc and which when they add up to several others of these characteristics of the dozen – you now know what to predict. You're going to predict no case gain, you're going to predict catastrophe, you're going to predict a total mess in all directions. And somewhere along this line you better unload, because you are auditing an ethics-type case and you got no business doing it.

When you see somebody rolly coaster – they felt good and then they felt bad – you say, "Well, Scientology has harmed them." No, Scientology didn't harm them, but by being audited, they attracted the notice of a suppressive who then proceeded to cave them in fast! And you do an S&D on somebody and find the wrong suppressive, why, the p... you'll get a rolly coaster – a Search and Discovery – you'll get a rolly coaster; you'll get a person worsening. But also remember the situation can occur that you did a perfectly good S&D and then one week later they met another SP. See, that condition could exist also.

Well, I hope that this will be of some service to you. It's a gruesome subject. I hate to run this type of thing into your lap. But I would rather tell you than have you find it out in an auditing chair. I think maybe it would be of some service to you. Now, there will be an article published on this particular subject. But you should know these twelve characteristics.

Thank you very much.



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 27 SEPTEMBER 1966

Remimeo

**THE ANTI-SOCIAL PERSONALITY**  
**THE ANTI-SCIENTOLOGIST**

There are certain characteristics and mental attitudes which cause about 20% of a race to oppose violently any betterment activity or group.

Such people are known to have anti-social tendencies.

When the legal or political structure of a country becomes such as to favor such personalities in positions of trust, then all the civilizing organizations of the country become suppressed and a barbarism of criminality and economic duress ensues.

Crime and criminal acts are perpetuated by anti-social personalities. Inmates of institutions commonly trace their state back to contact with such personalities.

Thus, in the fields of government, police activities and mental health, to name a few, we see that it is important to be able to detect and isolate this personality type so as to protect society and individuals from the destructive consequences attendant upon letting such have free rein to injure others.

As they only comprise 20% of the population and as only 2½% of this 20% are truly dangerous, we see that with a very small amount of effort we could considerably better the state of society.

Well-known, even stellar, examples of such a personality are, of course, Napoleon and Hitler, Dillinger, Pretty Boy Floyd, Christie\* and other famous criminals were well-known examples of the anti-social personality. But with such a cast of characters in history we neglect the less stellar examples and do not perceive that such personalities exist in current life, very common, often undetected.

When we trace the cause of a failing business, we will inevitably discover somewhere in its ranks the anti-social personality hard at work.

In families which are breaking up we commonly find one or the other of the persons involved to have such a personality.

Where life has become rough and is failing, a careful review of the area by a trained observer will detect one or more such personalities at work.

---

\* Editor's note: John Dillinger, famous American bank robber, 1902-1934; Pretty Boy Floyd, famous American gangster 1904-1934; Christie: English serial killer from the middle of the 20th century.

As there are 80% of us trying to get along and only 20% trying to prevent us, our lives would be much easier to live were we well-informed as to the exact manifestations of such a personality. Thus we could detect it and save ourselves much failure and heartbreak.

It is important then to examine and list the attributes of the anti-social personality. Influencing as it does the daily lives of so many, it well behooves decent people to become better informed on this subject.

### ATTRIBUTES

The anti-social personality has the following attributes:

1. He or she speaks only in very broad generalities. "*They say...*" "Everybody thinks..." "Everyone knows..." and such expressions are in continual use, particularly when imparting rumor. When asked, "Who is everybody..." it normally turns out to be one source and from this source the anti-social person has manufactured what he or she pretends is the whole opinion of the whole society.

This is natural to them since to them all society is a large hostile generality, against the anti-social in particular.

2. Such a person deals mainly in bad news, critical or hostile remarks, invalidation and general suppression.

"Gossip" or "harbinger of evil tidings" or "rumormonger" once described such persons.

It is notable that there is no good news or complimentary remark passed on by such a person.

3. The anti-social personality alters, to worsen, communication when he or she relays a message or news. Good news is stopped and only bad news, often embellished, is passed along.

Such a person also pretends to pass on "bad news" which is in actual fact invented.

4. A characteristic, and one of the sad things about an anti-social personality, is that it does not respond to treatment or reform or psychotherapy.

5. Surrounding such a personality we find cowed or ill associates or friends who, when not driven actually insane, are yet behaving in a crippled manner in life, failing, not succeeding.

Such people make trouble for others.

When treated or educated, the near associate of the anti-social personality has no stability of gain but promptly relapses or loses his advantages of knowledge, being under the suppressive influence of the other.

Physically treated, such associates commonly do not recover in the expected time but worsen and have poor convalescences.

It is quite useless to treat or help or train such persons so long as they remain under the influence of the anti-social connection.

The largest number of insane are insane because of such anti-social connections and do not recover easily for the same reason.

Unjustly we seldom see the anti-social personality actually in an institution. Only his "friends" and family are there.

6. The anti-social personality habitually selects the wrong target.

If a tyre is flat from driving over nails, he or she curses a companion or a non-causative source of the trouble. If the radio next door is too loud, he or she kicks the cat.

If A is the obvious cause, the anti-social personality inevitably blames B, or C or D.

7. The anti-social cannot finish a cycle of action.

Such become surrounded with incomplete projects.

8. Many anti-social persons will freely confess to the most alarming crimes when forced to do so, but will have no faintest sense of responsibility for them.

Their actions have little or nothing to do with their own volition. Things "just happened".

They have no sense of correct causation and particularly cannot feel any sense of remorse or shame therefore.

9. The anti-social personality supports only destructive groups and rages against and attacks any constructive or betterment group.

10. This type of personality approves only of destructive actions and fights against constructive or helpful actions or activities.

The artist in particular is often found as a magnet for persons with anti-social personalities who see in his art something which must be destroyed and covertly, "as a friend", proceed to try.

11. Helping others is an activity which drives the anti-social personality nearly berserk. Activities, however, which destroy in the name of help are closely supported.

12. The anti-social personality has a bad sense of property and conceives that the idea that anyone owns anything is a pretense made up to fool people. Nothing is ever really owned.

### THE BASIC REASON

The basic reason the anti-social personality behaves as he or she does lies in a hidden terror of others.

To such a person every other being is an enemy, an enemy to be covertly or overtly destroyed.

The fixation is that survival itself depends on "keeping others down" or "keeping people ignorant".

If anyone were to promise to make others stronger or brighter, the anti-social personality suffers the utmost agony of personal danger.

They reason that if they are in this much trouble with people around them weak or stupid, they would perish should anyone become strong or bright.

Such a person has no trust to a point of terror. This is usually masked and unrevealed.

When such a personality goes insane the world is full of Martians or the FBI and each person met is really a Martian or FBI agent.

But the bulk of such people exhibit no outward signs of insanity. They appear quite rational. They can be *very* convincing.

However, the list given above consists of things which such a personality cannot detect in himself or herself. This is so true that if you thought you found yourself in one of the above, you most certainly are not anti-social. Self-criticism is a luxury the anti-social cannot afford. They must be RIGHT because they are in continual danger in their own estimation. If you proved one WRONG, you might even send him or her into a severe illness.

Only the sane, well-balanced person tries to correct his conduct.

### RELIEF

If you were to weed out of your past by proper search and discovery those anti-social persons you have known and if you then disconnected, you might experience great relief.

Similarly, if society were to recognize this personality type as a sick being as they now isolate people with smallpox, both social and economic recoveries could occur.

Things are not likely to get much better so long as 20% of the population is permitted to dominate and injure the lives and enterprise of the remaining 80%.

As majority rule is the political manner of the day, so should majority sanity express itself in our daily lives without the interference and destruction of the socially unwell.

The pity of it is, they will not permit themselves to be helped and would not respond to treatment if help were attempted.

An understanding and ability to recognize such personalities could bring a major change in society and our lives.

### THE SOCIAL PERSONALITY

Man in his anxieties is prone to witch hunts.

All one has to do is designate "people wearing black caps" as the villains and one can start a slaughter of people in black caps.

This characteristic makes it very easy for the anti-social personality to bring about a chaotic or dangerous environment.

Man is not naturally brave or calm in his human state. And he is not necessarily villainous.

Even the anti-social personality, in his warped way, is quite certain that he is acting for the best and commonly sees himself as the only good person around, doing all for the good of everyone – the only flaw in his reasoning being that if one kills everyone else, none are left to be protected from the imagined evils. His *conduct* in his environment and toward his fellows is the only method of detecting either the antisocial or the social personalities. Their motives for self are similar – self-preservation and survival. They simply go about achieving these in different ways.

Thus, as Man is naturally neither calm nor brave, anyone to some degree tends to be alert to dangerous persons and hence, witch hunts can begin.

It is therefore even more important to identify the social personality than the anti-social personality. One then avoids shooting the innocent out of mere prejudice or dislike or because of some momentary misconduct.

The social personality can be defined most easily by comparison with his opposite, the anti-social personality.

This differentiation is easily done and no test should ever be constructed which isolates only the anti-social. On the same test must appear the upper as well as lower ranges of Man's actions.

A test that declares only anti-social personalities without also being able to identify the social personality would be itself a suppressive test. It would be like answering "Yes" or "No" to the question "Do you still beat your wife?" Anyone who took it could be found guilty. While this mechanism might have suited the times of the Inquisition, it would not suit modern needs.

As the society runs, prospers and lives *solely* through the efforts of social personalities, one must know them as *they*, not the anti-social, are the worthwhile people. These are the people who must have rights and freedom. Attention is given to the antisocial solely to protect and assist the social personalities in the society.

All majority rules, civilizing intentions and even the human race will fail unless one can identify and thwart the anti-social personalities and help and forward the social personalities in the society. For the very word "society" implies social conduct and without it there is no society at all, only a barbarism with all men, good or bad, at risk.

The frailty of showing how the harmful people can be known is that these then apply the characteristics to decent people to get them hunted down and eradicated.

The swan song of every great civilization is the tune played by arrows, axes or bullets used by the anti-social to slay the last decent men.

Government is only dangerous when it can be employed by and for anti-social personalities. The end result is the eradication of all social personalities and the resultant collapse of Egypt, Babylon, Rome, Russia or the West.

You will note in the characteristics of the anti-social personality that intelligence is not a clue to the anti-social. They are bright or stupid or average. Thus those who are extremely intelligent can rise to considerable, even head-of-state heights.

Importance and ability or wish to rise above others are likewise not indexes to the anti-social. When they do become important or rise they are, however, rather visible by the broad consequences of their acts. But they are as likely to be unimportant people or hold very lowly stations and wish for nothing better.

Thus it is the twelve given characteristics alone which identify the anti-social personality. And these same twelve reversed are the sole criteria of the social personality if one wishes to be truthful about them.

The identification or labeling of an anti-social personality cannot be done honestly and accurately unless one *also*, in the same examination of the person, reviews the positive side of his life.

All persons under stress can react with momentary flashes of anti-social conduct. This does not make them anti-social personalities.

The true anti-social person has a majority of anti-social characteristics.

The social personality has a majority of social characteristics.

Thus one must examine the good with the bad before one can truly label the anti-social or the social.

In reviewing such matters, very broad testimony and evidence are best. One or two isolated instances determine nothing. One should search all twelve social and all twelve anti-social characteristics and decide on the basis of actual evidence, not opinion.

The twelve primary characteristics of the social personality are as follows:

1. The social personality is specific in relating circumstances. "Joe Jones said..." "The Star Newspaper reported..." and gives sources of data where important or possible.  
He may use the generality of "they" or "people" but seldom in connection with attributing statements or opinions of an alarming nature.
2. The social personality is eager to relay good news and reluctant to relay bad.  
He may not even bother to pass along criticism when it doesn't matter.  
He is more interested in making another feel liked or wanted than disliked by others and tends to err toward reassurance rather than toward criticism.
3. A social personality passes communication without much alteration and if deleting anything tends to delete injurious matters.

He does not like to hurt people's feelings. He sometimes errs in holding back bad news or orders which seem critical or harsh.

4. Treatment, reform and psychotherapy particularly of a mild nature work very well on the social personality.

Whereas anti-social people sometimes promise to reform, they do not. Only the social personality can change or improve easily.

It is often enough to point out unwanted conduct to a social personality to completely alter it for the better.

Criminal codes and violent punishment are not needed to regulate social personalities.

5. The friends and associates of a social personality tend to be well, happy and of good morale.

A truly social personality quite often produces betterment in health or fortune by his mere presence on the scene.

At the very least he does not reduce the existing levels of health or morale in his associates.

When ill, the social personality heals or recovers in an expected manner, and is found open to successful treatment.

6. The social personality tends to select correct targets for correction. He fixes the tyre that is flat rather than attack the windscreen. In the mechanical arts he can therefore repair things and make them work.
7. Cycles of action begun are ordinarily completed by the social personality, if possible.
8. The social personality is ashamed of his misdeeds and reluctant to confess them. He takes responsibility for his errors.
9. The social personality supports constructive groups and tends to protest or resist destructive groups.
10. Destructive actions are protested by the social personality. He assists constructive or helpful actions.
11. The social personality helps others and actively resists acts which harm others.
12. Property is property of someone to the social personality and its theft or misuse is prevented or frowned upon.

### THE BASIC MOTIVATION

The social personality naturally operates on the basis of the greatest good.

He is not haunted by imagined enemies but he does recognize real enemies when they exist.

The social personality wants to survive and wants others to survive, whereas the anti-social personality really and covertly wants others to succumb.

Basically the social personality wants others to be happy and do well, whereas the anti-social personality is very clever in making others do very badly indeed.

A basic clue to the social personality is not really his successes but his motivations. The social personality when successful is often a target for the anti-social and by this reason he may fail. But his intentions included others in his success, whereas the anti-social only appreciate the doom of others.

Unless we can detect the social personality and hold him safe from undue restraint and detect also the anti-social and restrain him, our society will go on suffering from insanity, criminality and war, and Man and civilization will not endure.

Of all our technical skills, such differentiation ranks the highest since, failing, no other skill can continue, as the base on which it operates – civilization – will not be here to continue it.

Do not smash the social personality – and do not fail to render powerless the anti-social in their efforts to harm the rest of us.

Just because a man rises above his fellows or takes an important part does not make him an anti-social personality. Just because a man can control or dominate others does not make him an anti-social personality.

It is his motives in doing so and the consequences of his acts which distinguish the anti-social from the social.

Unless we realize and apply the true characteristics of the two types of personality, we will continue to live in a quandary of who our enemies are and, in doing so, victimize our friends.

All men have committed acts of violence or omission for which they could be censured. In all Mankind there is not one single perfect human being.

But there are those who try to do right and those who specialize in wrong and upon these facts and characteristics you can know them.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:lb-r.rd.jh

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 15 AUGUST 1967

Remimeo

## **DISCIPLINE SPS AND ADMIN HOW STATISTICS CRASH**

One of the ways an SP works to stop an activity or to halt an affluence is to pick out key personnel and spread wild, false and alarming stories about them.

Another way, often used in conjunction with the above, is to pound a key executive with alarming entheta about staff, divisions or activities. This urges the key executive to take uncalled for action which upsets things and which may lead to the dismissal of valuable staff.

Also it is a symptom of an org under external pressure to come down on its own personnel rather than on the public or on real SPS.

SPs tend to vanish in memory since they speak in generalities. "Always" "everyone" salt their language so that when you say, "Who told you?" in tracing a rumor, it is hard to remember since "everyone" seems to have said it. Actually the SP who did say it used "everyone" in his comm so often as to become in memory "everyone".

### **A good manager ignores rumor and only acts on statistics.**

Had I heeded over the years any rumormonger, we would have no orgs. I generally don't listen and if I do, only go so far as inspecting stats.

It is easy to discipline staff and hard to discipline the public. A **lazy** executive only disciplines staff. It takes more confront to tackle the public.

When an executive listens to rumor and bad things about his fellow staff members without looking at the actual production statistics, that executive can harm the org badly.

I have never tried to make staff members "be good". I have only tried to make them produce and wear their hats.

Our whole statistic system exists to end excessive discipline of valuable staff members.

To me a staff member whose stats are up can do no wrong.

I am not interested in wog morality. I am only interested in getting the show on the road and keeping it there.

Also I detest having to discipline anyone for anything, particularly a Scientologist. And the only discipline I use is to hold the fort until people are clear enough to see the light. They always do. All misconduct comes from aberration.

However if anyone is getting industrious trying to enturbulate or stop Scientology or its activities I can make Captain Bligh look like a Sunday school teacher. There is probably

no limit on what I would do to safeguard Man's only road to freedom against persons who, disdaining processing, seek to stop Scientology or hurt Scientologists.

I well know Man's fixation on trying to make "everybody good". Which means, really, inactive. The best men I have had in wars routinely have been continually arrested and generally frowned on by "shore patrols", "military police", etc. To the body politic a quiet person is the ideal. When the guns begin to go, these quiet ones are all hiding and only the active ones are there to fight. I often wonder what would happen to a state if it did achieve its apparent goal of making one and all inactive little sheep.

So I don't care what men or women do if they just wear their hats and keep their stats up. Only when Scientology is being slowed or stopped do you find me rigging up the tools of discipline.

In actual fact I rather hold the person who is inactive because he is afraid of punishment in contempt. I respect only those who are strong enough to be decent without the "self protection" of evil.

I use discipline to hold the edges of a channel, not to stop the flow.

SPs **love** to coax those with power to slay. As the basic ambition of any SP is "**everybody dead so I can be safe**" he or she will use all manner of lies and mechanisms to excite a thirst for discipline in those in power.

If I ever heed any "Kill everybody" advice it is to put the adviser up against a brick wall.

---

All evil stems from aberration. And it can be pretty evil. And awfully aberrated. The only road out from evil is processing. Therefore one must protect the road to freedom as the answer to evil and must protect as well all those who are working to keep the road in.

The world will never become good because of discipline or oppression of evil. All discipline pre-supposes that the person being disciplined wants to survive. The truly evil only want to succumb so discipline threat is no answer. The truly evil **love** pain and suffering and deprivation. So it coerces nothing and improves nothing when you seek to solve all evil with discipline. Only the already decent can be disciplined. It only obliges the evil ones. So all you can do really is to get the evil ones parked off the lines.

The Executive in disciplining is concerned with those who would stop or hinder the flow and those who are just plain idle or stupid. So he severely leaves alone all up stats and only acts to move the suppressives off the lines and not let the idle and stupid slow the flow. An executive could never make the world reform by discipline alone. He can by processing. So his only use of discipline is to continue to make processing possible. It's as simple as that.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:jp.rd

## CERTAINTY

[February, 1966]

Vol. 13 No. 2

Official Periodical of  
SCIENTOLOGY  
in the British Isles

## PSYCHOTICS

**L. Ron Hubbard**

In a footnote early in the book *Dianetics: The Modern Science Of Mental Health* I promised to publish material someday on the subject of institutional psychosis.

Recently I was fortunate enough to make a breakthrough on this subject. I had supposed that it would be necessary to undertake a considerable amount of research work in institutions to complete that which I began so many years ago. Researching recently on the reasons cases worsen after they become better, the answer tumbled out all unexpectedly and shed an entirely new light on the whole subject of insanity.

We are confronted in our modern society with a growing statistic for insanity. The number of psychotics is increasing, apparently, faster than the population growth. This could mean many things. It could mean that the psychiatrist was inept in applying what he knew, it could mean that there were insufficient numbers of psychiatrists, as they state, or it could mean, as they tell the legislators, that insufficient funds are being appropriated for the handling of psychosis. But the answer is apparently none of these.

If one wished to halt an epidemic it would be necessary to isolate the germ or virus which was causing it. This has become accepted procedure in the field of public health and is intensely effective. However, scientific methodology has never really been applied to the field of psychosis. It is such a frantic and desperate field that anyone associated with it has little time for careful consideration. The patients are in such dangerous condition, their families and friends are so desperate, that no-one could be expected to look for the actual cause of the situation. Thus the true facts concerning psychosis have been masked.

If you want to know why people are having trouble with something it is a good thing to look at the something. There you will find that things have not been defined. There is no true, acceptable definition of psychosis. The root word "PSYCH" refers only to a being or soul and the "OSIS" could loosely be defined as "the condition of". Therefore, in actual fact, it is not much of a word and if we look it up in the larger dictionaries we will find some long, complex dissertation or a sweeping generality which, frankly, would never be accepted in the physical sciences as a definition for anything, reflecting as it does wholly opinion. The word

"psychosis" is not, however, completely inept as it at least indicates that it is something about a spirit or soul or its quality of animation.

Thus we can suspect, if the thing has never adequately been defined, that a great many misconceptions exist concerning it and furthermore, it would seem pretty obvious that if man had not defined what it was then he was very far from being able to identify the source of it.

We all have some idea of what we mean when we say "insane" or "crazy" or "nutty" but half the time we only mean that we don't agree with the action. Things which are unreasonable to us or not understood we commonly refer to as "insane" or "crazy" or "nutty". Thus man does not make a differentiation between what he disagrees with and an actual deteriorated mental state dangerous to the society and the individual.

So the first thing we can know about Psychosis is that it is becoming more widespread for two reasons:

1. Man has not adequately or workably defined it, and
2. The true source of it has not been identified.

There follows, naturally, a third fact that it has not been cured, quite obviously, because it is getting worse.

The whole subject has been so wrapped up in untested opinion that the ordinary scientist has found it quite unapproachable. The whole field bristles with authoritarian differences of view and bitter arguments.

The number of types of "psychoses" which have been listed over the years have become so great that classification has become relatively meaningless. Further, the names given mean different things to different schools of psychiatry.

Examining this sea of turmoil, human misery, mistreatment and failure, one would not ordinarily expect to find any ready solution. If one intended to find a solution, one could have expected to search for some years amongst the institutional population observing and taking notes until at last one had identified some common denominator of the illness which might lead to relief.

The orderly mind of a research scientist would, however, begin to take the problem itself apart on the basis of excluding those things which had not led to a ready solution, and the fact I am about to give you here should have been realized a long time ago.

Psychosis has not been solved because it has been studied in the wrong place. This is the first observation which might lead to a resolution of the problem. The source of psychosis is rarely to be found in the artificial atmosphere of an institution, therefore the problem was not earlier solved. After all, it didn't occur in the institution. The person was sent there after it occurred. So the source of psychosis is obviously outside institutions. Further, a psychotic patient is seldom able to discuss accurately his life outside, so the institution would only give one evidence on the results of the source of psychosis; the source would be elsewhere.

The true psychotic is not always found in an institution. Behind those grey walls you mainly discover his victims. The true psychotic is one who causes hysteria, apathy, miscon-

ceptions and the reactions of stress in others. That is the identity of the being that is the source of psychosis.

He is, by and large, rather unconfrontable as a being, talking in the widest generalities, and sounds quite sane unless you listen to him closely. Then it will be found that the reasons he gives do not quite make sense, but are all directed toward the necessity of smashing or brutalizing anyone and everyone or selected groups, or material objects.

The actual psychotic is covertly or overtly destructive of anything the rest of us consider good or decent or worthwhile.

Sometimes such a being is "successful" in life, but the end result of his activities are what you would expect—total smash. Some notable examples were Hitler and Napoleon. Not even historians are quite brave enough to state that these two beings were totally, completely and incomprehensibly separated from reality and acted without good cause, reason or justification other than an obsession to destroy, ruin and bring misery to millions.

How Napoleon, for instance, justified beginning an attack on Russia too late in the year for his troops to operate there at all is very hard to see. Why Hitler had to destroy the Jewish people in Germany as a "necessary act in prosecuting his war against the world outside of Germany" has no other answer other than madness.

The true psychotic brings about an hysterical, apathetic, or deranged mental condition in others. He or she does it for "many good reasons", does it for no reason at all, or doesn't even notice that he is doing it.

The true psychotic worships destruction and abhors reasonable, decent or helpful actions.

Although history affords us innumerable examples, they are so common in the society around us that one does not have to go into a study of mass murderers to find them. The phenomenon is by no means rare and at the absolute minimum is 2 1/2% of the population.

This individual fills the institutions with victims, the hospitals with the sick and the graveyards with the dead. The statistics of psychosis are not going to lessen in the society until this type of personality is completely isolated and understood.

The first problem one confronts in identifying the true psychotic is that anyone detecting in himself, or herself, some destructive urge is likely to believe that he or she is psychotic. This is definitely not the case. One of the primary characteristics of the true psychotic is a total lack of introspection, a total irresponsibility to the pain or suffering of others, coupled with a logic which explains it all away but uses reasons which are not sensible to any of the rest of us.

An actual psychotic never for a moment suspects his madness. You and I have often wondered about our own sanity, particularly since nobody could define it, but a psychotic never does.

Further, he would not help his fellow man if his own life depended upon it—he would rather perish.

This being is difficult to spot because he does not, ordinarily, fling himself about and make scenes. He is often entirely emotionless, completely cold-blooded and apparently perfectly controlled. The control, however, is only apparent, as this being is in the grip of a force far more powerful than himself and is a thoroughly controlled being. He or she must destroy and must not help or assist in any way. Such a case is almost impossible to treat even when identified. They do not easily respond to therapy since their level of responsibility is too low to experience even hope or despair about themselves. Thus they never assist anyone seeking to help them, and indeed are far more likely to turn on any benefactor than to permit assistance by them.

Therefore, under the subject of psychosis, we have the actual psychotic and the victims of the psychotic. As long as we only studied the symptoms of the victims we could not discover the source of their difficulty.

Any theory is only as good as it can be proven or as it works. Theories are not good because they are appealing or because they are uttered by a famous name, but are only good if they are useful. The question is—do they lead to a resolution of the problem?

Therefore, does the theory that the psychotic is ordinarily not in the institution and that the institution contains mainly his victims open the door to a solution of psychosis?

One could be charged with "oversimplification", or "total ignorance of the subject", or "lack of experience", but none of this would alter the fact that a solution which worked was the true solution to the problem.

I never promised to resolve the whole field of psychosis. I was only interested in institutional psychosis, for I do not think that an actual psychotic, by the above definitions, is likely to be salvaged even if one were able to apply the solution to his case.

There are several reasons for this. The first and foremost is that he wouldn't sit still or stand still long enough. Another is that he isn't likely to be caught very easily and the third and most powerful is that he usually cannot be persuaded to forego his destructive actions long enough to receive any benefit from treatment.

Another reason is that when people are able to identify him, they do not wish to help him.

With those reservations the actual psychotic probably could be handled so far as technical actions are concerned, but these need to be applied before they can hope to work and the application of them in this particular case is prevented by nearly insurmountable difficulties of non-cooperation, disdain, contempt and a total lack of desire on the part of the actual psychotic to salvage himself.

Last and not least, any true psychotic can be counted upon to attack or attempt to destroy Scientology groups or activities as these help people. The source of such attacks traces back usually to pretty dangerous psychotics who aren't in institutions or even suspected, some in public places where not only Scientology groups suffer from their actions. Thus it isn't likely that Scientologists will do much to help cure them even if Scientology was in the business, which it is not.

It is easy to handle a large number of those persons who are the victims of actual psychotics. These are found in a majority in institutions as well as other places. Once again one has the problem of accessibility and communication but with those limitations institutional psychotics can be helped.

As I have said, the proof of any theory is its workability and it will take a considerable number of case histories to display the success of the observations. But if a person were sick from a certain germ and one knew what that germ was and one killed that germ and then that person became well, one would have to conclude that he had located the source of the illness. The total indicated therapy cure for an institutional psychotic who is, after all, only the victim of an actual psychotic is to locate the actual psychotic in that person's life. There is a very magic response to this action. The technology now exists. It is called "Search and Discovery".

It is commonly observed that whole families will exhibit psychotic tendencies. This is too great a generality. In such a case it should be stated "the whole family except one" exhibit very obvious traces of insanity. The actual psychotic is most probably that one. This person is continually performing acts, often hidden, atrocious in nature, which destroy the confidence and reality of those about him. The others exhibit the hysteria or apathy commonly associated with the illness Psychosis. They never once locate, until it is done for them, the actual source of their obsessions and confusions.

Whether or not a victim exhibits one or another symptom depends largely upon what has been done to the person. To catalogue these is not easy and indeed is not helpful. In each of the cases it is only necessary to find the source of menace (an actual psychotic) which has made them as they are.

I have not tried to give you this as a learned paper. It is rather a discussion of a subject into which man has made almost no inroad. Today a Class III Auditor could expect some success in the field of Institutional Psychosis providing they were well trained, and we permitted him to practice in that field.

Today in institutions the treatment of the psychotic differs from that administered in Bedlam centuries past in that today they have cleaner beds. Otherwise there is no real change. Instead of whips, they use electricity; instead of chains they use brain surgery to incapacitate the person.

A great deal could be done in the field of Institutional Psychosis and being able to isolate the germ in the society which causes Psychosis is only a small step in the direction of lessening the degree of psychosis in the society but it is at least a step in a definite direction.

And if this leaves you wondering whether or not you are insane, all you have to do is ask yourself the questions:

1. Have I ever helped anybody or wanted to?
2. Am I violently opposed to those who help others?

If you can answer "Yes" to 1 and "No" to 2 there is no slightest doubt about your sanity. You are quite sane and those times in your life when you have wondered about your own wits you were only in connection with an actual psychotic somewhere in your environment.

The actual psychotic sometimes climbs to high places in the society, as witness Napoleon and Hitler. But even so he can be identified. Those who advocate violent measures as the only means of solving problems—such as advocating war—those who are violently opposed to organizations which help others are easily identified.

And in the smaller world when you see a cold, indifferent smile to the agony of another, you have seen an actual psychotic. We do not consider psychosis a field of practice in Scientology and Scientology was not researched or designed as a cure for psychosis or "substitute for psychiatry". But in the course of research, I have discovered these things and found them to be workable.

I trust they may be of some use to you who, who knows, may someday become involved with an actual psychotic or his victim and need the data.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 28 NOVEMBER 1970

Remimeo  
Class VIIIs  
Class VIII Chksheet

*C/S Series 22*

**PSYCHOSIS**

Through a slight change of procedure on certain preclears I have been able to view the underlying motives and mechanisms of psychosis.

Very possibly this is the first time the mechanisms which bring about insanity have been fully viewed. I must say that it requires a bit of confronting.

The alleviation of the condition of insanity has also been accomplished now and the footnote in *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* concerning future research into this field can be considered fulfilled.

The things a C/S should know about insanity are as follows:

**HIGHER PERCENT**

About 15% to 20% of the human race apparently is insane or certainly a much higher percent than was estimated.

The truly insane do not necessarily act insane visibly. They are not the psychiatric obvious cases who go rigid for years or scream for days. This is observed only in the last stages or during temporary stress.

Under apparent social behavior the continual crimes knowingly committed by the insane are much more vicious than ever has been catalogued in psychiatric texts.

The actions of the insane are not "unconscious". They are completely aware of what they are doing.

All insane actions are entirely justified and seem wholly rational to them. As they have no reality on the harmful and irrational nature of their conduct it does not often register on an E-Meter.

The product of their past duties is destructive but is excused as ignorance or errors.

As cases in normal processing they roller coaster continually.

They nearly always have a fixed emotional tone. It does not vary in nearly all insane people. In a very few it is cyclic, high then low.

All characteristics classified as those of the "suppressive person" are in fact those of an insane person.

The easiest ways for a C/S to detect the insane are:

1. Pretending to do a post or duties, the real consistent result is destructive to the group in terms of breakage, lost items, injured business, etc.
2. The case is no case gain or roller coaster and is covered under "PTS symptoms".
3. They are usually chronically physically ill.
4. They have a deep but carefully masked hatred of anyone who seeks to help them.
5. The result of their "help" is actually injurious.
6. They often seek transfers or wish to leave.
7. They are involved in warfare with conflicts around them which are invisible to others. One wonders how they can be so involved or get so involved in so much hostility.

## TYPES

The German psychiatric 1500 or so "different types of insanity" are just different symptoms of the same cause. There is only one insanity and from it springs different manifestations. Psychiatry erred in calling these different types and trying to invent different treatments.

## DEFINITION

Insanity can now be precisely defined.

The definition is:

**Insanity is the overt or covert but always complex and continuous determination to harm or destroy.**

Possibly the only frightening thing about it is the cleverness with which it can be hidden.

Whereas a sane person can become angry or upset and a bit destructive for short periods, he or she recovers. The insane mask it, are misemotional continuously and do not recover. (Except by modern processing.)

## THE NATURE OF MAN

Man is basically good. This is obvious. For when he begins to do evil he seeks to destroy his memory in order to change and seeks to destroy his body. He seeks to check his evil impulses by inhibiting his own skill and strength.

He can act in a very evil fashion but his basic nature then makes it mandatory that he lessens himself in many ways.

The towering "strength" of a madman is a rarity and is compensated by efforts at self-destruction.

Man's mortality, his "one life" fixation, all stem from his efforts to check himself, obliterate his memory in a fruitless effort to change his conduct and his self-destructive habits and impulses and losses of skills and abilities.

As this rationale proves out completely in processing and fits all cases observed, we have for the first time proof of his actual nature.

As only around 20% are insane, and as those who previously worked in the mental field were themselves mainly insane, Man as a whole has been assigned an evil repute. Governments, where such personalities exist, listen to the opinion of the insane and apply the characteristic of 20% to the entire hundred percent.

This gives an 80% wrong diagnosis. Which is why mental science itself was destructive when used by states.

## TECHNIQUES

The only technique available at this writing which will benefit the insane is contained in all the overt-motivator sequences and Grade II technology.

At Flag at this writing new improvement on this exists but it is so powerful that slight errors in use can cause a psychotic break in the insane. It therefore will only be exported for use by specially trained persons and this programming will require quite a while.

**Meanwhile** it helps the C/S to know and use these firm rules:

**Always run Dianetic Triples.**

Never run Singles. The overt side (Flow 2) is vital. If you only run Flow 1 Motivators, the pc will not recover fully. Further running Flow 1 (Motivator only) any psychotic being processed will not recover but may even trigger into a psychotic break. If one never ran anything but motivators, psychotic manifestations would not erase.

**Depend on Expanded Grade II technology to ease off or handle the insane.**

Don't keep asking what's been done to him as he'll trigger.

A new discovery on this is that when you run out the motivator the person gets a higher reality on his overts. If you ran out all his motivators he would have no reason for his overts. If these are not then run out he might cave himself in.

### Pattern OF BEHAVIOR

The **apparent** pattern of insane behavior is to come in (ask for processing, go on staff, etc) with the advertised intention of being helped or helping, then mess up either as a pc or on post, then state how bad it all is and leave. It looks obvious enough. He came, found it bad, left.

That is only the **apparent** behavior. **Apparent reasons.**

Based on numerous cases, this is the real cycle. Hearing of something good that might help these hateful awful rotten nasty people, the psycho comes in, wrecks this, upsets that, caves in this one, chops up that one and **when somebody says "No!"** the psychotic either

- (a) Caves himself in physically or
- (b) Runs away.

The psychotic is motivated by intent to harm.

If he realizes he is harming things he shouldn't, he caves himself in. If he is afraid he will be found out, he runs.

In the psychotic the impulse is quite conscious.

### CONCLUSION

None of this is very nice. It is hard to confront. Even I find it so.

Freud thought all men had a hidden monster in them for he dealt mainly with the psychotic and their behavior was what he saw.

All men are not like this. The percentage that are is greater than I supposed but is a long way from all men.

Sometimes one only becomes aware of these when things are getting worked on and improved. They stay on as long as it can be made bad or there is hope it can be destroyed. Then when attention is given to improvement they blow.

Artists, writers often have these types hanging around them as there is someone or something there to be destroyed. When success or failure to destroy or possible detection appears on the scene they blow, often as destructively as possible.

Orgs are subjected to a lot of this. A psychotic sometimes succeeds in blowing off good staff. And then sooner or later realizes how evil he is acting and sickens or leaves.

The society is not geared to any of this at all. The insane walk around wrecking the place and decent people think it's "human nature" or "inevitable" or a "bad childhood".

As of this writing the insane can be handled. The proof of any pudding is the processing. And this is successful. It is also rather swift. But, as I say, it is so swift the special technique has to be done by the specially trained flubless auditor.

For a long while I've realized that we would have to be able to handle insane people as the psychiatrist is fading. I have had opportunity to work on the problem. And have it handled. Until it is fully released, the C/S will benefit greatly from knowing the above as these come on his lines far more often than he has suspected.

The insane can be helped. They are not hopeless.

I trust this data will be of use.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:rr.rd



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 8 NOVEMBER 1965

Remimeo  
Tech Personnel  
Qual Personnel  
Students

*Tech Div*

*Qual Div*

## SUPPRESSIVES AND HIDDEN STANDARDS

If you find a Suppressive on a case you will also find a chronic problem.

A problem is postulate-counter-postulate.

When a person is faced with suppression he is facing a counter-postulate.

A hidden standard is a problem a person thinks must be resolved before auditing can be seen to have worked. It's a standard by which to judge Scientology or auditing or the auditor.

This hidden standard is always an old problem of long duration. It is a postulate-counter-postulate situation – the source of the counter-postulate was suppressive to the pc.

Therefore you can always find a Suppressive by finding a pc's hidden standard and following it back to when it began. You will find there a Suppressive to the pc.

Similarly if you trace back the persons and groups who have been suppressive of the pc you will find a hidden standard popping into view.

The datum is – a case that betters then worsens (a "Roller Coaster Case" or a "Roller Coaster") is always connected to a suppressive person.

The Roller Coaster is *caused* by the hidden standard going into action. "My eyesight didn't get better." Locate a present time Suppressive on the case and trace that suppressive back to others earlier and you suddenly see the pc brighten up and (apparently for no reason) state his eyesight suddenly improved.

A case that betters and worsens (a Roller Coaster) is *always* connected to a suppressive person and will not get steady gain until the Suppressive is found on the case or the *basic* suppressive person earlier.

Because the case doesn't get well he or she is a Potential Trouble Source. To us, to others, to himself. You can't successfully audit that pc because there is a *hidden standard*. It makes the pc think he is no better. Suppressives also suppress the pc just like that so long as a hidden standard is present.

Find the Suppressive, make the pc handle or disconnect. Then audit the pc up to Problems Release by getting rid of the hidden standard *and* the basic suppressive.

Never audit a pc who is a Potential Trouble Source other than on the infallible, never varied datum, a Roller Coaster is always a PTS connected to an SP.

Note also that a person going clear is now a thetan with a new view of life and has *new* hidden standards (requiring the location of suppressives) which he had no reality on as a Man or later as a Release.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 24 NOVEMBER 1965

Remimeo  
Required for  
Level IV Students  
To Review Auditors

*LEVEL IV*

## SEARCH AND DISCOVERY

PREREQUISITE: A KNOWLEDGE OF ETHICS  
DEFINITIONS AND PURPOSES.

The process called Search and Discovery requires as well a good knowledge of Ethics.

One must know what a **Suppressive Person** is, what a **Potential Trouble Source** is and the mechanism of how and why a case Roller Coasters and what that is. All this data exists in Ethics policy letters and should be studied well before one attempts a "Search and Discovery" or further study of this HCOB. Ethics is not merely a legal action – it handles the whole phenomena of case worsening (Roller Coaster) after processing and without this technology an auditor easily becomes baffled and tends to plunge and squirrel. The *only* reason a case Roller Coasters after good standard auditing is the PTS phenomena and a Suppressive is present.

### THREE TYPES

There are Three Types of PTS.

Type One is the easy one. The SP on the case is right in present time, actively suppressing the person.

Type Two is harder for the *apparent* Suppressive Person in present time is only a res-timulator for the actual suppressive.

Type Three is beyond the facilities of orgs not equipped with hospitals as these are entirely psychotic.

### HANDLING TYPE ONE PTS

The Type One is normally handled by an Ethics Officer in the course of a hearing.

The person is asked if anyone is invalidating him or his gains or Scientology and if the pc answers with a name and is then told to handle or disconnect from that person the *good indicators* come in promptly and the person is *quite* satisfied.

If however there is no success in finding the SP on the case or if the person starts naming Org personnel or other unlikely persons as SP the Ethics Officer must realize that he is

handling a Type Two PTS and, because the Auditing will consume time, sends the person to Tech or Qual for a Search and Discovery.

It is easy to tell a Type One PTS from a Type Two. The Type One brightens up at once and ceases to Roller Coaster the moment the present time SP is spotted. The pc ceases to Roller Coaster. The pc does not go back on it and begin to beg off. The pc does not begin to worry about the consequences of disconnection. If the pc does any of these things, then the pc is a Type Two.

It can be seen that Ethics handles the majority of PTSs in a fast manner. There is no trouble about it. All goes smoothly.

It can also be seen that Ethics cannot afford the time to handle a Type Two PTS and there is no reason the Type Two should not pay well for the Auditing.

Therefore, when Ethics finds its Type One approach does not work quickly, Ethics must send the person to the proper division that is handling Search and Discovery.

## TYPE TWO

The pc who isn't sure, won't disconnect, or still Roller Coasters, or who doesn't brighten up, can't name any SP at all, is a Type Two.

Only Search and Discovery will help.

## SEARCH AND DISCOVERY

The first thing to know is that **case worsening is caused only by a PTS situation.**

There never will be any other reason.

As soon as you doubt this datum and think about "other causes" or try to explain it some other way you no longer prevent cases from worsening and no longer rescue those who have worsened.

The second thing to know is that **a suppressive is always a person, a being or a group of beings.** A suppressive is *not* a condition, a problem, a postulate. Problems and Counter-Postulates come into the matter but the SP as a being or group must always be located as a being or a group, not as merely an idea. As the technology is close to and similar to that of a service facsimile, a poorly trained auditor can get confused between them and produce a condition he says is the cause. Persons who cannot confront and who therefore see persons as ideas not people are the ones most likely to fail in doing Search and Discovery.

The third thing to know is that there can be an actual SP and another person or being similar to the actual one who is only an apparent SP.

*An actual* SP actually suppresses another.

*An apparent* SP only reminds the pc of the actual one and so is restimulated into being a PTS.

The *actual* SP can be in present time (Type One PTS) or is in the past or distant (Type Two PTS).

The Type Two always has an *apparent* SP who is not *the* SP on the case, is confusing the two and is acting PTS only because of restimulation, not because of suppression.

Search and Discovery as a process is done exactly by the general rules of listing. One lists for persons or groups who are or have suppressed the pc. The list is complete when only one item reads on nulling and this is the item.

If the item turns out to be a group, one does a second list of who or what would represent that group, gets the list long enough to leave on nulling only one item reading, and that is the SP.

*An incident is not a person or a group.*

A condition is not a person or a group. And a group is not a person, what you want is one being.

The E-Meter signs are unmistakable and the good indicators come in strongly when the actual SP is found.

This is the entire action. It is liable to the various ills and errors of writing and nulling a list, such as overlisting, underlisting, ARC Breaking the pc by by-passing the item or getting an incomplete list. These are avoided by knowing one's business as an Auditor and being able to handle an E-Meter with skill and confidence.

When one goofs on a Search and Discovery and finds the wrong actual SP the signs are the same as those where a Type Two is handled as a Type One – not sure, no good indicators, Roller Coasters again, etc.

The actual SP can be back track but it is seldom vital to go far out of PT and usual for a lifetime person to turn up.

Done correctly the pc's good indicators come in at once, the pc cognites, the meter reacts *very* well with Blowdowns and repeated long falls, and the pc ceases to Roller Coaster.

Care should be taken not to get too enthusiastic in going far back track on the pc as you run into whole track implants etc, easily handleable only at Level V. The pc can get "over whumped" if you go too far back and you'll wish you hadn't. This normally happens however, only when the pc has been ARC Broken by the Auditor, when the right item has been by-passed and the list is overlong, or when 2 or 3 items are still reading on the list (incomplete list).

Locating a Service Facsimile is quite similar to Search and Discovery but they are different processes entirely.

Only the doingness is similar. In Search and Discovery the end product is a *being*. In Service Facsimile the end product is an item or concept or idea. Don't get the two mixed.

### HANDLING TYPE THREE

The Type Three PTS is mostly in institutions or would be.

In this case the Type Two's *apparent* SP is spread all over the world and is often more than all the people there are – for the person sometimes has ghosts about him or demons and they are just more apparent SPs but imaginary as beings as well.

*All* institutional cases are PTSs. The whole of insanity is wrapped up in this one fact.

The insane is not just a bad off being, the insane is a being who has been overwhelmed by an actual SP until too many persons are apparent SPs. This makes the person Roller Coaster continually in life. The Roller Coaster is even cyclic (repetitive as a cycle).

Handling an insane person as a Type Two might work but probably not case for case. One might get enough wins on a few to make one fail completely by so many loses on the many.

Just as you tell a Type Two to disconnect from the actual SP (wherever found on the track) you must disconnect the person from the environment.

Putting the person in a current institution puts him in a Bedlam. And when also "treated" it may finish him. *For he will Roller Coaster from any treatment given*, until made into a Type Two and given a Search and Discovery.

The task with a Type Three is *not* treatment as such. It is to provide a relatively safe environment and quiet and rest and no treatment of a mental nature at all. Giving him a quiet court with a motionless object in it might do the trick if he is permitted to sit there unmolested. Medical care of a very unbrutal nature is necessary as intravenous feeding and soporifics (sleeping and quietening drugs) may be necessary, such persons are sometimes also physically ill from an illness with a known medical cure.

*Treatment* with drugs, shock, operation is just more suppression. The person will not really get well, will relapse, etc.

Standard Auditing on such a person is subject to the Roller Coaster phenomena. They get worse after getting better. "Successes" are sporadic, enough to lead one on, and usually worsen again since these people are PTS.

But removed from apparent SPs, kept in a quiet surroundings, not pestered or threatened or put in fear, the person comes up to Type Two and a Search and Discovery should end the matter. But there will always be some failures as the insane sometimes withdraw into rigid unawareness as a final defense, sometimes can't be kept alive and sometimes are too hectic and distraught to ever become quiet, the extremes of too quiet and never quiet have a number of psychiatric names such as "catatonia" (withdrawn totally) and "manic" (too hectic).

Classification is interesting but non-productive since they are all PTS, all will Roller Coaster and none can be trained or processed with any idea of lasting result no matter the temporary miracle.

Remove a Type Three PTS from the environment, give him or her rest and quiet, do a Search and Discovery when rest and quiet have made the person Type Two.

(Note: These paragraphs on the Type Three make good a promise given in *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* to develop "Institutional Dianetics".)

The modern mental hospital with its brutality and suppressive treatments is not the way to give a psychotic quiet and rest. Before anything effective can be done in this field a proper institution would have to be provided, offering only rest, quiet and medical assistance for intravenous feedings and sleeping draughts where necessary but not as "treatment" and where *no* treatment is attempted until the person looks recovered and only then a Search and Discovery as above under Type Two.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ep.cden



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 26 DECEMBER 1966

Remimeo

*Admin Know-How Series 12*

**PTS SECTIONS, PERSONNEL AND EXECS**

An org has certain sections, units, personnel and executives who go PTS to suppressive elements in the society.

If one knows this, one becomes less puzzled by noncompliances and trouble in those quarters. One can also do something effective if one realizes why.

Legal, accounts and construction and lesser units tend to go PTS very easily.

A "P.T.S." is a *Potential Trouble Source* by reason of contact with a suppressive person or group."

*Suppression* is "a harmful intention or action against which one cannot fight back." Thus when one can do *anything* about it, it is less suppressive.

Thus Legal goes PTS being in contact with SP courts and with SP or PTS attorney firms as well as confronting suppressives who are seeking to injure the org through various suppressive actions.

Accounts goes PTS through various tax and government supervision suppressions.

An Estate Branch listening to Town and Country Planning or Zoning suppressives tends to go PTS.

In a standard issue corporation the labor relations contact point, continually messed up by labor agitators who could do the company in and regulations protecting such, tends to go PTS.

An Ethics Officer may become PTS.

The Dead File Unit may go PTS on all the entheta letters.

As such PTS personnel impinge on top executives, these can also go PTS and the org gets harmed to say the least.

## HANDLING

As one cannot easily disconnect from suppressive society points without leaving the society, it remains that an executive must handle, if not the SP social groups, at least the situation developing from them and into the org.

Ideally one removes the SPs in the social groups. But where that is not possible one can do several things:

- a. Limit the number of org personnel such groups contact.
- b. Give such org personnel as do contact such suppressive elements S & Ds occasionally.
- c. Change such personnel frequently.
- d. Develop a system to restrain the SP from easily influencing such org personnel as may remain in contact.
- e. Work gradually but steadily into a position to be able to remove suppressives from the social groups in question, such as becoming more influential as an org, suing, exposing, public education and other means.

## INDICATORS

The first indicator an org executive has of a unit or staff member going PTS is non-compliance. Such personnel are being overwhelmed in various ways by the SP social groups and have no energy left to undertake their duties or forward org programs.

Another indicator is the amount of illness and lack of case progress on the part of such PTS staff members.

A third indicator is an executive getting the hat of such a personnel on his own plate.

An executive who doesn't notice such indicators and act is being in turn PTS, or simply isn't of executive caliber.

## METHODS OF BALKING

There are several methods by which a staff member acting as an org contact point in connection with suppressives can balk the agents of SP groups.

One is to always tape-record *visibly* whatever the agent from such a suppressive group says. "Ah. Mr. Figuretwist of the Tax Division? Good. Now wait a moment so I can record whatever you say. Good. It's now recording. Go ahead." We used to handle the Internal "Revenue" Service of the US this way quite successfully. The org contact point always stopping the IRS inspector they sent around, turning on a portable recorder and then, and not until then, letting the man speak. Quite effective. That org only got into tax trouble when it stopped doing this. After the recording was dropped out as drill the SP utterances of IRS agents were

in full cry at the staff and they went PTS and began to make crazy errors and ignore org orders re tax.

Any time such agents come around, they try to get as many staff into it as possible. And yap and yap and threaten and enturbulate. One *must* put them in Coventry (silence treatment) from staff other than the contact point. Staff members of a unit that could go PTS must be ordered to walk off without a word whenever such an agent shows up. *No* "bull sessions" or arguments with such a person. The staff personnel who handles should point at the agent if other staff is about and say some key word like "This is a government man" at which all other staff in the unit turns its back or pointedly walks off. If you do this, such agents can't take offense but they get very uneasy, transact quickly, forget their mission to be enturbulative and go away soon. Don't ever think politeness will help you. Tipping one's hat to snakes never stopped a person getting bitten. Walking off has.

Staffs are so "reasonable" they think these SP group representatives are there for necessary purposes or serve some purpose, or can be reasoned with – all of which is nonsense.

There are no good reporters. There are no good government or SP group agents. The longer you try to be nice, the worse off you will be. And the sooner one learns this, the happier he will be.

Some staff member in such contact points in the org should be the only one who handles and all other staff should be given chits for talking to such a person.

This limits the area of enturbulation. The handling staff member can become expert. But even so, watch for bad indicators in that staff member, and the moment they show up, change the contact point.

Never give such persons access to persons high up in the org – or unit. Turn such over to special personnel who can get the business over with at once and get the agent off the premises soon.

If you see a manager snapping terminals with such agents, transfer him to another post in the org. Unless you do so, he'll soon cease complying with policy and will soon have the place falling apart.

When such agents act or sound *very* suppressive, get them investigated, find the scandal and attack. It is a fortunate truth that such people *also* have crimes in their background that can be found. Find and expose them.

SPs are at war. Pleasant conduct, mean conduct, *any* conduct at all is simply more war. So wage the back action as a battle.

In all the history of Scientology no interviewing reporter ever helped. They all meant the worst when they acted their best and we are always sorry ever to have spoken. Even if the reporter is all right, his newspaper isn't and will twist his story. We have done best when we have blocked off reporters and worst when we've been nice. So the moral is, a person from an SP group will eventually make an org or some part of it PTS regardless of the agent's conduct.

These words may seem harsh and unreasonable, yet truth is truth and only when we ignore it do we get fouled up. Agents from SP groups lead to PTS staff, units or sections, leads to noncompliance, leads to a mess.

It isn't just imagination that SPs attack Scientology. The evidence has been around in plenty for 16 years.

We began to prosper the day we cut public SPs' correspondence off the org lines and sent it to dead file. Our executives began to function, policy began to be followed, and we began to grow.

So we'll attain new expansion just by applying what is in this policy letter.

I personally find such agents rather pitiful in their attempts to make trouble. I think the contemporary attempts to upset us and accusations of things we never do, quite prove the fact such mean us no good. But many staff and executives try desperately to be nice to them.

Handle the business they present as effectively as possible on special channels. Don't be nice. Limit their reach. And have less noncompliance and a far more effective and happier org. After all, real suppressives only constitute about 2½ percent of the total population. Why spend more than 2½ percent of your time on them?

The whole stunt is realizing that certain groups are SP and recognizing them and then handling them.

Be alert and stay alive. It won't always be this way.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:jp.rd.gm

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 22 MARCH 1967

Remimeo  
Level 0

***IMPORTANT***

***ADMIN KNOW-HOW***

**ALTER-IS AND DEGRADED BEINGS**

Alteration of orders and tech is worse than non-compliance.

Alter-is is a covert avoidance of an order. Although it is apparently often brought about by non-comprehension, the non-comprehension itself and failure to mention it, is an avoidance of orders.

Very degraded beings alter-is. Degraded ones refuse to comply without mentioning it. Beings in fair condition try to comply but remark their troubles to get help when needed. Competent higher toned beings understand orders and comply if possible but mainly do their jobs without needing lots of special orders.

Degraded beings find *any* instruction painful as they have been painfully indoctrinated with violent measures in the past. They therefore alter-is any order or don't comply.

Thus in auditing pcs or in org, where you find alter-is (covert non-compliance) and non-compliance, given sensible and correct tech or instructions, you are dealing with a degraded low level being and should act accordingly.

One uses very simple low level processes on a degraded being, gently.

In admin, orgs and especially the Tech Div where a staff member alter-ises, or fails to comply you are also dealing with a degraded being but one who is too much a pc to be a staff member. He cannot be at cause and staff members must be at cause. So he or she should not be on staff.

This is a primary senior datum regulating all handling of pcs and staff members.

A degraded being is not a suppressive as he can have case gain. But he is so PTS that he works for suppressives only. He is sort of a super-continual PTS beyond the reach really of a simple S & D and handled only at Sect 3 OT Course.

Degraded beings, taking a cue from SP associates, instinctively resent, hate and seek to obstruct any person in charge of anything or any Big Being.

Anyone issuing *sensible* orders is the first one resented by a degraded being.

A degraded being lies to his seniors, avoids orders covertly by alter-is, fails to comply, supplies only complex ideas that can't ever work (obstructive) and is a general area of entur-

bulence, often mild seeming or even "cooperative", often even flattering, sometimes merely dull but consistently alter-ising or non-complying.

This datum appeared during higher level research and is highly revelatory of earlier unexplained phenomena – the pc who changes commands or doesn't do them, the worker who can't get it straight or who is always on a tea break.

In an area where suppression has been very heavy for long periods people become degraded beings. However, they must have been so before already due to track incidents.

Some thetans are bigger than others. None are truly equal. But the degraded being is not necessarily a natively bad thetan. He is simply so PTS and has been for so long that it requires our highest level tech to finally undo it *after* he has scaled up all our grades.

Degraded beings are about 18 to 1 over Big Beings in the human race (minimum ratio). So those who keep things going are few. And those who will make it without the steam of the few in our orgs behind them are zero. At the same time, we can't have a world full of them and still make it. So we have no choice.

*And* we can handle them, even when they cannot serve, at higher levels.

This is really OT data but we need it at lower levels to get the job done.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:jp.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 12 MARCH 1968

Remimeo

**MISTAKES, ANATOMY OF**

In the presence of Suppression, one makes mistakes.

People making mistakes or doing stupid things is evidence that an SP exists in that vicinity.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:jc.cden



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 20 MAY 1968  
CORRECTED & REISSUED MARCH 1974

Remimeo

(Only change is in this type style)

## OVERT-MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE

*Dianetics Courses – Level Two*

*Solo Audit – OT Sections*

There was an important discovery made in 1952 on the subject of engrams which did not get included in "Book One", *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*.

This was the "Overt-Motivator sequence of **Engrams**".

An **Overt**, in Dianetics and Scientology, is an aggressive or destructive **act** by the individual against one or another of the 8 dynamics (self, family, group, Mankind, animals or plants, MEST, Life or the Infinite).

A **Motivator** is an aggressive or destructive act received by the person or one of the dynamics.

The viewpoint from which the act is viewed resolves whether the act is an overt or a motivator.

The reason it is called a "Motivator" is because it tends to prompt that one pays it back – it "motivates" a new overt.

When one has done something bad to someone or something one tends to believe it must have been "motivated".

When one has received something bad, he also may tend to feel *he* must have done something to deserve it.

The above points are true. The actions and reactions of people on the subject are often very falsified.

People go about believing they were in an auto accident when in actual fact they caused one.

Also people may believe they caused an accident when they were only *in* one.

Some people, on hearing of a death, at once believe they must have killed the person even though they were far away.

Police in large cities have people turn up and confess to almost every murder as a routine.

One doesn't have to be crazy to be subject to the Overt-Motivator sequence. It is not only used on him continually by others, it also is a basic part of his own "case".

There are two extreme stages of Overt-Motivator phenomena. One is a person who gives up only motivators (always done to him) and the other is the person who "has done only overts" (done to others).

In running engrams you will find

1. All overt engrams that hang up (won't audit easily) have *also* a motivator engram as the same or different incident.
2. All motivator engrams that hang up have an overt engram in the same or different incident.

The two *types* of engrams then are **Overt** Engrams and **Motivator** Engrams.

Example of Overt Engram – **shooting a dog**.

Example of Motivator Engram – **being bitten by a dog**.

The rule is that the **subject matter must be similar**.

They can be in different points in time.

When you can't run out (erase) a dog bite engram, why then you find the "shoot dog" engram.

**Psychosomatic ills or aberrations that do not resolve by running one side, usually resolve by finding and running the other.**

When you can't erase an engram about shooting a dog, why then there's a bitten by dog.

It's all very simple really. There are always two sides to the coin. If one won't run, you try the other.

## BASICS

Finding the basic engram on a chain also applies to finding the basic overt or basic motivator engram.

Engrams then hang up (won't run out) when

- (a) The other type needs to be run and
- (b) The one found has earlier engrams on it.

## NONEXTANT ENGRAMS

An "engram" sometimes didn't exist. A pc can be trying to run being run over by a car when he never was. What needs to be done, when the incident won't run, is get the pc's incident of running over somebody. It also works in reverse. A pc can be trying to run an engram

of running over somebody when he was in fact only run over himself and never did run over anyone.

So **both** engrams can exist and be run or only one side exists and can be run or with a heavy foul-up on overts and motivators, one side can be non-factual and won't run because only the *other* side exists.

It is easy to visualize this as a matter of flows. An overt of course is an Outflow and a motivator is an Inflow.

## SECONDARIES

It may never have been said that secondaries always sit squarely on incidents of actual pain and unconsciousness.

Also secondaries can exist on the overt-motivator sequence pattern just as in engrams.

This is the cause of frozen emotions or "unemotional" people. Also some people complain they can't feel anymore.

This works out by overt-motivator sequence. A person in grief over loss (grief is always loss) who then can't run it has *caused* grief and that overt-secondary can be run.

Also a person misemotional over causing grief has been caused grief. It works both ways with **all points on the tone scale**.

The last is a newer discovery and wasn't known to early Dianeticists.

The Overt-Motivator Engram phenomena did not receive adequate dissemination. The principle applied to secondaries has not before been released. It is basically Dianetic Engram running that resolves all cases in the end so one had better be pretty good at auditing Engrams and Secondaries, Motivator and Overt both.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:jp.nt.cden:jh



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 16 AUGUST 1969R  
REVISED 25 SEPTEMBER 1978

Class VIII Checksheet  
Class VIIIs  
Class VIII C/S Book  
*Class IV Grad Checksheet*

(Revisions in this type style)  
(Ellipses indicate deletions)

## HANDLING ILLNESS IN SCIENTOLOGY

Sickness is of course the result of engram chains in restimulation.

One has to ask, however, what causes restimulation to occur?

The answer is out-ruds plus a suppressive environment or situation.

Therefore, obviously, if one wanted to really handle handle handle sickness and do some miracles, one would use the lot of one's weapons.

Don't mistake that Dianetics (HCOB 24 JULY 1969R SERIOUSLY ILL PCs) can all by itself practically bring the dead to life to all intents and purposes and it can be used all by itself.

However, when that doesn't work completely, then the Class VIII Case Supervisor and well-trained Scientology auditors can step in.

Let us examine the basic full dress parade routine of what Scientology and Dianetics could be used.

1. Put in life ruds (as given below).
2. 3 S & Ds.
3. Narrative handling and full preassessment on the sick area, run Triple or Quad, plus other Dianetic Assist actions and any needed medical treatment. (See HCOB 2 April 69RA, Rev. 28.7.78, DIANETIC ASSISTS, which cautions against overwhelming a sick pc with too much restim.)
4. NED for OTs (on OT III and above).

Obviously this illness hasn't a chance at all. It disappears in 1. Or in 2. Or in 3. Or in 4....

The system is obvious. You take away the current out-ruds and the illness can destimulate. You take away the suppressions and destimulation is more positive.

You erase all the engrams and the source is gone.

You do the second, ... third, and zero flows and the overts and sympathies are also vanished.

On ruds alone you can of course get a recurrence.

You also risk a recurrence on the S & Ds.

The motivators go on the engram chains.

The overts and sympathy for like illness goes on the second,... third and zero flows.

### LIFE RUDS

As the person with out-ruds makes no real gain it is wise to put ruds in "In life."

This is done with

"In life have you had an ARC break?"

"In life have you had a problem?"

"In life have you had a withhold?"

If the person has had much auditing you ask after each of the "In life" questions "Was that present in an auditing session?"

### S & Ds

The full parade for three S & Ds (as given in HCOB 19 January 1968 in the Class VIII pack) is as follows:

3 item S & D

Fly a rud.

Assess

Withdraw from

Stop

Unmock

Suppress

Invalidate

Make nothing of

Suggest

Been careful of

Fail to reveal

Take the 3 that read best (null to 3 items). Use the one that read most first.

Test one of these items in these two questions to see which question then reads best.

"Who or what has attempted to ..... you?"

"Who or what have you tried to .....?"

List the best reading question by the laws of listing and nulling. **Be exact in following those laws** or you'll make the person even sicker!

Use each of the 3 this way.

Prepcheck any item that does not F/N until it F/Ns or proves not to be the correct one in which event correct the list. If the list item does not F/N on being found and indicated, you prepcheck it to F/N.

## DIANETICS

The New Era Dianetics HCOBs fully cover assists and Dianetic handling of body problems and illnesses.

---

This rundown is what could be known as beating an illness to death.

Handling it medically and spiritually should bring home a winner every time.

---

This full approach is recommended only when one has encountered a resistive situation.

Very often a Dianetic Assist precedes all this.

Usually the Dianetic handling is done without the ruds or S & Ds.

But when you have somebody whose "lumbosis" has not surrendered to Dianetics, you have this full approach to fall back on.

It's nice to have a full arsenal.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:ldm.ei.rd.rk



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 20 APRIL 1972

Remimeo

***Expanded Dianetics Series 4***

*(Adds C/S Series 76 to HGDS checksheet)*

**SUPPRESSED PCS AND PTS TECH**

(PTS means Potential Trouble Source which itself means a person connected to a Suppressive Person.)

As the Dianetic Specialist (HGDS) is often called upon to handle pcs who are not well, it is vital that he knows all about and can use "PTS Tech".

All sick persons are PTS.

All pcs who rollercoaster (regularly lose gains) are PTS.

Suppressive persons are themselves PTS to themselves.

If a Dianetic Specialist does not know this, have reality upon it and use it, he will have losses on pcs he need not have.

There is considerable *Administrative* Tech connected with this subject of PTS and there is a special Rundown which handles PTS people.

They get handled *if* the auditor knows his PTS tech, if he audits well and if he uses both the auditing and Administrative Tech to handle.

The Administrative Tech requires an interview, usually by the Director of Processing or Ethics Officer and the person is required to handle the PTS situation itself *before* being audited. A check for stability is also made after being audited on the PTS Rundown.

For this reason, HCO B 17 April 72 and all the checksheet of HCO P/L 31 May 71 must be fully known to the Dianetic Specialist.

HCO B 17 April 72 is also C/S Series 76 so as to be sure that Case Supervisors handle the Admin and C/Sing correctly.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:mes.rd



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 10 MAY 1972

Remimeo

## ROBOTISM

(Reference HCOB 28 Nov 1970, C/S Series 22, "Psychosis".)

A technical advance has been made in relation to the inactivity, slowness or incompetence of human beings.

This discovery proceeds from a two and a half year intense study of aberration as it affects the ability to function as a group member.

The ideal group member is capable of working causatively in full cooperation with his fellows in the achievement of group goals and the realization of his own happiness.

The *primary* human failing is an inability to function as himself or contribute to group achievements.

Wars, political upsets, organizational duress, growing crime rates, increasingly heavy "justice", growing demands for excessive welfare, economic failure and other age long and repeating conditions find a common denominator in the inability of human beings to coordinate.

The current political answer, in vogue in this century and growing, is totalitarianism where the state orders the whole life of the individual. The production figures of such states are very low and their crimes against the individual are numerous.

A discovery therefore of what this factor is, that makes the humanoid the victim of oppression, would be a valuable one.

The opening lines of *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* comment on Man's lack of an answer for himself.

The group needs such an answer in order to survive and for its individual members to be happy.

## SCALE

	Pan-determined
	Self-determined
Robot	Other-determined
band	Oblivious
	Insane

## NEEDING ORDERS

The exact mechanism of needing orders is to be found as an outgrowth of the mental condition outlined in HCOB 28 Nov 1970, "Psychosis".

The individual with an evil purpose has to withhold himself because he may do destructive things.

When he fails to withhold himself he commits overt acts on his fellows or other dynamics and occasionally loses control and does so.

This of course makes him quite inactive.

To overcome this he refuses any responsibility for his own actions.

Any motion he makes must be on the responsibility of others.

He operates then only when given orders.

Thus he *must* have orders to operate.

Therefore one could term such a person a *robot*. And the malady could be called *robotism*.

## PERCEPTION

Studies of perception undertaken since HCOB 28 Nov 70 reveal that sight, hearing and other channels of awareness *decrease* in proportion to the number of overt acts – and therefore withholds – which the person has committed on the whole track.

By relieving these sight has been remarkably brightened.

Therefore a person who is withholding himself from committing overt acts because of his own undesired purposes has very poor perception.

He does not *see* the environment around him.

Thus, combined with his unwillingness to act on his own initiative, there is a blindness to the environment.

## OVERT PRODUCTS

(see P/L 14 Nov 70, Org Series 14)

Since he does not act upon orders he is taking responsibility for, he executes orders without fully understanding them.

Further he executes them in an environment he does not see.

Thus when forced to produce he will produce overt products. These are called so because they are not in actual fact useful products but something no one wants and are overt acts in themselves – such as inedible biscuits or a "repair" that is just further breakage.

## SLOWNESS

The person is slow because he is moving on other-determinism, is carefully withholding himself and cannot see anyway.

Thus he feels lost, confused or unsafe and cannot move positively.

Because he produces overt products he gets slapped around or goes unthanked and so begins a decline.

He cannot move swiftly and if he does has accidents. So he teaches himself to be careful and cautious.

## JUSTICE

Group justice is of some use but all it really does is make the person withhold himself even harder and while a necessary restraint, nevertheless does not itself bring a lasting improvement.

Threats and "heads on a pike" (meaning examples of discipline) do however jar the person into giving his attention and channeling his actions into a more desirable path from the group viewpoint.

Justice is necessary in a society of such people but it is not a remedy for improvement.

## MALICE

Despite the viciousness of the truly insane, there is little or no real malice in the robot.

The truly insane cannot control or withhold their evil purposes and dramatize them at least covertly.

The insane are not always visible. But they are visible enough. And they *are* malicious.

The robot on the other hand does control his evil impulses to a great extent.

He is not malicious.

His danger mainly stems from the incompetent things he does, the time of others he consumes, the waste of time and material and the brakes he puts on the general group endeavor.

He does not do all these things intentionally. He does not really know he is doing them.

He looks in wounded surprise at the wrath he generates when he breaks things, wrecks programs and gets in the way. He does not know he is doing these things. For he cannot see that he is. He may go along for some time doing (slowly wasteful) well and then carelessly smashes the exact thing that wrecks the whole activity.

People suppose he cunningly intended to do so. He seldom does.

He winds up even more convinced he can't be trusted and that he should withhold harder!

### FALSE REPORTS

The robot gives many false reports. Unable to *see*, how can he know what is true?

He seeks to fend off wrath and attract good will by "PR" (public relations boasts) without realizing he is giving false reports.

### MORALE

The robot goes into morale declines easily. Since production is the basis of morale, and since he does not really produce much, left to his own devices, his morale sags heavily.

### PHYSICAL INERTIA

The body is a physical object. It is not the being himself.

As a body has mass it tends to remain motionless unless moved and tends to keep going in a certain direction unless steered.

As he is not really running his body, the robot has to be moved when not moving or diverted if moving on a wrong course.

Thus anyone with one or more of such beings around him tends to get exhausted with shoving them into motion or halting them when they go wrong.

Exhaustion only occurs when one does not understand the robot.

It is the exasperation that exhausts one.

With understanding one is not exasperated because he *can* handle the situation. But only if he knows what it is.

### PTS

Potential Trouble Sources are not necessarily robots.

A PTS person generally is withholding himself from a Suppressive Person or group or thing.

Toward that SP person or group or thing he is a robot! He takes orders from them if only in opposites.

His overts on the SP person make him blind and non-self-determined.

## BASIC WHY

The basic reason behind persons who cannot function, are slow or inactive or incompetent and who do not produce is

**Withholding self from doing destructive things, and thus unwilling to take responsibility and therefore needing orders.**

The exact wording of this **why** must be done by the individual himself after examining and grasping this principle.

If one writes this principle down on the top of a sheet and then asks the person to word it exactly as it applies to himself one will attain the individual why for inaction and incompetence. It will produce GIs and F/N at the Examiner.

## PROCESSING

Physical work in the physical universe, general confronting, reach and withdraw; and Objective Processes go far in remedying this condition.

Touch assists regularly and correctly given to proper End Phenomena will handle illnesses of such persons.

Word Clearing is vital tech to open the person's comm lines, wipe out earlier misunderstandings and increase his understanding.

PTS tech will handle the person's robotism toward SP individuals, groups or things. To this and the PTS Rundown can be added the **why** above as it relates to the things or beings found as suppressive as a last step.

The why above can be used in Danger Formula work such as HCO P/L 9 April 72, Correct Danger Formula, and HCO P/L 3 May 72, "Ethics and Executives". Other individual whys can exist in these instances.

## EXPANDED DIANETICS

The miracle of well done perfectly executed Expanded Dianetics eradicates both insanity and robotism. Drug handling and other actions may be necessary.

## END PRODUCT

The end product when one has fully handled robotism is not a person who cannot follow orders or who operates solely on his own.

Totalitarian states fear any relief of the condition as they foolishly actively promote and hope for such beings. But this is only a deficiency in their own causes and their lack of

experience with fully self-determined beings. Yet education, advertising and amusements have been designed only for robots. Even religions existed to suppress "Man's Evil Nature".

Lacking any examples or understanding many have feared to free the robot to his own control and think even with horror on it.

But you see, beings are **not** basically robots. They are miserable when they are.

Basically they prosper only when they are self-determined and can be pan-determined to help in the prosperity of all.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:sb.bh

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 9 DECEMBER 1971RC

Remimeo  
Class IV Grad  
Checksheet  
Checksheet  
Class IV Grad  
and above  
auditors  
C/Ses  
Ethics Officers

REVISED 29 JULY 1976  
RE-REVISED 8 DECEMBER 1978

(Revisions in this type style)  
(Ellipses indicate deletions)

## PTS RUNDOWN, AUDITED

Ref:	BPL 5 Apr 72RC I	PTS TYPE A HANDLING
	BPL 31 May 71RG	PTS/SP CHECKSHEET
	HCOB 20 Jan 72R	PTS RD ADDITION
	HCOB 16 Apr 72	PTS RD CORRECTION LIST
	HCOB 17 Apr 72	C/SING A PTS RD
	HCOB 3 Jun 72RA	PTS RD, FINAL STEP
	HCOB 24 Apr 72 I	PTS INTERVIEWS
	HCOB 10 Aug 73	PTS HANDLING
	HCOB 9 Nov 67	REVIEW AUDITORS BOOK OF CASE REMEDIES, REVISION OF REMEDY A, REMEDY B AND S AND Ds
	...	
	HCOB 19 Jan 68	S&Ds BY BUTTON
	HCOB 16 Aug 69R	HANDLING ILLNESS IN SCIENTOLOGY

## CASES

One remaining problem in cases was "PTS phenomena."

PTS means potential trouble source. When someone is suppressed he becomes a potential trouble source.

There are numerous HCOBs and PLs on this subject. All of them are true observations and predictions.

The cause of **Roller-Coaster** is PTS. Roller-coaster means a slump after a gain. Pcs who do not hold their gains are PTS.

S and Ds (for Search and Discovery) was the earlier approach. These are still valid and "3 S&Ds" as a rundown is used in the PTS Rundown without change.

Now with the PTS Rundown, this common and all too frequent case condition can be handled.

## WHO DOES IT

There are actually three PTS handlings:

1. This is essentially an ethics action done by the Ethics Officer. Its substance is contained in BOARD POLICY LETTER 5 APR 72RC ISSUE I, PTS TYPE A HANDLING. It is usually the first step at any sign of trouble. It is not an audited action, it is an interview. The PTS person is given a program in order to handle the scene.
2. This is the PTS RUNDOWN, AUDITED as covered in this HCOB, in HCOB 20 JAN 72R, PTS RD ADDITION and in HCOB 3 Jun 72RA. It is done by an auditor in regular session as described in these HCOBs.

... It can be done by Class IV Grads who are also HNEDAs, HGC Okay to Audits.

For an auditor who is not HNEDA, Class IV Grad Okay to Audit HGC by competent internship to attempt a PTS Rundown would be very risky for the pc as it needs exact listing, exact TRs, exact metering, exact Code keeping and very honest auditing and competent C/Sing.

3. The third handling is THE SUPPRESSED PERSON RUNDOWN, HCOB 29 DEC 78, and HCOB 30 DEC 78R – THE SUPPRESSED PERSON RD PROBLEMS PROCESSES. It is done by a qualified auditor in regular session. Essentially, it handles the OTHER person connected to the pc.

Therefore, what you have here is **three** stages of handling PTSness. The first above, the interview, cools off the scene and in many cases that is that. But when the pc is further affected by the connection and roller-coasters, he is given the audited rundown as in 2 above. This usually handles the case of PTSness as a case. But there sometimes remains another person, the SP person or group and its relationship in the real universe to the pc. And this is handled with 3 above.

## CLEARs, OTs AND DIANETIC CLEARs

The Dianetic steps of the PTS Rundown, Audited are not run on Clears, OTs or Dianetic Clears. (REF: HCOB 12 SEP 78, DIANETICS FORBIDDEN ON CLEARs AND OTs.)

Clears, OTs and Dianetic Clears can of course be given the interview step (1 above) and can be given the Suppressed Person Rundown as in 3 above as neither contains any handling of engrams.

## DEVELOPMENT

Early discovery and development of the PTS theory is extensively covered.

The recent wrap-up came about through my OT research in November 1971.

The principle breakthrough was realizing one should NOT invalidate having known certain people before.

This is similar to the past life discovery in 1950. Some people thinking this was "unpopular" frowned on it. Some others were only famous characters so flagrantly that past lives were easily invalidated. But people who don't go past track in Dianetics don't recover. Even running them as "imaginary" as in *Science of Survival* advices suddenly breaks through for a stalled Dianetic case.

In this same way with young men and girls using "I knew you when you were ....." for 2D advantage tended to invalidate having known certain individuals before this life.

But now it turns out that the **only** PTS situation that is serious and lasting and can cause a roller-coaster comes from having known the person *before* this life.

Possibly in the last life or earlier lives one knew persons before *that* life too. This however shows up in the 3 S&Ds.

### BREAKDOWN

There are only four points of breakdown of the PTS Rundown.

1. Improperly audited. Auditor not able to always do a correct list. TRs out, metering out, poor R3RA, just plain untrained or not totally familiar with this rundown.
2. Pc not completely set up. Like: Has TA trouble but no C/S 53 done, is a no change case but no EXGF 40RD done, old auditing not repaired by... proper programing or... pc too tired or too ill for the R3RA.
3. The rundown not fully and completely done, but chopped or left incomplete (pc will still roller-coaster).
4. People who "can't run engrams" – which means a druggie who hasn't had a full Drug Rundown.

There is nothing especially tricky about the auditing of the PTS Rundown except that all auditing should be of flubless quality and when the PTS RD is flubbed by bad lists or poor R3RA or out-TRs or poor metering it really **is** a mess. The RD is so powerful that errors in C/Sing and auditing it are especially rough.

Currently sick pcs should not be run on the PTS Rundown as a standard practice. It IS what they need **but** you can easily overwhelm a sick pc with engram running.

The time to run a PTS RD is when the pc is set up and when it is noted the pc roller-coasters, not when he collapses with a temperature.

Roller-coaster can also be caused by a bad Interiorization RD or Int repair, out-lists, bypassed charge of other descriptions. These should be gotten rid of before a PTS RD is attempted.

The prerequisites for a PTS RD are covered in 2 and 4 above. It is not restricted to Ex Dn but is a separate RD developed before Ex Dn.

## BEHAVIOR OF RD

Valence shifts occur rapidly and frequently in PTS RDs and should be noted on the worksheet.

The R3RA can sometimes be a bit of a long haul on a basic incident. Be sure with an L3RF. But get the postulate off the basic no matter how hard you have to work at it. In the PTS RD incidents can "develop." Missing pieces can appear. A whole new slant can occur on the subject when one goes to F2 after finishing F1.

Chronic somatics are likely to appear and be handled on this rundown. And case conditions not previously remedied by other means can be remedied by this rundown.

## END PHENOMENA

There is a point where the pc is absolutely sure he knew the person before this life. This is NOT the EP.

A pc can exteriorize on this RD. That is NOT the EP (but can require an Int RD if none has been done before...).

**The EP is a pc who is getting and keeping case gains and never again Roller-Coasters.**

## FLOWS

You cannot use Flow 1 as any old direction to or from pc. To do this fouls it up.

*Flow 1 is to the pc.*

Flow 2 is pc to the person (or place).

Flow 3 is the person (or place) to others.

Flow 0 is the pc to himself because of the person (or place).

If you did F1 R3RA as "Locate a time you knew " you might get to the pc, pc to the person or the person to others. You would not get a clean motivator F1. This would leave the PTS chain partially run.

This is also true of the ruds.

## RE-DOS

If the pc does *not* recover, then reasons for failure 1 to 4 above should be checked into.

Then the lists and R3RA should be handled with L4BRA and L3RF.

Then an overlooked item or person or place should be scouted for and handled. There is no question of the validity of the rundown. It might have missed. "True love" might have

been passed over as unlikely but such obsessive attraction is always based on having known (and probably done in) the other person.

Then the true EP will be attained where it only appeared to be before.

## SUMMARY OF REFERENCES

Here are the issues that directly cover the rundown:

BPL 5 Apr 72RC	PTS TYPE A HANDLING
HCOB 9 Dec 71RC	PTS RUNDOWN, <i>AUDITED</i>
HCOB 20 Jan 72R	PTS RD ADDITION
HCOB 16 Apr 72	PTS RD CORRECTION LIST
HCOB 17 Apr 72	C/SING A PTS RD
HCOB 3 Jun 72RA	PTS RD, FINAL STEP
HCOB 19 Jan 68	S&Ds BY BUTTON
HCOB 16 Aug 69R	HANDLING ILLNESS IN SCIENTOLOGY
HCOB 20 Apr 72 II	C/S Series 78
HCOB 15 Dec 68RA	L4BRA
HCOB 24 Apr 72 I	PTS INTERVIEWS
HCOB 10 Aug 73	PTS HANDLING

## THE RUNDOWN

### A. PAST S&Ds:

1. Collect up past S&D items (which should have already been verified on \_\_\_\_\_ set-ups) or get the pc to tell you them if no folder.
2. On the earliest one ask if known before. If it so reads handle per steps \_\_\_\_\_ 3-6. If not, pick next item and repeat this check for validity.
3. R3RA Triple/Quad the item using these commands: \_\_\_\_\_
  - F1 Locate a time when \_\_\_\_\_ did something to you. R3RA. \_\_\_\_\_
  - F2 Locate a time when you did something to \_\_\_\_\_. R3RA. \_\_\_\_\_
  - F3 Locate a time when \_\_\_\_\_ did something to others. R3RA. \_\_\_\_\_
  - F0 Locate a time when you did something to yourself because of \_\_\_\_\_. R3RA. \_\_\_\_\_
4. Triple/Quad ruds and overts on the item using these commands: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (a) Did \_\_\_\_\_ ARC break you? ARCU CDEINR. E/S to F/N. \_\_\_\_\_
  - (b) Did you ARC break \_\_\_\_\_? ARCU CDEINR. E/S to F/N. \_\_\_\_\_
  - (c) Did \_\_\_\_\_ ARC break others? ARCU CDEINR. \_\_\_\_\_

(d) Did you ARC break with yourself because of \_\_\_\_\_? ARCU CDEINR. \_\_\_\_\_

**Always do a fresh ARCU CDEINR on each E/S.**

(e) Did \_\_\_\_\_ give you a problem? E/S to F/N. \_\_\_\_\_

(f) Did you give \_\_\_\_\_ a problem? E/S to F/N. \_\_\_\_\_

(g) Did \_\_\_\_\_ give others problems? E/S to F/N. \_\_\_\_\_

(h) Did you give yourself problems because of \_\_\_\_\_? E/S to F/N. \_\_\_\_\_

(i) Did you withhold anything from \_\_\_\_\_? E/S to F/N. \_\_\_\_\_

(j) Did \_\_\_\_\_ withhold anything from you? E/S to F/N. \_\_\_\_\_

(k) Did \_\_\_\_\_ withhold anything from others? E/S to F/N. \_\_\_\_\_

(l) Did you withhold anything from yourself because of \_\_\_\_\_? E/S to F/N. \_\_\_\_\_

(m) Did \_\_\_\_\_ commit an overt (harmful act) on you? E/S to F/N. \_\_\_\_\_

(n) Did you commit an overt (harmful act) on \_\_\_\_\_? E/S to F/N. \_\_\_\_\_

(o) Did \_\_\_\_\_ commit an overt on others? E/S to F/N. \_\_\_\_\_

(p) Did you commit an overt on yourself because of \_\_\_\_\_? E/S to F/N. \_\_\_\_\_

5. Run "Can't Hav/Enforced Hav" with these steps:

(a) Clear "can't have," "couldn't have" as **denial of something to someone else**. Clear "enforced have" as **making someone accept what they didn't want**. Have pc get the idea of these with an example or two. \_\_\_\_\_

(b) Run on the SP items "can't have/enforced have" as motivator repetitive, then overt repetitive, the Flow 3 terminal to others, others to terminal (four flows of two commands each, or five if pc Quad).<sup>1</sup> \_\_\_\_\_

(c) After **each** item is handled with the four flows, Objective Havingness should be run.<sup>2</sup> \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>1</sup> Editor's Note: This process is not checked for read, see HCOB 27 MAY 70 UNREADING QUESTIONS AND ITEMS

<sup>2</sup> Editor's Note: "Objective Havingness" refers to Factual Havingness, ref. HCOB 3 July 1959 General Information, see History of Factual Havingness.

**THE COMMANDS:**

- F1. Did \_\_\_\_\_ run a can't have on you? Tell me about it.  
 Did \_\_\_\_\_ force something on you you didn't want? Tell me about it.  
 (Alternate/repetitive to EP.)
- F2. Did you run a can't have on \_\_\_\_\_? Tell me about it.  
 Did you try to force something on \_\_\_\_\_ that he (she, it) didn't want?  
 Tell me about it. (Alternate/repetitive to EP.)
- F3. Did \_\_\_\_\_ run a can't have on others? Tell me about it.  
 Did \_\_\_\_\_ force something on others they didn't want? Tell me about it.  
 (Alternate/repetitive to EP.)
- F3A Did others run a can't have on \_\_\_\_\_? Tell me about it.  
 Did others force something on \_\_\_\_\_ that he (she, it) didn't want? Tell  
 me about it. (Alternate/repetitive to EP.)
- F0. Did you run a can't have on yourself because of \_\_\_\_\_? Tell me about  
 it.  
 Did you try to force something on yourself that you didn't want because  
 of \_\_\_\_\_? Tell me about it. (Alternate/repetitive to EP.)

**– OBJECTIVE HAVINGNESS –**

6. Handle all past S&D items per above steps. \_\_\_\_\_

**B. PAST PTS INTERVIEWS:**

7. Collect up all past PTS interview items (which should have already  
 been verified with C/S Series 78 on set-ups). \_\_\_\_\_
8. Check known before on earliest one. If it so reads handle as below. \_\_\_\_\_
9. R3RA Triple/Quad the item. \_\_\_\_\_
10. Triple/Quad ruds and overts on the item. \_\_\_\_\_
11. Can't Hav/Enforced Hav on the item followed by Objective Hav. \_\_\_\_\_
12. Repeat steps 8-11 on all valid past PTS interview items. \_\_\_\_\_

**C. NEW S&Ds (3 S&Ds):**

13. Do 3 S&Ds per HCOB 16 AUG 69R, HANDLING ILLNESS IN SCIENTOLOGY,  
 ASSESSMENT AND L&Ns. \_\_\_\_\_
14. Check the first item for known before, handle if it so reads. \_\_\_\_\_

15. R3RA Triple/Quad the item. \_\_\_\_\_
16. Triple/Quad ruds and overts on the item. \_\_\_\_\_
17. Can't Hav/Enforced Hav on the item, followed by Objective Hav. \_\_\_\_\_
18. Repeat steps 14-17 on the other items if valid. \_\_\_\_\_

#### **D. TROUBLED/WORRIED:**

19. L&N Who have you known this lifetime who has troubled or worried you? to BD F/N item. (Usually includes father, mother, wife or wives, husband, brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles, grandparents, lovers.) \_\_\_\_\_
20. Check item for known before, if it so reads: \_\_\_\_\_
21. R3RA Triple/Quad. \_\_\_\_\_
22. Triple/Quad ruds and overts. \_\_\_\_\_
23. Can't Hav/Enforced Hav followed by Objective Hav. \_\_\_\_\_

#### **E. BEEN AFTER:**

24. L&N Who have you been after this life? to BD F/N item. \_\_\_\_\_
25. Check known before and if it reads: \_\_\_\_\_
26. R3RA Triple/Quad. \_\_\_\_\_
27. Triple/Quad ruds & overts. \_\_\_\_\_
28. Can't Hav/Enforced Hav plus Objective Hav. \_\_\_\_\_

#### **F. PLANETS:**

29. L&N What planets have you known before this lifetime? to BD F/N item. \_\_\_\_\_
30. R3RA Triple/Quad. \_\_\_\_\_
31. Triple/Quad ruds and overts. \_\_\_\_\_
32. Can't Hav/Enforced Hav plus Objective Hav. \_\_\_\_\_
33. D of P interview the person AFTER the RD is "complete" to be sure the person is now all right (not PTS). \_\_\_\_\_

### **READING FLOWS**

Each flow of each process on the rundown is checked for a read before it is run. This includes Dianetics, ruds, Can't Hav/Enforced Hav. You do not run unreading flows.

## REPAIR

Auditor errors during the RD are handled with L4BRA, L3RF, ... and ... C/S 53 if necessary.

A really big snarl up on the RD that won't clear up is handled with HCOB 16 APR 72 PTS RD CORRECTION LIST.

If pc gets ill or roller-coasters after the RD is complete the PTS RD CORRECTION LIST HCOB 16 APR 72 is done and whatever was missed is cleared up.

## SUMMARY

The PTS RD as revised is very direct and powerful. The L&N blows each aspect apart. Don't miss on it with auditor flubs. Get it drilled thoroughly before it is delivered.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:nt.dr



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 3 JUNE 1972RA

REVISED 15 OCTOBER 1974

RE-REVISED 8 DECEMBER 1978

(Cancels BTB 24 March 1973R  
"PTS RD ERRORS")

(Revisions in this type style)

Remimeo  
Class IV Grad a  
Class IV Grad c  
Ethics Officers

## PTS RUNDOWN, FINAL STEP

The following is an additional step to the PTS Rundown developed by me and tested at Flag. This step is run after *each* terminal is run, to prevent bypassing charge.

### The steps are:

1. Select the terminal already run in R3RA and ruds.
2. Clear "can't have," "couldn't have" as **denial of something to someone else**. Clear "enforced have" as **making someone accept what they didn't want**. Have pc get the idea of these with an example or two.
3. Run on the SP item "can't have/enforced have" as motivator repetitive, then overt repetitive, the Flow Three terminal to others, others to terminal and the Flow Zero of the pc to himself because of the terminal (four flows of two commands each or five if the pc is Quad). Check the flows for a read before running them. Do not run unreading flows.
4. After the terminal is handled with the four (or five) flows of "can't have/enforced have" Objective Havingness should be run. Then the next PTS Rundown item is taken up and run on all steps, as above.

### The commands:

- F1. Did \_\_\_\_\_ run a can't have on you? Tell me about it.  
Did \_\_\_\_\_ force something on you you didn't want? Tell me about it. (Alternate/repetitive to EP.)
- F2. Did you run a can't have on \_\_\_\_\_? Tell me about it.

Did you try to force something on \_\_\_\_\_ that he (she, it) didn't want? Tell me about it. (Alternate/repetitive to EP.)

- F3. Did \_\_\_\_\_ run a can't have on others? Tell me about it.  
Did \_\_\_\_\_ force something on others they didn't want? Tell me about it. (Alternate/repetitive to EP.)
- F3A. Did others run a can't have on \_\_\_\_\_? Tell me about it.  
Did others force something on \_\_\_\_\_ that he (she, it) didn't want? Tell me about it. (Alternate/repetitive to EP.)
- F0. Did you run a can't have on yourself because of \_\_\_\_\_? Tell me about it.  
Did you try to force something on yourself that you didn't want because of \_\_\_\_\_? Tell me about it. (Alternate/repetitive to EP.)

### – OBJECTIVE HAVINGNESS –

### THEORY

The theory is that SPs are SPs because they deny Hav and enforce unwanted Hav. They also deny *do* and enforce unwanted *do*. They also deny *be* and enforce unwanted *be*. This is why we have never before been able to run Subjective Hav. It collided with SPs, overts, and withholds on them.

A very full rundown then would be to start with *don't be, must be*; go on to *don't do must do*; end up with *can't have, enforced have*. (Not to be run at this time.) Hav alone should handle without resorting to be or do.

**End off at once and begin Objective Havingness if the TA soars or the pc caves in.**  
If this does not handle, then do a C/S 53RL at once and handle.

### PTS RD NOTES

With the issue of HCOB 17 Mar 74, TWC, USING WRONG QUESTIONS, it becomes necessary to convert the PTS RD 2WCs for items into L&N questions. Example: Who have you known this lifetime who has troubled or worried you? L&N to BD F/N item.

Avoid listing the same question twice. The L&N for places and planets should be restricted to planets only on VA pcs and an L4BRA used at the first sign of trouble.

Additional PTS RD items can be obtained from past PTS interviews. Done by L&N the RD is very powerful and direct. The pc must be well set up for it.

LRH:nt.jh.dr

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder



# Briefing of Review Auditors

A lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard  
on the 14 October 1965

And this is a briefing of Review Auditors, 14 October 1965.

The whole situation boils down to this, is there are three data which I have not been able to teach orgs or Tech or anybody else. There are three data. They don't know these data as key data. These data don't have any either/or's or qualifications or "there are other cases," do you see? There are three data that are just smashers as far as cases, and so forth, are concerned. Our concern is with one of these, which is the second one. But what I'm going to – giving you your briefing – that I'll tell you what these three data are that we just can't really seem to get across – that I don't have any luck getting across at all.

So the reason why I'm talking to you is, in Review then, you will run into these three data all the time. Because they won't have gotten across in Tech. The Tech Division won't have gotten it across or the rest of the org or Supervisors won't have gotten them, don't you see? Or Ethics doesn't get them, don't you see? And they don't get these three data! See?

And the first one is that a high TA equals overrun and that there isn't any other reason for a high TA. There aren't 192 different reasons for a high TA. There's just one: it's overrun. And that's the only, the only reason you have a high TA. From a Review standpoint, then, you have to find out what's overrun. Do you see? From a Review standpoint.

All right. Covering this, then, a high TA always equals overrun and equals nothing else and is the problem of Review to find out *how* and *what* was overrun. The Review Auditor's problem is to find out what and how. All right. Therefore, raw meat walks in off the street and he's got a TA at 5. And he's never been audited and he has never been anywhere near Buddhism, mysticism, anything else. Well, you've got your work cut out. Do you see?

I'll plead with you. This isn't any reason to throw away the datum. Do you follow? Because the easy way out is you say, "Well, we can't find out what's overrun, so let's just throw away the datum." Well now, that's what the HGC auditor did; that's what the field auditor did; that is what Ethics did; and that is what the Course Supervisor did. They all threw away the datum. And they're looking now for mysterious reasons why the TA is high. And therefore, in view of the fact that they're all looking for it, as a Review Auditor, for heaven's sake, don't you do it, too! Do you see? Because then we can't repair the case and nothing patches up.

Now, you're going to find some interesting things when you get into this. You'll see there's a TA sitting at 5. All right, it's an overrun. You're liable to get into some case and find out the fellow went into Christianity and had a big datum in Christianity and went release

when he was six years old in Sunday school. And then he kept on studying religion. Do you follow? It's overrun. You got it?

Now, this bird took up a health course and he walked out there and he just was walking five miles every morning and he was getting up and he was doing sitting-up exercises and he was... terrific. He'd been an invalid and he used this therapy and there he is, boy! And he gets into terrible shape. And his TA is stuck at 5 and you want to figure out why it's an overrun. Well, he just did one too many push-ups. Do you follow? He didn't knock off the regimen when he was winning. You get the idea?

Ordinarily, I would say there was some kind of treatment or wisdom back of it which he then went beyond release. Because don't think we're so special that just because somebody is in Scientology then life all behaves differently. No, we in Scientology, and so forth, progress because we parallel what life is doing and we know more about it than people out in life, don't you see? But that doesn't mean the phenomena of Scientology doesn't happen elsewhere. It does, all the time. It isn't specialized to Scientology.

Now, I should imagine, these poor blokes in practically every therapy from Aesculapian, the witch doctor, the juju, anybody under the sun, has run across the overrun-release phenomena. Can you grab that as a datum? So we look on these things as all failed technologies. And we don't know what the original technology was – let me point that out to you – because it got alter-ised and they all went the route that we almost went. And I'll call to your attention that we *almost* went the route. We almost did.

Fifteen years we were overrunning a state of Keyed-Out Clear. We called it originally Clear, then we called it Keyed-Out Clear, and now we're calling it Release, because there *was* such a thing as a Clear. And the funny part of it is all the original works talk about a pure Clear. If you want to listen to the congress of 19 – I think it was 57, 58, and so forth – it's talking about a pure Clear that we're making today. Do you see? But there was this intermediate stage and people would hit this, and that was the stage I was hitting with people as early as 1947, you see? And it made a Release, and it made an apparency of this other state. So the state had its harmonics, don't you see?

So the state is approached gradually. A Clear is somebody who hasn't got a bank. If you release somebody of the bank then he behaves like somebody who doesn't have a bank. Do you follow? But the only way you could guarantee his total behavior that way forever would be to have no bank at all. And then there wouldn't be any bank to get away from and that's, of course, clearing. Do you follow that?

So therefore, nobody else has made one of these things; don't worry about that. Clear: that's highly specialized as far as we're concerned. But these states of release is what you're handling in Review, and they're the ones that are going to give you trouble.

And the key datum of the whole thing is that a high TA equals an overrun. It isn't necessarily what was being run at the time the TA went high. And there you also come a cropper. The guy is running Pr Pr 5, and the TA suddenly flies up and sticks at 5 and the auditor can't do anything. Well, bend your wits around to the complication that you may have restimulated an overrun Communication Release. Do you follow? And the guy drops straight back into the

lockup in the bank which he had – which was an overrun Communication Release. Do you follow?

He might have gone back into that and Existence might not be flat. Isn't that interesting? The likelihood of this occurring is very slight, but it's still a possibility, do you see, that the TA is not high on what is currently being run. The TA might be high on a rudiments question.

Now, if – let's say the guy was a Problems Release, he'd been a Problems Release for many, many years, and somebody asked him a problems question in the rudiments. All of a sudden his TA goes up and sticks. And then they go on running the Power Process and the TA is up and stuck and nothing is moving with the case and then this looks like an awful bungle. So now what you have to find out is *what* was overrun. You see?

So your question is always asking, on this first item, "What was overrun?"

And believe me, if the auditor in the HGC did not solve it or the field auditor didn't solve it, and so forth, then it is *always* true that what they were repairing is not what was wrong.

If you try to fix the loudspeaker of a radio set when it is the mains plug that's broken (just to get corny about it), you can't, of course, fix the radio set. So if somebody kept on working on this and working on this and working on this and it wasn't solving it, then realize, please, that that wasn't what was wrong. So they've got the wrong overrun if they're trying to get a TA down – invariably and inevitably.

So if you look back through the person's folder and you find out they've been working on rehabilitation of former release and the TA was high and no TA, and they've been working on the rehabilitation of former release and the TA is high and so forth, don't discard the datum that a high TA equals overrun. The guy is rehabilitating the wrong release. It's just, they've never spotted the right release.

Now, we had one case here, actually, that for about five months was driving us all around the bend. And we were trying to rehabilitate former release on this person. We tried to rehabilitate him in 1950, 1952, 1958. We're trying to rehabilitate, time after time, a former release – thetan exterior. We worked and worked and worked on these things, don't you see? Having an awful time.

It happened in 1965. There was the auditor, right there. And that case did not resolve, because in the rehabilitation of the former release they had the wrong release they were trying to rehabilitate. And it was highly improbable that the case had had former releases of the states and at the times they were trying to rehabilitate them. Do you follow?

And the case had sat there and given a tremendous lot of end words to her auditor. I've forgotten exactly when it was; it was less than a year ago, wasn't it?

*Male voice: Yeah.*

And had given a whole bunch of end words and had gone Fourth Stage Release.

*Male voice: The first PC in the Saint Hill HGC.*

First pc in the Saint Hill HGC and gone Fourth Stage Release. Do you see the gag here?

Now, the first tendency is to throw away the datum that high TA equals overrun. Because, you see, you're trying to find the overrun and you don't find the overrun, so you throw the datum away and say the TA must be high from something else, do you follow me? You just haven't located the right overrun.

You see, the TA could be held up with half a dozen different overruns, but it would be held up with the one it's held up with. It wouldn't be held up with one of the others that could have held it up. Do you understand?

It is the one that it is. So all you've got to do – all you got to do – is find the right overrun and the TA will come down and the case will go release again. And the rehabilitation technique which you've got will do it, *providing* you have the right overrun.

Now, for instance, I rehabilitated what we were then calling a First Stage Release. I rehabilitated this release. I got a momentary floating needle. That was good enough for me; I wasn't going to push it any further. And I just came off of it right like that. But I noticed that when I came off of it the needle stopped floating. Well, I didn't want to push my luck. I didn't push my luck, because in the first place this case was going to be further audited, you see, on higher grades. So I just had the case declared and got away from it. And I started pushing the case along some other line of Power Processing and I didn't get anyplace.

And quite incidentally and almost by accident, I noted the fact that the case had been a Fourth Stage Release, and found it, and down came the TA and so forth. And the case was very, very ARC broken about Solo auditing on end words, too. Very ARC broken about the whole thing. Couldn't find any more end words that would read. She got very upset. I mean, the bank blew, and that was it. As far as she was concerned she was out of it – Release – she couldn't go back into it again, and so forth. Actually, the TA had come down and floated while she was looking through dictionaries. And I dug it all back up and refloated it and that was that. Do you follow me?

So your job in Review is definitely: if you got a high TA, don't come off of the concept a high TA equals an overrun. You just find out the right "when" and the right "what", and down it'll come – crash! And every time we've had trouble is when we haven't put this into action. Do you understand?

*Male voice: Very well.*

You got it?

*Audience: Yes.*

So that's not a datum, then, that you run away from. There's a high TA; that's an overrun. Where is the overrun? What was overrun? And the sky is the limit; it could be anything. Do you follow? You can get wilder than scat if you've got somebody that hasn't been audited very much and he's got a high TA. You're *wha-a-aw!* The sky's the limit. What was he doing that released him? That's the question. Something. You'll find out what it is.

Now, I haven't found a whole track former release, overrun, stuck TA. I'll just give you that as a little beneficial datum. I haven't found one. Now, you notice I haven't told you it doesn't exist.

*Male voice: Thank you for that.*

All right. You got that one real good? Is there anything misunderstood about it? Any question about it? Hm?

*Audience: No.*

Nope?

*Female voice: Yeah, I have a question.*

Yes?

*Female voice: That exact thing happened with me this morning.*

Well, you overran something, but it probably wasn't what you were running.

*Female voice: No.*

Do you follow?

*Female voice: Yes.*

No, no, I haven't found somebody that because he was a member of the Planet Builders eight – you get the idea – eight trillion years ago – he obviously was a Release then – I haven't found his TA stuck up because of that whole track release. Do you understand? I don't say it can't exist, but I do say I haven't found it. I've found them all in this lifetime so far. Got it?

All right, now, let's take number two, and this is the main thing I want to talk to you about: A rolly coaster equals a suppressive person in that person's vicinity. In other words, rolly coaster – PTS. If a person rolly coasters, it's PTS. A PTS is a connection with a suppressive. I'll give you the exact mechanics of it; I'll let you sort them out on your own time.

And that's postulat-counter-postulate is the anatomy of a problem. And this belongs in actual fact at Grade I. And it's just this: postulate-counter-postulate. Postulate versus postulate. That is the definition and the anatomy of a problem. And there is *no* other definition to a problem. There can be several counter-postulates; there can be several going out like this, but that makes several problems. The central problem is always postulate-counter-postulate.

So the guy has had a purpose in life and somebody has suppressed it, or a guy has had a purpose over a twenty-four-hour period and somebody suppressed that purpose. In other words, his purpose was his postulate, the other person saying he couldn't do it was the counter-postulate. Do you follow?

So that is simply the anatomy of a problem and it belongs at Grade I. And there is *no other reason* for rolly coaster. This is the "no other" data I'm giving you. There just is no other datum.

People don't rolly coaster because they got into an engram. People don't rolly coaster because the auditor misread the action. People don't rolly coaster because his father was a

Methodist and has been dead since birth. Do you understand? So don't, as a Review Auditor, ever fall for two seconds for any other reason for a rolly coaster than postulate-counter-postulate. There isn't any other reason.

Now, SP is a version of this. It's a version of a problem and is a specialized kind of problem, and that is what causes the rolly coaster. The individual has run into a postulate-counter-postulate since his last improvement, which makes him a potential trouble source.

Potential trouble source means the case is going to go up and fall down. And he's a trouble source because he's going to get upset. He's a trouble source because he's going to make trouble. And he's a trouble for the auditor and he's trouble for us and he's trouble for himself and so forth. And he really does make trouble. That's very carefully named.

The SP isn't making trouble. See? He's just poisoning the whole universe, you know? But it isn't – he isn't making trouble; he's just going *squash!* Do you see? Anybody says anything to him – *squash!* You see? It's the PTS who makes the trouble. Do you see this?

Now, this is the whole backbone of ethics. And there isn't anything more to ethics than the – this basic purpose of ethics is ethics exists to get tech in. If you ever see ethics being put in that throws tech out, then ethics is being used in a suppressive fashion. Now, the only way that you could use ethics suppressively is use it in such a way that it threw tech out. Because the purpose of ethics is to put tech in. If you've got ethics, you can get tech in. You carry on ethics long enough to get tech in, and that's all the longer you carry it. But in the process of getting tech in you very often will run into a rolly coaster – and that is, a case worsens after it improves, as easily as that.

The case did all right in yesterday's session; comes to this session, falls on his head. That's a rolly coaster. And there's no other cause for it, see, than postulate-counter-postulate.

You could handle this. You'll see a process come out and an HCOB come out on a process that will be called "Search and Discovery." And Search and Discovery is just to find the purposes – to find the suppressions the person has had in life. And one of the broad ways of finding it, unfortunately, will make a Problems Release in minutes. You say, "What has been your main purpose in life? Thank you very much. Who opposed it? Thank you very much." And in a large percentage of cases, Problems Release! Do you understand? It'd be an interesting percentage on which this would occur.

Of course, the person doesn't know about problems – they aren't cleaned up about problems worth a nickel – but they'll go release on the subject of problems, and they'll stay released. And now you try to run problems on them and you're going to get a high TA. Do you see? They've solved all their problems.

The way you solve a problem is to find the source of the counter-postulate. You find the source of the counter-postulate; that's the way to solve a problem. Now, man gets *solutions* to problems. In other words, he leaves the counter-postulate and his own postulate in place, not knowing the definition of a problem, and then solves the resulting collision, as in dialectic materialism.

You want to read that some day; that's very interesting. It's the anatomy of a problem gone mad. "Any idea is the product of two forces" is the backbone of it. It's quite interesting.

It's the – it's a current philosophy. But in actual fact, that's based on a problem. Two forces going together make a squash, so therefore, that's it!

Now, if you want to really solve a problem and see it solve in the physical universe and have an awful lot of fun with it, then you had certainly better look over the whole perimeter of counter-postulates: What is the source of the problem?

And if you hit it right – if you've got a problem with Joe Jinks and he's in Toronto, Canada – if you hit it right, don't be surprised if you get a phone call from Joe Jinks telling you the problem is all solved. It happens, routinely and constantly. And I had to run down what process was it that was causing this phenomena, because we ran into the problem very often.

We'd run Problems of Comparable Magnitude on a pc in an HGC or an ACC or something like this, and the next thing you know their long-lost husband or something, that they'd had such awful problems with, is very sweetness and light. Do you follow? You see, the problem evaporated. But the funny part of it is, in the physical universe it'll also evaporate for the other person sometimes. So that's quite interesting. And that's very interesting for you to know that in connection with ethics. Because when you see that the disconnection, or the handle or disconnect, causes an enormous problem for the person or for the other person from whom they are disconnecting, you have *invariably* found the wrong person.

Now, Ethics... The policy letter that moved them over to "Suppressives must be located by Review" – and that's where you're coming in and that's why I'm talking to you. We're not permitting Ethics, anymore, to locate suppressive persons. They're going to be located by Review Auditors in regular session. Do you see that? Because Ethics just flubs it too often. They're not equipped for auditing and so forth. They're interested in justice and that sort of thing, and they don't go ahead with it and do a good job of it. So therefore, anybody walking into Ethics who is PTS, who has roly coasted and so forth, is sent to Review. And that is the route.

Actually, an HGC auditor should send directly to Review and then Review sends to Ethics. Ethics has to have some notation of this. That's the only reason they go to Ethics after Review. Do you see? Because when they're sent to... when somebody says, "Well, this person is PTS," and so forth, you *could* send them directly, don't you see, over to Ethics and *then* to Review in all cases. But I know very well that if one of your Examiners was to find a PTS, and know very well that that Examiner would inevitably and invariably send that person directly to Review, wouldn't send them to Ethics. Why? Review is closer. Do you see?

So after the person has been found to roly coaster and then Review cleans up the SP, why, they can go over to Ethics and get a statement of handle or declare, don't you see? But it's all cleaned up. They're not any longer – they're not even vaguely worried about it. Do you see?

Now, that's the way it's going to be handled, and that's the change of route. So therefore I'm briefing you. And the reason why I've called you in is just to give you this datum and just tell you that although around you will hear occasionally that there are other reasons for roly coaster, that's for the birds! That's not true. There are no other reasons for roly coaster than PTS. And PTS is the manifestation of a postulate-counter-postulate.

Now, you notice that I haven't said how long. You know, the person didn't have to be a PTS for two and a half years before he became up to Review's attention – I mean, up to the attention of Ethics. He might have only been PTS for twenty minutes. And it's very interesting that you can overrun a person who is trying to tell you he's already gone Release and the person becomes a PTS. Who's the suppressive?

*Audience: The auditor.*

Isn't that interesting? Of course, the suppressive – it's merely a suppressive action. You don't declare the auditor a suppressive person. Do you follow? You don't have to then go through the endless action of "the PC must separate from the auditor and disconnect and..." That's a lot of balderdash, isn't it? But still, the mechanics are there: rolly coaster – PTS. Well, just who? Where? How? What? And that's your job in Review.

Now, you can use listing. You can list the person's purposes: "What purpose of yours has been thwarted?" I mean, unfortunately, in handling this you're going to have some Releases on your hands. But watch it! Get them declared when they occur; that's a Grade I Release.

Now, don't let somebody shake you off of this datum that a rolly coaster is a PTS. And the definition of PTS is: connected to a suppressive person or action. See? Person or action. A guy can inadvertently suppress something. You're driving down the road and somebody steps out in front of your car – believe me, when you hit him, you suppressed him. You certainly didn't intend to and that doesn't make you a suppressive person. Do you follow?

So just looking at this from straight technical mechanics and so forth: a rolly coaster – PTS. Now, if that PTS is not handled the person does become, then, a trouble source. And "PTS" – *very* well named. You overrun somebody, oh boy, you're going to have trouble. They're going to make trouble. There's going to be all kinds of trouble.

What's your main consideration, then, in handling anybody sent to you from Ethics or from the HGC, in the review? Your main consideration is, promptly and immediately, this person has been up against a suppressive action or person. And don't go nutty and try to do ARC breaks on him and sympathize with how badly they've been hit. Nothing like that. All you've got to do is find the suppressive person. Now, the person may only have been suppressive for five minutes. Or the person might have been suppressive for a lifetime. But you find the right one and instantly the good indicators will come in, and watch it, because you're liable to make a Release right at that moment.

Now, also watch it that by getting off the SP you rehabilitate the state of Release which was being overrun. You see now, the person came in to you with a high TA, and all of a sudden you recognize the person is PTS, also. Do you follow? Person felt better, now feels worse. Well, your action is to locate the suppressive action or person, of course. But you might have the high TA because the person has had an overrun on a process. But it's still a suppressive action. See, completely aside from rehabilitating the process, what have you got?

Now, a suppressive person is not somebody with horns; it's a person who has had a counter-postulate to the PC you are handling. But a suppressive person who is routinely sup-

pressive in life, invalidative of Scientology and trying to keep people from getting well and that sort of thing, is a social menace.

Now, he's the problem of Ethics. Your problem in Review is to find him. And if it's just a momentary suppression and so forth, you don't go declaring somebody suppressive because he accidentally overran the PC, and the PC says, "I feel good now and I don't want to answer any more auditing commands."

"Well, you'd better answer this next auditing command."

"Well, I don't *want* to answer any more auditing commands."

"Well, you'd *better* answer this next auditing command."

The person will now behave to some degree on the basis of PTS. You not only have got an overrun release, or something of that sort is lurking around there, but you in addition to that have a PTS. Do you follow? So both of those actions would have to be handled. But please, please don't let somebody shake this datum for you. Because when they can't find the SP by any means, then they will drop the datum. Do you see? They drop the datum, huh? They say, "Well, all right. It was because he ate bananas last night."

Well, I'm afraid that somebody in auditing wouldn't roly coaster if he just ate some bad bananas last night. He's not roller coastering in auditing. So he doesn't feel so well this morning; well, he knows damn well what did it. If he wanted to – if you wanted to be an absolute perfectionist on this, you could say, "Well, who insisted you eat the bananas?" Don't you see? And probably at that moment, why, his tummyache would go [snaps fingers].

But that sort of thing is too minor. We're talking about a real honest-to-God roly coaster, see? The person was doing fine in the – audited in London, doing fine; appears here, doing badly. Oh boy, that's a roly coaster. He signs all over the wall, that's roly coaster. Don't you see? Did all right last week; isn't doing well this week. Well, that's a roly coaster. And *always* there *is* a suppressive action or person – invariably, inevitably. And Review's job, then, when somebody sends to Review a PTS, is to find that.

Now, Review also, as I told you, might find also an overrun – may find two things while looking for one. And the only mistake you can make is, two things being present, find the wrong one and say the person is now okay, when the other one still has to be handled. See, you'd handle both of them. If two things are wrong, you'd handle both things – if the person has had an overrun and is also a PTS from some other course – or source.

Now, you'll notice that whenever you tell a person the right suppressive, that's like locating, indicating the bypassed charge. It isn't the same as an ARC break. Don't get it tangled with an ARC break, because an ARC break is *only* cycles of communication. That's another animal. And you can't handle these things. But the funny part of it is, the same technology will locate and indicate the suppressive – source of the suppression – locate what it is, get the pc to look it over, indicate what it is. You should get good indicators. And you should get them right now, and your meter ought to blow down. And it's unmistakable.

And now if the person again roly coasters, don't say, "We didn't find the right suppressive." There's another one, that's all. It's that simple. You got – you did this and the good

indicators all came in. The person felt fine for three days and all of a sudden roly coasters again, and you have the person back on your hands. Don't let anybody berate you. And you, John, as Qual Sec, don't let anybody start berating Qual for not having found the right suppressive. Do you see? This person was *infested*. You see? Just find it. You say, "Aw, *poo-phoo-phoo*, *wuff-wuff* nothing, *bah-bah-bah*. There was just another suppressive to be found, that's all." And go ahead and do so.

If you found all the suppressive persons and actions in a person's lifetime you would have a Problems Release. And sometimes, as I said to you, and all too often, the Problems Release will occur while you're looking for it. And after that, you're up the creek, aren't you? How, now, are you going to handle this when the person gets into another PTS situation? Well, don't let it worry you, because he's a Release on the subject and he won't. Unless he goes home and starts self-auditing it.

Now, let me give you another little point on overrun here – just a point in question, so forth. You know you have auditors around who self-audit and that a person can be released and then they're so anxious to get to the next grade of Release that they dicker around and tinker around with whatever they're doing. And then they think, "That was a good command the auditor was running," and then *they* overrun it.

They actually will give themselves repetitive auditing commands. I'm calling that to your attention. And it is a source of overrun which is all too often overlooked. There can be, in a trained Scientologist, another auditor present: the pc as an auditor, auditing himself. He's liable to go home – ARC breaks: "Oh, gee, I felt so wonderful after Aunt Molly..." and so forth, and he hasn't quite blown it all, don't you see? And he sits down and he says, "Let me see, was there anything else that Aunt Molly invalidated me about? Oh yes, that. And somebody else invalidated me about..." Now, it's going to run, for a very short distance. And then his TA is going to go high, and he's going to have a high TA. Do you see that? It's a hidden source of an overrun.

All right. But this roly coaster, suppressive, PTP of long duration is the one which gives Ethics the most trouble, and it's being handed over as an auditing proposition to Review. And one of the reasons it's being handed over is I've solved the technology of it and there isn't anything more to the technology of it than I've just given you. And you can fancy this up any way you please. You can run fifty dozen different processes to solve the same thing. You could tailor-make all kinds of one-two-threes and that sort of thing. But it's just postulate-counter-postulate. It's just an effort to act versus an effort to – not to act. It's this, you see? It's just postulate-counter-postulate.

You spot the source of the counter-postulate and that will be the end of the problem. And that's the piece of technology that's just come up, and I think you'll admit that's ter... it's so plainly stated that you're sure I have said it before. [laughs] And I haven't said it in that two connected words.

All right. Now, the other thing has nothing much to do with those two, but it is the source of the overt. And the source of the overt is that formula whereby when something is misunderstood, a person will then individuate from it and then he will commit overt acts against it. And that is the cycle. There's a longer cycle than that; you'll find it in bulletins; it's

already been covered. But this is the third datum which is a key, top-flight senior datum that is most commonly overlooked.

Confusion or argumentation, upset or stupidity, comes from a misunderstood word, misunderstood *earlier* than the one the person is talking about. The word that is misunderstood is always *earlier* than the one the person is nattering about. That's *always* the case, and that's part of the original study materials. But it's just uniformly missed.

Student is having a hard time out here arguing with the Supervisor – *yip, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap*. The Supervisor will just stand there and argue about what the student is arguing about. They'll go on arguing and arguing and arguing. And they bring them over and come into Review and Cramming and so forth. And they go on arguing, arguing, arguing – oh bull! This is *terrible!* Because in the first place, how did the Supervisor not know this other part of the datum? It's always earlier than the one they're arguing about.

If they're arguing about a point in paragraph two that the student can't understand, then the missing point is in paragraph one, always. And the student will never argue about paragraph one, and he'll always argue about paragraph two. Do you see that? And the misunderstood word is in paragraph one. Do you follow?

All right. If halfway through a course they're very upset and they can't understand their material and they're being very, very stupid, then there was something in the *very* early part of the course that they're not discussing at all. And this is *always* the case! The person *never spots* what they've misunderstood!

So any confusion, stupidity or upset from the level of training always comes from a word misunderstood or a misunderstood thing, *prior to* the one the person insists on talking about. It's always *prior to* the one the guy is talking about. And to talk to him about what he is talking about is just a *waste of time*. And as a Review Auditor you get this, every once in a while.

You get – have to do an assist on a student of some kind or another. And he'll say, "Well..." and you'll say, "Well, what didn't you understand?" (I'll show you how to do this wrong.) "What didn't you understand?"

"Oh, why, I didn't understand – uh – I just couldn't understand about engrams. They just – just – oh, they're *very* upsetting. I couldn't understand anything about them."

"Well, was there some word in the connection with engrams that you didn't know?"

Flunk! Flunk! Flunk! Flunk! You get it? The auditor is saying, "What word connected with engrams didn't you understand?" Or the auditor says, "Well, he didn't get the definition of engrams." Do you see, this is just flunk, flunk, flunk, flunk. Guy doesn't know what he misunderstood. It's before he went into engrams.

And you say, "All right..." Now, the pat question, if you want to solve this [snaps fingers] right like that, is, "Just before you got into engrams, what was there that you collided with that you didn't dig?"

"Oh! Oh, that. Locks. I just didn't understand what a lock was or what – what – what is this thing called a picture?"

All of a sudden, *bing-bang*, now he understands it, and that's all there is to it. Do you follow? And the magic of the whole thing is spotting the *earlier* misunderstood thing from the one he is talking about. And that is implicit in the study materials themselves, but is the key major point and is the solution to it, and is the one which is consistently missed in Tech, it's missed in Ethics, it's missed all over the organization. It's missed in checkouts. It's just missed in a rash. And when the guy has missed all the way across the boards, he inevitably will wind up sooner or later in Review to get this handled or to get handled some way or another, because he will get routed down there.

Now, he very often will get routed there from Cramming. See? Cramming will get fed up with this guy and send him over for some auditing, don't you see? Now, *that's* all you do with him. Now, you can run the form 26 June on him, and you can do a lot of other things, but *this* is the one you do with him. This is the key datum. This is senior to everything else that you can do.

Now, these first two I've given you rank this way: The first one ranks as exclusively an auditing activity – high TA equals overrun.

The second one, rolly coaster and suppressive and so forth – that is really, exclusively an environmental difficulty. Do you understand? And it can occasionally incur in auditing. You'll err when you think it always occurs in auditing. But that's really environmental, don't you see?

And this next one is on the subject of comprehension of Scientology materials, and that's where they relate. And they are the key datum to each one of these activities. In other words, "high TA equals overrun"; that is the key datum of auditing. Because that's the one that can wreck all auditing. So therefore, it obviously is the boss datum.

And the second one, this can wreck a guy's whole life: PTS. And if that's not discovered and so forth... And that's the key datum that regulates the environment.

And this third one is the one that regulates his comprehension, not only of Scientology but of existence. See, that's the key datum that regulates his IQ. And that is the boss datum. That is the top dog, right there. That's the one way up on top. And it's so easy to get it wrong! It is just so simple to get this wrong.

"Oh! The reason the guy is arguing with me is misunderstood a word." That's wrong! That is a totally improper statement and it won't lead to a resolution of the problem. Do you understand? That's a false datum!

"There is a misunderstood word in what the guy is arguing with me about," and that is false. From the standpoint of a Review Auditor, that has not sufficient truth to resolve the situation. That's wrong! The correct datum is "There is something misunderstood just *before* what he's talking about." That's the correct datum and that's the one that leads to a resolution of the situation.

Guy's talking about steam engines: "Well, I just never dug any steam engines. Steam *eng-aw-blah!* It's a terrible subject. I just hate steam engines and so forth. Never could understand anything about them, I'm always having accidents with them, and so forth, even though I own the B&O Railroad. Ah, yeah, steam engines and so forth."

Well, an auditor who'd say to him at that moment, "What word have you misunderstood about steam engines?" just has missed the whole boat. That's why the datum won't work.

*Female voice: Sure, if that was the problem, it would resolve.*

Yes! The guy's trying to understand steam engines. He isn't confused about steam engines. "Just before you got into steam engines, what did you misunderstand? What did you find incomprehensible just before you got into steam engines? What were you in just before you got into steam engines?"

Let's take it on a terribly broad basis, see? "What were you in just before you got into steam engines?"

"History."

And you'll find out that his misunderstanding comes into the basis of politics. And railroads, after that, you see, is a secondary subject that has to do with the political expansion of continents or something. And he's all hung up in the subject of politics, and he doesn't think people ought to drive other people off continents or something, see? It's that wild. So he moves into this whole field of steam engines and he doesn't understand anything about steam engines. Steam engines were the source and cause of a lot of things he doesn't comprehend anything about it. There's an allied subject he was in just before he got there. Do you follow? I'm giving you a ridiculously broad example. Do you understand?

So this auditor out here, he's saying, "I just don't understand anything." He'll keep saying, "Mind? Mind? Now, what do you mean by mind?" I mean, it's this boy on course, see. "What do you mean by mind? I don't understand anything about mind." All right. His Supervisor stands there and defines mind for him and goes into all kinds of gesticulations and explanations and graphs on the board about... Honest-to-Pete, he could do this probably for the next century without ever getting his point across. You got it? He could go on and on and on.

"Just before you got upset about minds, what were you into? What were you studying just before you got to that point about minds?" That's the right question.

"Oh, I don't remember... Oh, yes I do. Yes. Yes, I-I-I do. Yes, there is something there – religion." And he'll be hung up on a completely different subject, and he's never spotted it, and you've got to actually take his wits and back him up on the time track. Do you understand? So that your Review Auditor action is always realizing that the remainder of the org possibly has not got this one straight: that it's the earlier one. If there's *anything* wrong with a guy's study, then this is the thing that is wrong. They have not backed it up one.

They're arguing about bulletin three, when it's bulletin two, see? They're arguing about paragraph seven when it's paragraph six. It's always – they're arguing about the one after when the fault is the one before. You got that?

And your Review action, then, becomes unstabilized to the degree that you don't find a misdefinition in what he is studying. You don't find the misdefinition in what he is studying and therefore you think his stupidity comes from some end word or something. You see, you'll change your mind; you'll think the study datum is gone; you'll start looking elsewhere

for the reason why. Well, the magic is all connected in: If it doesn't resolve on what you ask him, it's before what you ask him. It's the one he's arguing about and telling you all about that he didn't understand and so forth, then he didn't dig something just ahead of it. And as a Review Auditor, when you get this boy from Cramming or from course or something like this, you *must* back it up.

"Well," he's saying, "the au... these Instructors, these Supervisors, they just won't listen to me. And I keep telling them and telling them and telling them that I just can't understand an E-Meter."

"What were you studying with regard to E-Meters?"

"Well, I was studying the E-Meter book of E-Meters."

"All right. Now, is there something in the very early portion of that book..." – this is possible, but not too probable – "Is there something in the very early portion of that book you didn't dig?"

Well, clean up a couple. See, it's like unburdening the time track. "Well, there's... All right. Is there something just before you got into E-Meters? Is there something before you got into E-Meters?" You could find possibly that it's the word *essentials*. He didn't understand *essentials* – you know, *E-Meter Essentials*. It's that early in the book. But the probability is it's something that predates E-Meters. It predates his study of E-Meters. And therefore you've got to follow that down.

Whatever it is, it'll read on your meter. Do you know that you can date it before you find it? You can say, "All right, you're having an awful time learning E-Meters. You've been checked out on 850 GAEs on the subject of E-Meters here in your last three weeks of auditing." His ethics file is thick with these things. All right. Now, I'll give you the wrong question: "What don't you understand about E-Meters?" Wrong question! Won't lead to a resolution. It'll lead to an argument; it'll lead to some tiny, partial result; it has no magic connected with it.

You say the right question: "The date of the misunderstanding that's got you upset about E-Meters: 1964? 1963? Is it before 1960? Is it after 1960?" You could do it as crazy as this. All of a sudden you get a read. And that was 1962. He says, "Well, I wasn't even in Scientology."

"All right, what were you in?"

"Well, I sold books in a bookstore."

And you'll find a dictionary fell on his foot or something of the sort. And at the moment that it fell on his foot he was looking up meters or he was looking up electronic devices. Or he was once an electrical engine... he wanted to be an electrical engineer when he was a child, and he'd forgotten all about this, but his parents wouldn't permit him to be an electrical engineer. Now he doesn't understand about *anything* electrical. Has nothing to do with meters. Do you find that? And you can plow around this way, but for heaven's sakes don't plow around on what the PC is arguing with. And that's my whole message.

The absolutely fixed datum here is it's *always* a misunderstood word and it is always prior to the one the PC is arguing about. And if you've got that, boy, can you handle cases on a Review basis on stupid students. *Whish, whish, whish* – there's nothing to it. It just rolls off *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*. Guy walks in, so on. There isn't anything else, by the way, wrong with a student. See, that's how senior the datum is. If you use this datum you'll find the other things wrong with the student just fall away; they're all apparencies, they're all locks on what this is, you see?

You can find a lot of things wrong with a student. You could find a lot of arguments he's having. You can find a lot of upsets he's having. You can find injustices. You can find all sorts of wild things, and so forth. But if he isn't making progress in his studies, then the thing is wrong with his studies, isn't it? You don't handle his environment so that he can handle his studies better. Let me give you that as a datum.

I've been so knocked out and dragged down and so forth, casewise and otherwise and otherwises, don't you see, that I couldn't see two feet away. And the funny part of it is, I could always work on technology. You normally find in existence, the thing the person is having trouble with will resolve if you find out what caused it. And if it doesn't resolve, then you haven't found out what caused it.

But this datum about study it – don't buy any guff off the student. Don't buy any bunch of different solutions. Let him get them off; let him get off some ARC breaks. Acknowledge him. Locate and indicate the bypassed charge of somebody who wouldn't listen to him about his not understanding things or... I don't care what you do – but realize, please – make him happy for sure – but realize, please, that you're just – that you're just flicking at the froth on the beer. You're not taking any drinks of beer.

You can do all the things you want to; you can putter around for hours. You can make him feel pretty good, you can get him into good communication with you, all this sort of thing and so forth. And then you jolly well better find out what he misunderstood *before* what he said he misunderstood.

You say, "What have you misunderstood about all this?" And the guy says, "Well, I don't understand buttercakes." And you say, "Well, that's good." Don't ever make the fatal mistake of saying, "What don't you understand about buttercakes?" If he's got buttercakes pinpointed that easy, he doesn't misunderstand buttercakes. It's cooks. It's something just ahead of buttercakes. And your right auditing question is "All right. Well, just before you got into the subject of buttercakes and so forth, what were you into?"

Guy says, "That's a new thought!" See, he'll give you the basic on the chain, don't you see? Well, I don't care how far down you follow the basic on the chain. After all, Review auditing is paid auditing. Follow it down to the year izzard, but don't follow it into the R6 bank. Got it?

I don't care how many study points you cure up with this bird. But remember, you are handling fringes on end words and that sort of thing. I don't care how many points you relieve; I don't care if you clean up his kindergarten. You understand? It's almost a deliberate anti-Q and A. He says it's B – well, don't ARC break him – say, "Oh, yes..." cheerily, cheer-

ily, "Yeah, oh yeah, good. I'm glad you don't understand buttercake." But now give him A. "All right, just before you got into buttercake, what was it?"

"Oh!"

You're going to get some big cognitions and you'll get some big results. You got it?

All right, to summarize up here – to summarize up – you got three data, and it's the three data that go out in the org. And that's why they're key data for Review. These three data go out in the org. The org in general has many other data which they consider very important. And how to run E-Meters and all that sort of thing – these data are very important. And how to do Power Processing and everything – these things are very important. You understand? But from the viewpoint of Review, there are really only three data that are important. Only three.

And one of those is a high TA equals overrun. And if you know that, boy, you're never going to have any trouble. When was it overrun; what was overrun?

Two: If a person roly coasters, he *is* a PTS, at that moment. He *is* a PTS and it's only a question of what was the source of the suppressive action? Do you see? That's the counter-postulate. Just get that counter-postulate, that's all. Who? It's not, by the way, good enough to get the counter-postulate. You've got to get, if you can, the source of the counter-postulate. The reason the R6 bank, for instance, doesn't blow, is because you don't get the counter-postulate – *who* on the counter-postulate. You can get all the counter-postulates – but who? That doesn't emerge till way late, don't you see?

You'll find the most difficult problems that you handle on an individual is he never found out who. He walked out his front doorstep and all of a sudden he had a bullet through his head and he never found out who shot him. He'll be hung up on the track for centuries. See? Who was the other fellow? And he goes around asking this question rather haunted.

Next one: Confusion of any sort comes from a misunderstood word that goes before the word the person is arguing about.

That's the whole lot.

Now, you could ask me for a whole bunch of fancy processes, one of which to handle each one, and I could probably be very amusing and be very interesting. I am going to write one called "Search and Discovery" and give several alternate methods of finding the SP and so forth, that mostly consist of listing or just asking or something like that. But actually, if you're a skilled auditor you should be able to do these.

Now, with the routing: for any auditing action required in Ethics, we're for sure going to send that person right straight to the Qual Div and the Department of Review. And no analysis of this particular character is going to be done in Ethics of any kind whatsoever. They just do nothing but make mistakes.

Oh, they spot one every once in a while and straighten a lot of thing up; I shouldn't invalidate them 100 percent. But there's too many mistakes, too many mistakes. And those mistakes have one common denominator. The mistakes Ethics makes are in actual fact failure to

spot the proper SP or source of the suppressive actions. And that is the big mistake. Because if Ethics spotted that mistake every time, then everyone would be very happy with Ethics.

And it's interesting that in the policy letter, the person is not permitted, if he's gone for an ethics action on this, PTS, he's actually not permitted to be trained or processed till he's paid for his Review auditing. Now, you'll say, "Boy, that is sure commercial. Oh, that's really commercial." No, I have found uniformly that if a person won't pay – actually the pennies and pence – for Review auditing, they didn't get it in Review. The person is usually so happy – if the person has really been handled in Review, he's so happy about it, he would actually push somebody out of his road to go over there and put down the quid or two that was necessary to handle his little bill. Do you follow?

But if he won't pay that, I can assure you that it hasn't been located. So it's just a pre-venter, don't you see?

[End of lecture.]



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 18 JUNE 1968

1. Remimeo
2. Flag Order

## ETHICS

The Purpose of Ethics is

**to remove Counter-Intentions from the environment.**

And having accomplished that the purpose becomes

**to remove Other-Intentionedness from the environment.**

Thus progress can be made by all.

Many mechanisms can exist to mask a counter-Intention.

One has an intention to expand the org. An "expert" says it is difficult as "The building society...". The impulse is to then handle the problem presented by the "expert", whereas the correct **ethics** action is to remove his Counter-Intentionedness or Other-Intentionedness. If he were an **expert** he would simply say "OK. I'll handle my end of the expansion".

There are many ways to handle counter and Other-Intentionedness.

There is a fine line between Ethics and Tech.

The point where a thetan goes mad is very exact. It is the point where he begins to obsessively stop something. From this the effort becomes generalized and he begins to stop lots of other things. When this includes anyone who or anything that would help him as well as those people and things that help, the being is *suppressive*. His intentions counter any other intention, particularly good intentions.

Other-intentionedness comes from unawareness or dispersal. It is handled by removing things which disperse others. Offering bottled medicine to cure "the blues" is a direct distraction. It is the purveyor of the distraction who is the target.

The person who enters on Scn groups to then sell other-answer is of course an enemy.

However we go about accomplishing the above is the *action of* Ethics. The above is the purpose.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

3. LRH:js.cden



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor' East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 29 JUNE 1968

Remimeo  
Ethics Officer  
Hat  
Registrar Hat  
Address Hat  
Franchise  
City Offices

*Div 1 – Dept 3 – Ethics Section*

**ENROLLMENT IN SUPPRESSIVE GROUPS**

(Amends HCO PL 28 Dec 1965  
of Same Title)

Any person found to be connected to a Suppressive Group may not thereafter be enrolled in the Saint Hill Solo Audit Course or the Clearing Course.

Suppressive Groups are defined as those which seek to destroy Scientology or which specialize in injuring or killing persons or damaging their cases or which advocate suppression of Mankind.

It does not matter whether the person so connected disconnects or handles, or whether the connection has been previously severed.

The reason for this policy letter is to make it extremely difficult for suppressive groups to acquire data they could then pervert and use to harm others.

If a person was a member and left, it still remains such a person must have had some basic agreement with the motives of the suppressive group.

If we do not hold this rule we may find our task made harder by the abuse of data. We do not want, ever again, the epidemics of implantation to recur and will do all in our power to deny data to any who might pervert it to such use.

A person so denied access to upper level data may not receive it ever unless the group of which he is or has been a member is completely abolished and dispersed.

Ethics files in all orgs must contain the names of such persons.

Neither may such a person ever become a staff member of a Scientology organization without special clearance from LRH Ethics Authority Section, Dept 27, WW. Anyone on staff found to have been a member of a suppressive group must be sent to this section for clearance.

**Names persons enrolled in SP groups or declared sp must be circulated to all Franchise Holders, Scn Offices and Orgs as and when discovered. They are not covered by any amnesty and may not have Advanced Courses until group disbanded. Such persons may not be employed by Orgs or Offices and if found employed in any Centre that Franchise will be cancelled. Persons of SP group membership or declared SP may not be FSMs.**

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:js.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 21 OCTOBER 1968

- 4.
- 5.
- 6. Remimeo
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.

**CANCELLATION OF FAIR GAME**

The practice of declaring people FAIR GAME will cease. FAIR GAME may not appear on any Ethics Order. It causes bad public relations.

This P/L does not cancel any policy on the treatment or handling of an SP.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

- 10. LRH:ei.cden



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 15 NOVEMBER 1968

Remimeo

**CANCELLATION OF DISCONNECTION**

Since we can now handle all types of cases disconnection as a condition is cancelled.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:rw.cden



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICER  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 MAY 1969

(Revises HCO Policy Letter of 27 Oct. 1964)

Remimeo  
Franchise  
Sthil Students  
Sthil Staff  
Dianetic Course

**POLICIES ON "SOURCES OF TROUBLE"**

See also HCO PL 6.4.69 II Dianetic Registration

11.

Policies similar to those regarding physical illness and insanity exist for types of persons who have caused us considerable trouble.

These persons can be grouped under "sources of trouble". They include:

12.

(a) Persons intimately connected with persons (such as marital or familial ties) of known antagonism to mental or spiritual treatment or Scientology. In practice such persons, even when they approach Scientology in a friendly fashion, have such pressure continually brought to bear upon them by persons with undue influence over them that they make very poor gains in processing and their interest is solely devoted to proving the antagonistic element wrong.

They, by experience, produce a great deal of trouble in the long run as their own condition does not improve adequately under such stresses to effectively combat the antagonism. Their present time problem cannot be reached as it is continuous, and so long as it remains so, they should not be accepted for auditing by any organization or auditor.

13.

(b) Criminals with proven criminal records often continue to commit so many undetected harmful acts between sessions that they do not make adequate case gains and therefore should not be accepted for processing by organizations or auditors.

14.

(c) Persons who have ever threatened to sue or embarrass or attack or who have publicly attacked Scientology or been a party to an attack and all their immediate families should never be accepted for processing by a Central Organization or auditor. They have a history of only serving other ends than case gain and commonly again turn on the organization or auditor. They have already barred themselves out by their own overt acts against Scientology and are thereafter too difficult to help, since they cannot openly accept help from those they have tried to injure.

15.

(d) Responsible-for-condition cases have been traced back to other causes for their condition too often to be acceptable. By responsible-for-condition cases is meant the person who insists a book or some auditor is "wholly responsible for the terrible condition I am in". Such cases demand unusual favours, free auditing, tremendous effort on the part of auditors. Review of these cases show that they were in the same or worse condition long before auditing, that they are losing a planned campaign to obtain auditing for nothing, that they are not as bad off as they claim, and that their antagonism extends to anyone who seeks to help them, even their own families. Establish the rights of the matter and decide accordingly.

16.

(e) Persons who are not being audited on their own determinism are a liability as they are forced into being processed by some other person and have no personal desire to become better. Quite on the contrary they usually want only to prove the person who wants them audited wrong and so do not get better. Until a personally determined goal to be processed occurs, the person will not benefit.

17.

(f) Persons who "want to be processed to see if Scientology works" as their only reason for being audited have never been known to make gains as they do not participate. News reporters fall into this category. They should not be audited.

18.

(g) Persons who claim that "if you help such and such a case" (at great and *your* expense) because somebody is rich and influential or the neighbors would be electrified should be ignored. Processing is designed for bettering individuals, not progressing by stunts or giving cases undue importance. Process only at convenience and usual arrangements. Make no extraordinary effort at the expense of other persons who do want processing for normal reasons. Not one of these arrangements has ever come off successfully as it has the unworthy goal of notoriety, not betterment.

19.

(h) Persons who "have an open mind" but no personal hopes or desires for auditing of knowingness should be ignored, as they really don't have all open mind at all, but a lack of ability to decide about things and are seldom found to be very responsible and waste anyone's efforts "to convince them".

20.

(i) Persons who do not believe anything or anyone can get better. They have a purpose far being audited entirely contrary to the auditor's and so in this conflict, do not benefit. When such persons are trained they use their training to degrade others. Thus they should not be accepted for training or auditing.

21.

(j) Persons attempting to sit in judgment on Scientology in hearings or attempting to investigate Scientology should be given no undue importance. One should not seek to instruct or assist them in any way. This includes judges, boards, newspaper reporters, magazine writers, etc. All efforts to be helpful or instructive have done nothing beneficial as their first idea is a firm "I don't know" and this usually ends with an equally firm "I don't know". If a person can't see for himself or judge from the obvious, then he does not have sufficient powers of

observation even to sort out actual evidence. In legal matters, only take the obvious effective steps – carry on no crusades in court. In the matter of reporters, etc., it is not worth while to give them any time contrary to popular belief. They are given their story before they leave their editorial rooms and you only strengthen what they have to say by saying anything. They are no public communication line that says much. Policy is very definite. Ignore.

---

To summarize troublesome persons, the policy in general is to cut communication as the longer it is extended the more trouble they are. I know of no instance where the types of persons listed above were handled by auditing or instruction. I know of many instances where they were handled by just ignoring them until they change their minds or just turning one's back.

In applying a policy of cut-communication one must also use judgement as there are exceptions in all things and to fail to handle a person's momentary upset in life or with us can be quite fatal. So these policies refer to non-Scientology persons in the main or persons who appear on the outer fringes and push toward us. When such a person bears any of the above designations we and the many are better off to ignore them.

Scientology works. You don't have to prove it to everyone. People don't deserve to have Scientology as a divine right, you know. They have to earn it. This has been true in every philosophy that sought to better man.

All the above "sources of trouble" are also forbidden training and when a person being trained or audited is detected to belong under the above headings (a) to (j) he or she should be advised to terminate and accept refund which must be paid at once and the full explanation should be given them at that time. Thus the few may not, in their own turmoil, impede service to and the advance of the many. And the less enturbulence you put on your lines, the better and the more people you will eventually help.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:cs.ei.rd



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 16 APRIL 1982

Remimeo  
HCO Area  
Sec Hat  
Dir I&R Hat  
E/O Hat  
MAA Hat  
Tech/Qual  
Ds of P  
PTS Pack

(Excerpted from an LRH despatch of 10 Aug 1973. Also note there are additional tools developed since this despatch was written for handling PTSes, e.g. Can We Ever Be Friends cassette, Suppressed Person Rundown, etc.)

## MORE ON PTS HANDLING

REF: HCOB 10 AUG 73	PTS HANDLING
HCOB 20 OCT 76	PTS DATA
HCOB 31 DEC 78 II	OUTLINE OF PTS HANDLING
BPL 31 MAY 71RG	PTS AND SP DETECTION, ROUTING
RE-REV. 13.11.77	AND HANDLING CHECKSHEET

PTS is a connection to an SP. That is true. But what may be overlooked is that persons of the middle class (which is a culture, not an income bracket, to which belong all the puritan hypocritical mores of the cop and the get-a-job-be-a-moderate-plugging-success) frown very terribly on anything that the least bit tries to make a better world. The middle class wants the world of a job and order and even hypocrisy and cops because they are **afraid**. They hold their narrow views because any other views may disturb their 20 year house mortgage, the store, the job. So when someone decides to make a better world they look on him as a direct menace even though the dull middle class world is a sort of slavery and suicide. It is the middle class that tries the hardest to keep the down-and-outer out and down, who go along with a cop America and hate support of anything not their class. And nearly every PTS you have will be found one way or another to be PTS to the middle class. As a group, not as individuals, the middle-class parent world suppresses anything different. So you have PTSes.

The bulk of your PTSes may very well be PTS to a class, the middle class of which their particular SP is simply a member. Few of them realize this or even that the middle class (bourgeoisie) **are** very suppressive to anyone who tries to do something in the world besides support the system. My attitude in this is that both the capitalist and communist are alike old hat and a bore, that they've made a ruddy mess of things, exhausted the planet and, with their senseless wars, smashed up mankind.

I have sometimes heard that less PTSes are found than are found people with the question "Do you have problems in your environment?" reading on a meter. I began to wonder about it. Then I heard of PTSes being simply transferred or demoted. Now listen, these people are PTS and there must be a total grasp on that tech. It **is** a tech.

It is definitely out-tech to either (1) transfer someone who is PTS to another area yet still keep the person on one's lines or (2) to put someone who is PTS on a lower post, **as a means of handling**, as it is not handling at all.

The person has to handle. If he does so he will begin to get well and cease to have problems. The reasons he cannot handle are because he tries to do it in the heroic fashion that is required in a disconnect. Handling can be very, very gradient. I have seen a case where the person was simply coached to give his parents good roads and good weather and not take up any entheta and have seen the person pull right out of it and get well. It doesn't have to be an explosive handling. It can be very gentle. All you want is the person at cause and that is attained on a gradient toward the SP.

The whole crux of PTSes is **handle**. And the misunderstood on it is how gently one can handle.

Many of them are caught up in the mystery of why they are snarled at and have no conception of the Middle Class as a formidable and jealous force that goes psychotic when it feels anyone may get away from the treadmill and threaten their uneasy and doomed lives.

One tries to find what it is and then persuades them into handling. That's the tech.

**Every one of those people can be straightened out. Every one of them should be.**

Every one who reads on "problems in your environment" is to some degree PTS. Most of them don't even know what the letters PTS stand for. So there is an educational step, the PTS/SP Checksheet. It does not mean they have been connected to ogres. It means they are suppressed by someone or something, **often far exterior to their present position or area**. So there is an educational step. The tech is in HCO PLs and HCOBs. It is perhaps given more directly herein, as it applies to that exact scene.

So go to it. Really get a grip on it. And handle the hell out of them yourselves.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Assisted by

Mission Issues Revision 2nd

LRH:BM:dr

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 16 AUGUST 1971R  
Issue II  
Revised 5 July 1978

Remimeo  
Courses  
Checksheets

(Revisions in this type style)

## TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED

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

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

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

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

1. The auditing skill of any student remains only as good as he can do his TRs.
2. Flubs in TRs are the basis of all confusion in subsequent efforts to audit.
3. If the TRs are not well learned early in Scientology training courses, **the balance of the course will fail and supervisors at Upper Levels will be teaching not their subjects but TRs.**
4. Almost all confusions on meter, Model Sessions and Scientology or Dianetic processes stem directly from inability to do the TRs.
5. A student who has not mastered his TRs will not master anything further.
6. Scientology or Dianetic processes will not function in the presence of bad TRs. The preclear is already being overwhelmed by process velocity and cannot bear up to TR flubs without ARC breaks.

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

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

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

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

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

### **NUMBER: OT TR 0 1971**

NAME: Operating Thetan Confronting.

COMMANDS: None.

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

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

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

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

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

### **NUMBER: TR 0 CONFRONTING REVISED 1961**

NAME: Confronting Preclear.

COMMANDS: None.

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

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

**TRAINING STRESS:** Have student and coach sit facing each other, neither making any conversation or effort to be interesting. Have them sit and look at each other and say and do nothing for some hours. Student must not speak, blink, fidget, giggle or be embarrassed or anaten.

It will be found the student tends to confront **with** a body part, rather than just confront, or to use a system of confronting rather than just **be** there. The drill is misnamed if confronting means to **do** something to the pc. The whole action is to accustom an auditor to **being there** three feet in front of a preclear without apologizing or moving or being startled or embarrassed or defending self. Confronting with a body part can cause somatics in that body part being used to confront. The solution is just to confront and **be** there. Student passes when he can just **be** there and confront and he has reached a *major stable win*.

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

## **NUMBER: TR 0 BULLBAIT REVISED 1961**

**NAME:** Confronting Bullbaited.

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

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

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

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

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

**PATTER AS A CONFRONTED SUBJECT:** The coach may say anything or do anything except leave the chair. The student's "buttons" can be found and tromped on hard.

Any words not coaching words may receive *no* response from the student.

If the student responds, the coach is instantly a coach (see patter above). Student passes when he can **be** there comfortably without being thrown off or distracted or react in any way to anything the coach says or does and has reached a *major stable win*.

**HISTORY:** Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington in March 1957 to train students to confront preclears in the absence of social tricks or conversation and to overcome obsessive

compulsions to be "interesting." Revised by L. Ron Hubbard April 1961 on finding that SOP Goals required for its success a much higher level of technical skill than earlier processes. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in August 1971 after research discoveries on TRs.

### NUMBER: TR 1 REVISED 1961

NAME: Dear Alice.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### NUMBER: TR 2 REVISED 1978

NAME: Acknowledgments.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **NUMBER: TR 2½ 1978**

**NAME:** Half Acks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **NUMBER: TR 3 REVISED 1961**

**NAME:** Duplicative Question.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Student: "Do fish swim?"

Coach: "Yes"

Student: "Good"

Student: "Do fish swim?"

Coach: "Aren't you hungry?"

Student: "Yes"

Coach: "Flunk."

When the question is not answered, the student must say, gently, "I'll repeat the auditing question," and do so until he gets an answer. Anything except commands, acknowledgement and as needed, the repeat statement is flunked. Unnecessary use of the repeat statement is flunked. A poor command is flunked. A poor acknowledgement is flunked. A Q and A is flunked (as in example). Student misemotion or confusion is flunked. Student failure to utter the next command without a long comm lag is flunked. A choppy or premature acknowledgement is flunked. Lack of an acknowledgement (or with a distinct comm lag) is flunked. Any words from the coach except an answer to the question, "Start," "Flunk," "Good" or "That's it" should have no influence on the student except to get him to give a repeat statement and the command again. By repeat statement is meant, "I'll repeat the auditing command."

"Start," "Flunk," "Good" and "That's it" may not be used to fluster or trap the student. Any other statement under the sun may be. The coach may try to leave his chair in this TR. If he succeeds it is a flunk. The coach should not use introverted statements such as "I just had a cognition." 'Coach divertive' statements should all concern the student, and should be de-

signed to throw the student off and cause the student to lose session control or track of what the student is doing. The student's job is to keep a session going in spite of anything, using only command, the repeat statement or the acknowledgement. The student may use his or her hands to prevent a 'blow' (leaving) of the coach. If the student does anything else than the above, it is a flunk and the coach must say so.

**HISTORY:** Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956, to overcome variations and sudden changes in sessions. Revised 1961 by L. Ron Hubbard. The old TR has a comm bridge as part of its training but this is now part of and is taught in Model Session and is no longer needed at this level. Auditors have been frail in getting their questions answered. This TR was redesigned to improve that frailty.

### **NUMBER: TR 4 REVISED 1961**

**NAME:** Preclear Originations.

**PURPOSE:** To teach the student not to be tongue-tied or startled or thrown off session by originations of preclear and to maintain ARC with preclear throughout an origination.

**COMMANDS:** The student runs "Do fish swim?" or "Do birds fly?" on coach. Coach answers but now and then makes startling comments from a prepared list given by supervisor. Student must handle originations to satisfaction of coach.

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

**TRAINING STRESS:** The student is taught to hear origination and do three things. 1. Understand it; 2. Acknowledge it; and 3. Return preclear to session. If the coach feels abruptness or too much time consumed or lack of comprehension, he corrects the student into better handling.

**PATTER:** All originations concern the coach, his ideas, reactions or difficulties, none concern the auditor. Otherwise the patter is the same as in earlier TRs. The student's patter is governed by: 1. Clarifying and understanding the origin. 2. Acknowledging the origin. 3. Giving the repeat statement "I'll repeat the auditing command," and then giving it. Anything else is a flunk.

The auditor must be taught to prevent ARC breaks and differentiate between a vital problem that concerns the pc and a mere effort to blow session. (TR 3 Revised.) Flunks are given if the student does more than 1. Understand; 2. Acknowledge; 3. Return pc to session.

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

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

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

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

### **TRAINING NOTE**

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

**L. RON HUBBARD**  
Founder

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

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 30 MARCH 1973

ISSUE I

REISSUED 21 SEPTEMBER 1974

(Only change is signature)

Remimeo

## STEP FOUR – HANDLING ORIGINATIONS

Edited and taken from  
PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN NO. 151  
1 January 1959

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.

So remember 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.

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 fish swim?" or "Do birds fly?" and the preclear says, "Yes." Here is the factor, now, entering: "Do fish swim?" The preclear doesn't answer *Do fish 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 skip 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.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.rd



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 31 JANUARY 1979

Remimeo  
TRs Course  
Checksheet  
TRs Course Supervisor  
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, REVISED 1 APR 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. (Reference: "Ability 36" and "Ability – Straight Wire.")

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-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 off a repulsion 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 brush off, 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.

## 50 FOOT MOOD DRILLS

50 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 50 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

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 5 APRIL 1972  
ISSUE I

Remimeo  
HCO Sec Hat  
Dir Insp & Rpts Hat  
Ethics Officer Hat

## **PTS TYPE A HANDLING**

### **DEFINITION**

Per HCO Policy Letter of October 27, 1964, a PTS (meaning a Potential Trouble Source) type A is a person "intimately connected with persons (such as marital or familial ties) of known antagonism to mental or spiritual treatment or Scientology. In practice PTS persons, even when they approach Scientology in a friendly fashion, have such pressure continually brought to bear upon them by persons with undue influence over them that they make very poor gains in processing and their interest is solely devoted to proving the antagonistic element wrong."

### **A SOURCE OF TROUBLE**

Such persons with antagonistic family members are a source of trouble to Scientology because their family members are not inactive. In fact from direct experience with Inquiry after Inquiry into Scientology, it has been found that those who have created the conditions which brought about the Inquiry in the first place and those who testified before same have been the wives, husbands, mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, or grandparents of some Scientologist. Their testimony has been full of such statements as, "My son completely changed after he went into Scientology – he no longer was respectful to me." "My daughter gave up a wonderful career as a hairdresser to go into Scientology." "My sister got these funny staring eyes the way all Scientologists have."

Their testimony was illogical and their descriptions of what occurred were untrue, but the point of the matter is that such persons **did** cause Scientology, Scientology Orgs and fellow Scientologists a great deal of trouble and difficulty.

## DON'T CREATE ANTAGONISM

Many Scientologists in their misunderstanding and misapplication of Scientology create the conditions that bring about the antagonism in the first place. A few illustrations of how this is done are as follows:

Scientologist to mother: "I now know where you are on the Tone Scale – 1.1. Boy are you sneaky!" (Evaluation and invalidation.)

Father to Scientologist: "Now I don't want you to borrow the car again without my permission. I have told you time and time..." Scientologist to father: "OKAY! FINE! OKAY! GOOD! THANK YOU! I GOT THAT!" (Not an acknowledgement, but an effort to shut up the father.)

Scientologist to older brother: "You murdered me in a past life, you dirty dog!" (Evaluation and invalidation.)

Mother to Scientologist: "Whatever are you doing?" Scientologist to mother: "I'm trying to confront your dreadful bank." (Invalidation.)

There are so many ways to misuse tech and to invalidate and evaluate for others in a destructive fashion to bring about bypassed charge, ARC Breaks and upset that they can not all be possibly listed. The idea is **not** to do so. Why create trouble for yourself and for your fellow Scientologists as nothing will have been gained but ill-will?

## THE WHY

Per HCO Policy Letter of March 7, 1965, it is a CRIME to be or become a PTS without reporting it or taking action, or to receive processing while PTS. Further as per HCO Policy letter of October 27, 1964, a PTS may not be trained.

This means that a person who is PTS may not receive processing or training while PTS and it also means that they had better do something to handle their condition. As per older, now cancelled policy; the PTS individual was required to handle or disconnect from the antagonistic family member before he or she could continue with their training or processing. Many took the easy course and merely disconnected as such disconnection was only temporary for the time of their training or processing and so they did not in actual fact handle the condition in their life which was upsetting to them as Scientologists.

Scientology executives have had to promise the New Zealand government that the policy of disconnection from families would be cancelled. This was done. But since that time we have had more PTS trouble than before.

Therefore what is needed is a legal and more sensible way to handle.

Using recent technology contained in the Data Series Policy Letters, a new procedure is possible. Each PTS individual should report to Ethics and with the assistance of Ethics find a **Why** as to their familial antagonism and then set about actually handling the situation. The **Why** could be that his parents wanted him to be a lawyer and so blame Scientology that he is

not one, rather than the fact that he flunked out of law school and couldn't stand the thought of being a lawyer!

Or perhaps the **Why** is that the Scientologist keeps writing her parents for money or the **Why** could be that the mother has just read an entheta newspaper article.

In any case the **Why** should be found and the PTS individual should then do whatever is necessary to handle.

See the Data Series P/Ls (must be word cleared on the user) to find out how to find a Why.

### HANDLING

The person who is PTS should be declared as such by Ethics and should not receive Scientology training or processing until the situation has been handled.

The handling could be as simple as writing to one's father and saying, "I do not complain that you are a janitor, please do not complain that I am a Scientologist. The important thing is that I am your son and that I love and respect you. I know you love me, but please learn to respect me as an adult individual who knows what he wants in life." Or it could be as follows, "I am writing to you, Daddy, because mother keeps sending me these dreadful newspaper clippings and they are upsetting to me because I know they are not true. You do not do this and so it is easier for me to write to you."

Again there are as many ways of handling as there are Why's found. Each case is individual. Remember, too, there is always the possibility of a **no** situation. And if the person thinks he's a PTS and isn't he can get sick. Or if he insists he isn't and is, he can also get upset. So find if there **is** a situation first.

It is the purpose of Ethics to ensure that the situation is handled.

CS-G  
for

L RON HUBBARD  
FOUNDER

LRH:MSH:nt.lm.tda



## BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN

11 NOVEMBER 1977

Reissued 10 December 1977

Remimeo  
PTS/SP Detection Routing  
and Handling Course  
Snr CI IV

### HANDLING PTS SITUATIONS

The majority of the Technology on how to handle PTSes is already covered in the PTS and SP Detection, Routing and Handling Course. The following LRH tips on handling PTS Type A situations have been excerpted from an LRH lecture as additional data for your use.

"I coached a pc one time as to how to talk to his parents. I coached him very, very carefully. This is a sort of an MAA job, not a C/S job. I made him repeat everything after me, very carefully. 'And when your mother says to you so and so and so and so what are you going to say?' It was just good roads and good weather. I forced on him at pain of being squashed, to follow this exact patter with his parents. 'Hello Mama, how are you? How's Papa?' etc., simply good roads and good weather. And she says 'Yeow yeow yeow yeow yeow yeow' and you '...wha wha wha wha wha'. Why just say 'well alright, alright', and don't answer back and don't engage in any argument of any kind whatsoever. Give it an acknowledgement. I told him 'You are calling them up just because you're passing through and you were interested in how they are, and that is your whole story.' And he did, and that was the end of the whole situation. The pc came back to battery. Relationships with the parents went totally normal. In other words, he was keeping it going by his worry, his upset, his letters, trying to answer their questions, his conversation with them. Whereas I cut it all into just the pattern of something on the order of about a Tone 3.5 straight across the boards. That was the end of the PTS condition.

"A PTS condition also has outside handling steps. But you as an auditor, or you as a C/S are possibly limited by the fact that you don't have an MAA, or you do not have somebody who is sufficiently skilled in order to do this job for you, and it winds up blowing everybody's head off. In such an instance, just get hold of the guy, coach him in exactly what he's going to say. 'Oh but no she'd never listen, she won't. She hasn't talked to me for seven years. She won't talk to me in any way shape or form.' 'Well alright, alright, alright, that's fine, good.' Then you get a little bit inventive and you say 'Well, when is her birthday? ', or something like that, and the pc says 'Well as a matter of fact, it was a month or two ago,' and you say 'Well alright, why don't you send her a birthday card, Remember to tell her it's a belated day card, and that you remembered her birthday and always had kind thoughts of her?' Now the incoming comm may blow his head off, and you just cool him off. Don't engage in any corner of this. This is not the game you're playing. You simply acknowledge any nice part that you can find. 'Papa went hunting, and you're a dirty dog, and I've never seen the like of you, and you're an ungrateful brat and so on, and why don't you be like your Great Uncle

Oscar who is now doing time in Sing Sing and will be executed next week?' And so forth, and you say 'I hope Daddy had a fine hunting trip.' It's the only part of it you answer. You coach him into a two-way comm that is well above 2.0 on the tone scale. That mostly consists of acknowledgments and mild interest in what's going on. You will find out these conditions will evaporate, if you can prevent the backflash from being responded to by the PTS person. In other words there are ways to handle this in real life.

"You will find a great many people who are 'PTS', are antagonizing the people. They're antagonizing them beyond belief, and they're telling them what's wrong with them, and they're telling them this and they're telling them that and so on, and the person eventually gets very resentful. Well even that can be patched up. You are not doing anything at the other end of the line. You cool off the PT scene sufficiently, one way or the other, so that the person can sit in the auditing chair." LRH (Compiled from LRH Taped Lecture 7511C20)

Julie Gillespie A/CS-4

Approved by LRH Pers Comm

Authorized by AVU

for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the  
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:AH:KU:JG:pat

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 20 OCTOBER 1976

Issue II

Remimeo  
SSO  
DPE  
Ethics Officer  
PTS/SP Checksheet

## PTS HANDLING

Once in a while I hear of PTS handlings that "didn't work" or "still PTS" or some such. Or I'll come across such extremes as a PTS is virtually an incurable leper to be shunned and kept isolated or almost everyone is PTS to some degree so what can you really do about it. The basic thing to realize is that PTSness, like any other case condition afflicting Man, responds to plain old standard tech. But one has to have studied and understood that tech to apply it, naturally.

I recall years ago in handling PTSes, that *none* of them at first knew what PTS really meant or what it was all about even when they used the term freely! So I recently called for a pilot to see what would be the effect of a study method of curing PTSes.

## FIRST PILOT

Before the final pilot was done, an earlier pilot was attempted by an Aide which was not conducted as laid down. CS-5 reviewed the failed pilot to find why so many failed on it. 4 out of 6 were never completed and the 2 that did failed.

CS-5 reported "What I found on these was that they uniformly were not PTS in the first place or were PTS but that was not the major trouble with the person. Three of the cases (2 on auditing and 1 on study) were out-ethics, R/Sing, Exp Dn cases who were trying to use PTS as the reason for their behavior. Thus handling their PTSness would not resolve anything. The most interesting case here was the study one who realized that he was not PTS and that that had been a wrong indication and that what was really wrong with him was that he had bad intentions and was committing overtacts. One of the audited cases had a similar realization but has not done as well on post and did get very sick 2 months or so later. Of the other 3 pilot cases in this first batch one could only come up with in-the-org terminals so is another Exp Dn case and the other 2 assigned to study were severely bugged students so never got off the ground (one has now finished the course 4 months later). So that's what happened to the original pilot."

The second pilot was then ordered to determine the original possibility, that people could study their way out of being PTS.

## SECOND PILOT

Three were put onto the PTS/SP Checksheet to study and three were handled by internees who had done the PTS/SP Checksheet themselves. The cases handled by auditing/interview steps completed their handlings within 10 hours. The study cases averaged 4-6 weeks of part-time study. Two studiers from the original pilot also completed the course. All were then watched for bad originations to the Examiner, medical reports, ethics trouble or trouble on post. In all cases, including those not yet complete on study, none of these indicators showed up. One case originated case troubles but this turned out to be one of the "Exp Dn" cases not PTSness.

On the study pilot the daily reports and success stories on completion uniformly mention more certainty, more stability and being more at cause with the data. Of particular interest is that three of the participants "cogged" they were not actually PTS (yet evidence of real PTS sits had gotten them on the project) but while they were studying they would align past PTS handlings they didn't fully understand at the time, spot why past PTS terminals were correct or incorrect, spot terminals who gave them a hard time in the past and see why certain people behaved the way they did. In short it appears the studiers were blowing charge on their past PTS handlings and on terminals in their life almost like an auditing session and while they were saying *not* PTS, *no longer* PTS (now that they had the data) is probably closer to the truth. All are reported to be doing well on post with no illness, roller-coaster or ethics trouble.

The PTS handlers (who had done the PTS/SP pack) were of particular use where the person had a study bug that needed handling before study could be done and assisting in working out the handlings for PTS sits that were uncovered. Also S&Ds and 10 Aug HCOB handlings and PTS interviews are *not* Solo actions. And it takes hours, not intensives to handle.

## FALSE PTS

As noted from the first pilot false PTSness must be watched for as unhattedness, ignorance of Scientology basics for handling life, past bad auditing uncorrected as well as unhandled bad intentions and personal out-ethics can be mistaken for PTSness and won't resolve as PTSness. This should be suspected when your "PTSES" start going above 20% of staff and public.

## SUMMARY

We have had the tech of PTSness for years, but it wasn't being fully used and then got mixed in with Exp Dn. PTSness can be handled routinely when the tech is fully known and applied. A PTS person can be brought to cause over his situation through study of the PTS tech. This is vitally important for staff. We can handle and the person himself can handle.

There is no substitute for understanding.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

As assisted by CS-5

LRH:JE:nt



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 20 OCTOBER 1976R  
REVISED 29 JUNE 1977

Remimeo  
SSO  
DPE  
Ethics Officers  
PTS/SP Checksheet

## PTS DATA

Based on a recent pilot it has become quite obvious that a full and complete PTS handling would consist of:

- A. PTSness handled terminatedly by interview or auditing by a person trained on BPL 31 May 71RF.
- B. Complete study and pass on the PTS/SP Checksheet, BPL 31 May 71RF Re-Revised 4 Mar 77.

The correctly located suppressive, who is then handled based on a thorough understanding of the mechanics of PTS/SP phenomena form the simplicity that is PTS tech. The tech of locating the suppressive source is also fully covered in the PTS/SP Checksheet and is a vital prerequisite for PTS handlers.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

As assisted by CS-5

Revision assisted by  
Anna Nordlof  
Int Cross Check Br Dir Int HQ

LRH:IE:AN:nt.lf



# Suppressives and GAEs

A lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard  
on the 2 August 1966

Thank you.

Thank you.

Thank you!

Well, I didn't know what to talk to you about today.

What's the date?

*Mary Sue: August the 2nd, AD 16.*

Well, Suzie knows it but the rest of you don't seem to know the date. [laughter]

What's the date?

*Audience: 2nd of August 1966, AD 16.*

That's correct! 2 August, AD 16.

Now, we have lots of subjects we can always talk about. We have lots of tapes on them. But we obviously never have enough. For some peculiar reason – for some peculiar reason – why, the Tech Sec and the Qual Sec and so forth have trouble with a scarcity of materials on some of these subjects. That's quite obvious, because they keep getting committed or omitted.

Now, there's two types of crime – two types of crime. There's the crimes of commission and the crimes of omission. And in modern society they pay very little attention to the crimes of omission.

The penalty is usually awarded to a person, really, for two reasons: one is for being there and the other is for communicating. Now, that is the normal penalty in this society. If you want to reduce any crime down, why, it was basically composed of those two elements: being there and communicating.

But there are crimes of not being there and not communicating, too; the society doesn't pay much attention to these. But the auditor not being there and the auditor not carrying out his communications is a crime of the highest order, because he's now barring the road.

Now, it used to be that people were – you know, they expected me to prove Dianetics and Scientology to them and, you know, sort of carry along the full responsibility for its

workability, and when it didn't work it was my fault; and I should have done it better, and so on.

Well, you probably expect changes in Level 0, I, II, III, IV and V and all that sort of thing. Now, I got an awful surprise for you, you know: I'm not changing one comma in nothin'.

Now, we've gone from a total change, you see, to a total no-change, you see, just to make a proper dichotomy. [laughter, laughs] So the materials now are just right there.

But today, today, I really speak from considerable strength, because we have such a thing as a Clear and when you clip a Clear on the ear he rings for an hour without stopping. They're that clear. [laughs] And everything that was predicted up to the level of Clear has more than been made good.

Now, what's very peculiar is the road to Clear, in its stages from wog to Grade IV – pardon me, raw meat to Grade IV (a wog is somebody who isn't even trying) – the total jump there is very fast. That is a very fast jump. And that is one of the troubles of the lower grades and the thing that you as an auditor will have the most trouble with. It happens too quick.

Now, there are some processes which are not in the lineup which would be so quick, well, I don't dare put them in the lineup, you see? The auditor is busy adjusting his meter, you know, and he doesn't notice the guy went Release. So we've omitted those.

And 2-12 is one of them. Marvelous process – the most fascinating process to overrun that anybody ever heard of. I mean, it wraps a person around more telegraph poles in less times. When I got that I said, "This is really it, man." People said, "Well, if that's really it, let's *really* audit it." [laughter, laughs]

But we have – we have today such a fast route, that it's only by additives, goofing it up and particularly the gross GAEs – the GAEs – the gross auditing errors – that can stop somebody from going.

So, in actual fact, it becomes a real crime now to audit badly, because you're barring the road for this fellow for eternity. That's quite a long time.

Now, any thetan wants out. Even the SP himself; personally, wants out, only he unfortunately is sure that you are simply trying to put him in. You see, he knows he belongs in. And he is very easily described as somebody who is totally surrounded by Martians, regardless of who you are. You see, he's stuck in an incident which has personnel that have nothing to do with present time. But all that personnel is in present time, and you are that personnel, so that of course, you have to be held down. Because if you got big and strong and powerful, you-being a Martian or being an FBI agent or being something else – would of course do him in. And so he has to be held down. So therefore, he commits almost continuous crimes in an effort to hold people down.

Now, there is a tendency on the part of Ethics that every time somebody commits a lot of GAEs, and so forth, to declare them suppressive. Now, I should make it rather clear that a suppressive is a special breed of cat. He is not hard to identify, in actual fact. He is somebody with no case gain.

Well, you say, that's very hard. You – if somebody is – does not get better with Dianetics or Scientology auditing, then you immediately say that he is no good. Well, interpret it that way if you like. It's okay with me. I'm impervious to criticism. [laughs]

But anyway, a suppressive, being a very particular breed of cat, will of course commit nothing but – and do nothing but – GAEs and cannot be pressed into auditing at all. They won't audit at all.

Now, because somebody makes a few GAEs, that doesn't make him a suppressive. Do you follow? But it does happen to be true that a suppressive would never audit, he would *only* commit GAEs. All you would have to do would be describe to him how to make the gross auditing error so as to keep it from working, and you instantly and immediately would have on your hands nothing but GAEs. Because he then would be able to mask himself by saying, "You see? I am trying my best to audit these people, and they still don't get any better. So therefore, I am right and Hubbard is wrong, and the rest of you guys are for the birds." Do you see? "And therefore it doesn't work, and there isn't any way to make them any stronger. And if we can just get rid of this, then I'm safe." That's his whole philosophy: If he can get rid of any method of making anybody stronger or more powerful, then he's got it made. So he of course rewards only down statistics. You see, only a down statistic gets rewarded. Never reward an *up* statistic. And goof up or vilify any effort to help anybody. And particularly knife with violence anything calculated to make human beings more powerful or more intelligent.

Now the main trouble with Scientology in Southern Africa is they are terrified that I may teach some day to the Africans. So that makes them very very very nervous. That's true. I have had said it to me several times. Wouldn't that be awful to have intelligent Africans? But I think at this stage of the game it might be wise not to have too many Africans OTs. [laughter, laughs]

Now, a suppressive automatically and immediately will curve, then, any betterment activity into something evil or bad. If you let him have auditing, he would then use... a pattern like the GAEs to audit. You see?

But once more I tell you that not everybody who makes GAEs is suppressive.

Now, a GAE – special breed of cat, no case gain. I mean no case gain. Now, I would coax Registrars into being alert to this, and they'd save us *fantastic* amounts of trouble. Because something on the order of two-and-a-half persons out of every hundred who walk in the streets are screaming, museum-piece, institution-bait suppressives. They're the people who put the people in institutions. People in institutions are really PTS – potential trouble sources – which are, they say, the effect of suppressives. Suppressives are very seldom picked up. They know better than to get obvious.

Now, a suppressive makes no case gain, and will sit there and brag about it, and he can't resist bragging about it. And any Registrar who had somebody come in and say, "Well, I've had three-and-a-half thousand hours of processing" or "one thousand hours of processing" or "every auditor in Seattle, and they haven't had any results on me so far, and I've still got this terrible lumbosis. And I've come here to find out if you could do anything for me. And I want a sort of a guarantee that you can."

At that moment if I were the Registrar, knowing my technology, I would say, "You bet! Now, you've had a lot of trouble with auditors. Now, before we sign you up, you had better go and see the Ethics Officer." [laughter]

Let him trot over to the Ethics Officer. And then an Ethics Officer should be very fully aware of what this is all about. He's not complaining – anybody has a right to complain about one auditor. But this guy will complain about them all, man.

He has other characteristics which are quite marked, and it's really an interesting breed of cat. If you ever got him auditing, he will only be happy or satisfied if his preclear gets worse. And he's only sad when the pc gets better. And that characteristic was what spotted us suppressives, years and years and years ago.

This is very peculiar. We'd notice here and there – once in a blue moon – we would have somebody exhibiting these characteristics. And the rest of the characteristics was that he himself got no case gain of any kind whatsoever, and he committed nothing but GAEs and could be educated into nothing else but committing errors. And we eventually traced these people as to what they did and how they behaved, and the monitoring fact was no case gain.

Now, there are a bunch of ramifications to this but these do not make a suppressive. The suppressive is in active attack on Scientology. He commits overts twenty-four hours a day. You almost never find out about them. "Every auditor in Seattle has audited me. Ahh, didn't make any case gain. Yeah, they took my money and they did me in." Ah, come off of it. You couldn't have that many Scientologists working on one person without a case gain. It's impossible. No, he would have had *some* gain at *some* time or another.

You know now that that person also privately commits overts: secret overts in the society around him. It isn't usually a nasty habit like strangling babies or something like that, but it could be. Spitting in other people's beer – you know, something. [laughter, laughs]

The person – just another characteristic, another characteristic – attacks wrong targets. If the fridge is making a great deal of noise – to you Americans, *refridge* is English for *icebox* or – *fridge*. [laughter] Anyway, if the fridge is making a lot of noise and it's annoying him, he'll go over and kick the lamp. If the car has a flat tire, he will fix the motor.

In addition to that, he will not complete a cycle of action, but if he occasionally does complete a cycle of action and finds out about it, he will then reverse it. You get the idea? He's found out that he accidentally completed a cycle of action (see, he delivered the goods or something); he will immediately reverse it.

Now, those continuous overts, wrong target, non-completions of cycles of action, are primary manifestations, and when accompanied with no case gain, you pretty well got the boy tagged.

Now, at no time during this lecture have I said that all existing governments on the planet today reward down statistics, choose wrong targets, fail to complete cycles of action, or commit continuous overts. I have not said that. And your inference on that subject is your own responsibility. [laughter]

Well now, if you, in auditing, find yourself up against somebody who can't make any case gain (and you are doing your best), now, don't be a fool as an auditor. You take this thing on an ethics basis. Tech is out, because it isn't working. So your other tool that comes before tech is ethics.

Now, you as an auditor can actually be an Ethics Officer – which I think is quite interesting, but you have to be every now and then – and you should know some of the technology of ethics. It isn't just routing somebody to the Ethics Officer. You yourself; every now and then, are going to find yourself sitting there as a cop. Well, much more superior to a cop – an Ethics Officer.

You're going to have to know how to locate overts, how to locate overts that are so unreal they don't even show on a normal meter. You're going to have to be able to locate all kinds of things, on a meter, or in life, concerning your pc.

Now, where you run up against a total blank, you obviously can't get tech in, huh? You see? I mean, no gain, no gain, so therefore your other weapon is ethics. And that becomes [comes] before tech.

Now, what's the matter with the planet at this particular time is ethics is out. And that is proven by the fact that you are having a hard time getting tech in. With the technology which you know at this particular moment and the results which you are delivering even at lower levels, you have a total monopoly of all mental activities, all religious activities and all social activities on this planet. That is what you are entitled to at this moment. Do you have them? Well, therefore, tech is out. Obvious.

So, the only thing that puts tech out, is if ethics is out. The only thing that can get tech in is ethics.

Now, ethics is based on the mechanics of the SP – the suppressive person – the mechanics of the SP. Now, if you were to audit one of these heads of governments who's always choosing wrong targets and not completing cycles of action and committing these little overts – like brush wars or something – if you were to put him in the auditing chair, you would find that he would not respond to processing. No matter what you called it, no matter what reason you had to do it, nothing, he wouldn't respond to processing. He's a suppressive!

Now, he isn't going to do what you say as an auditor, because you of course are a Martian like everybody else. You're his favorite – you're his favorite bugbear, a representative of; sitting there. You're not trying to help him; you're trying to trick him. You're trying to trick him into letting down his protective mechanisms long enough so that you can stab him in the back! That's his whole opinion of life. And that is what you would find in the driver's seat. That is what you would find.

Now, as long as that sort of bloke is in the driver's seat – now, nothing in this lecture invites anyone to war, civil commotion or rebellion, assassination or other political activities. But if you were to get ethics in, you would just have to get ethics in. Now, ethics isn't gotten in on a wide police-state basis. It's gotten in on a very narrow basis. It's just a very occasional individual here and there who is in power.

Now, the other part of the ethics picture is called a PTS, who is a potential trouble source. And if you don't think that a potential trouble source doesn't cause trouble, you should look along the line, because the trouble is great, numerous, and so on. Causes much more *apparent* trouble than the SP. So, you very often think that you are looking at an SP who is simply causing trouble, to find yourself looking in actual fact at a potential trouble source.

Now, the person is a potential trouble source because he's connected to the SP. He has not handled or disconnected from the SP, and as long as he does not either handle or disconnect, he will continue to be a potential trouble source, no matter *how* thoroughly he explains it otherwise.

Now, a potential trouble source is interesting to us, as far as technology is concerned, in that he rolly coasters. Now, a roller coaster is something they have on Coney Island and other places, and down in Long Beach they used to have one called the Rabbit Eight, and so on. It's these little railways that go up in the sky and have terrific dips, in amusement parks, you see? And the little cars go up and the little cars go down, and that's a rolly coaster. And the pc who goes up and the pc who goes down is *roller-coastering*.

And please don't think he's doing anything else. He hasn't done anything else at all but rolly coaster when he comes back in after the session and says, "I felt fine yesterday afternoon, but this morning I have a terrible stomachache." He's rolly coastered.

Now, during that period of time when that pc was out of sight, an SP was either directly contacted or restimulated. Now, the person didn't have to see the SP but only had to see something that reminded him of the SP. SP is a postman; he sees a letter box. That's enough. He goes PTS – potential trouble source – so he rolly coasters.

Now, this person is going to *endlessly* cause you, as an auditor, trouble. You're going to get them up three inches in the session and they will fall back four in life. And it is terrible to audit them. We're not being extreme. Actually, we're auditing over the dead body of some SP valence or person. *We're auditing across something which is going to kill this fellow if he gets any better!*

If, for instance, your pc – who is PTS – were to demonstrate an intelligence graph which went from 90 to 131, there's every possibility that he'd wake up the next morning very dead from arsenic. I mean, you're actually putting his life at risk. That's why you mustn't audit them, not because they're trouble to you. You're going to kill them. They're going to get sicker and sicker. More and more extraordinary effort is going to be applied to making this person ill. Sad but true.

Now, therefore, you are very interested in this thing called a potential trouble source, because a potential trouble source will give you trouble, will rolly coaster, won't get better, and it's a terrible liability to audit them – a liability to yourself personally, and a liability to them. If all of a sudden they made a sweeping gain, they're liable to be met with a .45-caliber pistol. I'm not joking.

Now, as fast as auditing is today, it really isn't fast enough to make the total grade against the SP, because there's that better part of a year to Clear.

Now, you could make the lower grades. You got the person for a week. You can make all the lower grades in a week, see?<sup>3</sup> You work real hard, and you do a real good job, and the person is responding okay, and they're out of a restimulative environment. And that's why you see so many Grade Vs and VI cave in. You're not making it fast enough to keep them away from the suppressive environment.

So they get up to V and they're going to have a long time to go before they're VI, and *whewww!* So you see Vs collapse. Do you see? They're PTS. And that was because an undetected suppressive is in this person's environment, and the person is moved out of his common environment, and you audited this person, and in the process of auditing this person you got them – *whsstt* – Grade IV Release! Great day! Fine!

Oh yes, they're not going to have this much trouble. Yes, during that period of release, they might even get wise to their environment. All kinds of things might be okay, but they walk out of that – and remember this person is only a Release. This person is still very mortal. Terrific shape, better than any activity was ever – actually Grade 0 is better than any activity in the past ever got to. They can still be hit head-on by the truck, and don't think they aren't if they have a real, live SP in their vicinity. Boy, that guy gets right into the General Sherman tank and throws all con... all fuel on the fire – *bam!*

And so you get more Grade V trouble – see, Grade IV, they went away, got restimulated. Now you come back; they're all set. Now you've got to rehabilitate them and so forth, and it takes a while to get through Grade V, and you start to run into your trouble if there's an SP in this person's vicinity.

Grade VI, you'll run into more trouble. And possibly anybody who's lagging on the Clearing Course is simply very PTS and so forth. But actually, the Clearing Course, if a person is – follows procedure and does grit his teeth and try to handle or disconnect his environment, he *can* make it through. I have; I'm making it through right – very nicely.

Well, I'm connected with some SPs known as governments and so on. They have long since made up their minds that we should be shot and pilloried and that sort of thing. I'm just – see, wrong target. So I'm just hoping that they will get very mad at somebody else.

But the point I'm making is that it's at about Grade VI which is the make-break point. You could somehow or other start persevering through, if you were a very superior thetan, at about Grade VI. You know, "So there's SPs; so I'm PTS – *rrrr, rrrr; rrrr; rrrr*. I'll make it somehow!" But I don't think it would be possible at Grade V.

Now, the answer to that is what we call an S&D, Search and Discovery. And when you're running an S&D, you're doing an ethics job. And you know assessment isn't auditing, and an S&D is an assessment.

This fellow who says – this fellow who says, "He doesn't do assessments well because he has GAEs during assessment and so forth." How could you have a GAE during an assessment? It's a gross *auditing* error. You can't have GAEs during assessment, unless you were

---

3 Editor's note: At that time, each Grade was only run to one F/N. This was considered to be the full EP and the achievement of the Grade Release.

auditing, which is against the law! You see, assessing comes much closer to being an ethics action than a technical action, because it's finding the suppressives, finding the PTS; it's patching up the ARC breaks caused by life and the environment. You see? Actually, those people have impinged on the individual.

So therefore, the auditor had better realize that these techniques – there are some techniques, such as the Search and Discovery (S&D) – Search and Discovery for the suppressive and ARC break are not auditing actions at all but ethics actions. So therefore, you have to be a bit of an Ethics Officer, don't you?

Well, let's continue it out just a little bit further. And let's let you recognize when you are not getting any case gains while doing your best, and don't keep cutting your throat. Start taking an ethics action.

Now, the ethics action that'd be taken against a potential trouble source or a PTS – somebody connected with a suppressive – the ethics action that can be taken with regard to that person is to do a Search and Discovery. You sometimes will have trouble with your Search and Discovery because you haven't handled the ARC break before you did it. You say the guy looks like he has a suppressive around. Well, suppressives also ARC break people. And you mustn't even do an assessment on an ARC broken person; you must get the ARC break *first*.

Anybody who looks a little bit sad has had an ARC break for a long time. He's going into the sad effect.

Now, where your auditing will break down in the lower grades is on a rock known as the SP. And what can you do about him? He's got no case gain. He has no potential of case gain. You are sitting there, a Martian. You audit him. He tells you that you have made his finger better. He runs immediately next door and says that you're a gyp and a fraud and ought to be killed! He spreads wild tales about you around the neighborhood. He's perfectly nice to your face, chops you up behind your back. Do you get the idea? That is not a characteristic of an SP. It's because you've tried to help him that has made him mad at you. Other people also talk behind other people's back, because we're not all brave.

But, what can *you* do for this fellow? What can you do for this fellow?

Well, now, the only known action – and there is one – that can be taken with an SP is the last Power Process. And that will handle an SP if you can get him to sit still and answer the auditing questions. But you mustn't run it until some other processes have been seen to fail. Do you follow?

Now, where can you get that done? Well, you can get that done in an organization which is qualified to run Power Processing; and where, I trust, they have an auditor who can do it very well; and where, I also trust, they have a Registrar who, as soon as the person sits down and says, "Everybody in Seattle has audited me, and they've gotten no results at all," will promptly call for the Ethics Officer and chuck the fellow out onto the street.

Well, you say, "That's – hey, wait a minute. You just said – you just said that this Power Process would handle the guy, and you're saying that he really couldn't get in to regis-

ter." Well, until such time as you run the mental hospitals, throw him out in the street, because he's the maddest hatter of them all. He's the real psycho.

You actually have to put him in something like a padded cell. You'd say, "Well, you answer the next auditing command and you can have your dinner." Three days later, you give him his dinner. [laughter]

But you're not equipped to handle this guy. But I'm saying that a person who gets no case gain could, in a well-handled HGC, whose auditors know their business on Power Processing, could in actual fact be audited up the line and out and squared around.

Now, when you've audited them on that, remember, you haven't made a Grade V Release. This condition, by the way, is often mistaken. You audit Grade V processes, but the person hasn't been bridged up to those processes; and when you've audited the Grade V processes, you've got somebody who is prepared to do a lower-grade release. You haven't got a Grade V Release; you've got somebody who can now be audited to Grade 0.

So therefore, don't be so surprised sometime when you run into somebody who has been audited on Grade V processes and who doesn't seem to be able to talk. Do you see? Do you see that? Power Processes are circular.

But until such time as you've got a very legal control of your environment, and until such time as you've got available padded cells and you can handle everything that goes wrong, and so forth, you'd be terribly wise to have a Registrar who, the second somebody says, "Well, I've been out in California, and I've been audited by everybody in California, and the organization out there charged me eighteen thousand dollars and I got no place, and I've never had any case gains, and that sort of thing" – If you had a smart Registrar, the smart Registrar would instantly say, "Well, you just go over and tell Ethics about it, because I'm very sure they would like to hear all these complaints about these auditors."

And then if you've got a clever Ethics Officer, the Ethics Officer listens to all this and sorts it out, and finds out whether or not this is an actual complaint, if there aren't just one or two auditors that made a goof; or whether this guy really hasn't been – has been audited well and didn't make any case gains. That's what the Ethics Officer has got to decide. And if the Ethics Officer decides that this is an SP, you're taking your life in your hands to put that person into the HGC.

But now, you say, "Well, that's a pretty cruel line to take, and we are very helpful persons."

Well, someday, when you haven't anything better to do, go down in the jungle and find a wounded water buffalo who is stuck in a hole, and go over barehandedly to help him out. And if you go through that elementary exercise, you will, I think, understand what I am talking about. Because that's what's going to happen: You're going to get gored.

Now, these people can be broken up pretty quickly. The only mistake they ever make in an HGC is running the preliminary Power Processes. You don't do this; just saw right in – *blambo!* 39:30

Now, all of this preamble is to give you a taste of what ethics is all about. Ethics is not our effort to make ourselves right and the rest of the world wrong. That is not that activity. It's not our service facsimile. It's how we're getting – it's how we're getting in tech.

Now we do, organizationally, we have a tendency to be snappy and choppy with ethics and do this and that, but the reason for that is, is we're slightly introverted because we're a bit PTS against the environment around us. We cannot depend on the governments or societies in which we exist to have any caliber or quality of justice or anything like that. On the one hand the Ethics Officer is trying to protect the organization from the consequences of SPs and PTSes, and on the other hand is trying also to bring about the justice which we so liberally pay for with income tax and nobody gives us.

There isn't any legal protection out there. If it's a jungle, it's because ethics are out, not because man is bad.

It might interest you how an SP comes about:

He's already got enough overts to deserve more motivators than you can shake a stick at, see? He has done something to dish one and all in. He's been a bad boy.

Now, the reason he got to be a bad boy was by switching valences. He had a bad boy over there, and he then in some peculiar way got into that bad boy's valence. Now, he knows what he is, he's a bad boy. See? Man is basically good, but he mocks up evil valences and then gets into them. You see, he says, "The other fellow is bad. The other fellow is bad. The other fellow is bad," see? And eventually he's got this pasted up other fellow, and one day he becomes the other fellow, see, in a valence shift or a personality – whole complete package of personality; and there he is. And so he's now an evil fellow. He knows how he's supposed to act: He's supposed to act like the other fellow. That's the switcheroo. That's how evil comes into being.

The religionists have been very – having a hard time trying to solve what evil was, and that is what evil is: It's the declaration or postulate that evil can exist. In the absence of postulates and the declaration of such, man is good. Isn't that interesting?

When you take all of the furniture polish off; and all the cast iron and old garbage and so forth, out, you find a good person. That's very lucky, because we're making very powerful persons, and it's very fortunate that they're good persons. Quite interesting as a mechanism. It would not be safe to embark upon such an activity as Scientology at all, you'd wreck the whole universe, if that truth wasn't a truth – and it is a truth.

It is the false, mocked-up valence which is the evil valence. Do you follow?

All right. Well, this fellow has been assigning great evilness to another personality or type of personality. And then one day he got into it. And then when he was in this basically evil personality, he started doing other people in. And then other people got very tired of him, or something of the sort, and he got himself into an incident, after which time never advanced.

Now, this is not the type of incident of which the R6 bank is composed. This is another type of incident. This is a battle incident or some kind of an incident. He is being at-

tacked. He's being actively attacked by other beings, and he is stuck on the track. Now, that portion of the time track, or that point in time, is more real than present time.

Now, every once in a while you will be sliding around in Dianetic auditing and once in a blue moon you will suddenly have the incident – well, you – all the time running one, with just your interest on it, the incident is more real than the environment in which you are, and so on. But you once in a while will run into an incident which is *far, far, far*, more real than *any* reality you ever experienced! *Thuhh!* There it is, boy!

Now, anybody's got a few of these. He isn't permanently stuck in them. I remember the first time it ever happened to me, there was a line of redcoats, and the guns had never gone off. It was a very light little incident and it went flick and that was the end of that. But just for that instant, that line of redcoats was about the realest line of people I ever saw in my life. There they were, you see, all ready for volley fire with their flintlocks, you know? It was an action back in the days, you know, when you tipped your hat and you said, "Your first shot, gentlemen." [laughter]

And for some reason or other, due to various complications, why, the volley had never arrived. In fact the flintlock hammers were just about halfway down on the priming pan. You know? There they were. They had to go the rest of that way and the guns had to fire. And – that's many, many years ago. And I said, "That's an interesting mechanism," because I just saw it as a mechanism, since it wasn't very affecting to me; I wasn't worried about redcoats.

And I looked afterwards; I looked for it to see if I couldn't find – find it. Many, many, many years later I found it, man. I found it, man. And it is – you see, anybody has got one or two or three of these things, you see, when they start in from scratch, you know, before they get up in the Grades. They'll have a point there, and they're flicking around and all of a sudden, why, there is a fighter plane, or there is the ground, you know, or there they are on the edge of the cliff and the arrow hasn't quite arrived. And for just a split instant as you see the thing, boy, that arrow is really real, man! That has made an impression. Well, to that degree time has been stopped, and when you run back into it, you'll find a stopped picture. But remember, you and I are running back into it.

Do you get the difference?

The SP never went on from there. He never advanced from that moment! He's there in totally absorbed attention! And these walls, to the SP, are phony and thin. He knows where the real walls are. The real walls are in that incident, and that incident is more real to him than present time with every tick of the clock. And that incident contains something. It contains other personalities, other vengeance. But you, moving around outside of this person – you, moving around outside of this person – are part of the *dramatis personae* of his incident, and you are a threat, because all life is this incident.

There he is, driven against the cliff and being butchered by man-monsters. He's next in the line of captives. And in the trillions which followed, he's always been next in the line of captives. This person is living a nightmare that was once very real. (It isn't, as the psychiatrist said, something which didn't exist. I would never take the opinion of a suppressive person on what the track was all about anyway.) [laughter] He's always been the next one to be killed, see?

Maybe the other personnel out there are Roman legionnaires or some past-track Rome. But whatever it is, his bank got stacked-stacked-stacked-stacked-stacked till he no longer had fluidity, he no longer could move on this track, and then he got the business! Well, you could only get the business that solidly if you yourself had enough overts to stretch from here to Halifax and back.

But there he is, and he's never been anyplace else – not from that moment on. You are the Roman legionnaire; you are part of the game.

Now, that is all there is to an SP. There aren't warped brain cells, or numerous other things. There aren't thousands of answers to this. It is that answer.

And you, in practicing Dianetic auditing, run into a mental image picture. All right. Now, a person has a lot of these mental image pictures. Now, don't blame me if a person's mental image pictures, perfectly accurate, go back further than man likes to think he has lived. Don't blame me for it, because anybody you audit in Dianetics will run into just that! You audit them long enough and there they go. Man is an immortal being, and he did not get born in sin at the beginning of this lifetime.

By the way, if you want to argue with that, get somebody to run you on some engrams so you fall through and see for yourself! Anyway...

The point is here that this is something that has happened to the fellow; like he's being beat up by a bunch of cops, and there he is, and he has never been out of being beat up by a bunch of cops. He's just stuck in time being beat up by the cops, you see? Now, that makes everyone he runs into a cop – male or female, peculiarly enough. His power of differentiation is zero. Everything equals everything in the incident. And that is the boy. And it makes him choose wrong targets. He can't complete a cycle of action because he's stuck in time. It makes him perform little overts because he's defending himself continuously – defending himself against the police.

Now, this is the character; this is the character called an SP, and he isn't anyplace else. Now, of course, with Power Processing, he could be blasted loose. And being blasted loose, he is able to function again on the track, and now he will respond to processing. It's as simple as that.

But how can a cop or a Roman legionnaire audit him? Do you get the difference? That's the only problem to be solved in handling an SP. It isn't an auditing problem; it's a problem of the identity of the auditor

Now, you would just be amazed how many cases resolve in an institution. I know, I've put my collar on backwards many a day and audited psychos in institutions, in many a yester-year. It's amazing, absolutely amazing. Some of the results I've had with this make me sometimes a little bit ashamed of myself that I don't push in that direction harder. Because institutions contain very few SPs. They're PTSes. The SPs are those in charge.

I've seen a girl actually getting better and had a psychiatrist run up to me absolutely screaming, "You must get the family – you must get the family of this person, to consent to electric shock!"

"What's the matter?"

"Well, we've got to electric shock her!"

"What's the matter with the patient?"

"We've got to do it!"

"No, no, no – is the patient getting worse?"

"You don't understand! We'll throw her out of here!"

Talking to a nut. Complete nut. Person was getting better, so they had to electric shock them.

The same person told me that I didn't keep good records. I should keep records that had the time and place connected with every single action as the predominant action, and so forth, and they kept good records.

And I said – it's sort of like shooting at tame dogs to talk to these fellows. I mean, it's cruel. They miss all the obvious things like, you know, "Yes, but what do you learn from your records?" You know? Question like that never occurs to them, see? "What do you learn from your records?"

"Well, what do we learn?" Then complete non sequitur – you know, ding-ding-ding, here comes the wagon. [laughter] Complete non sequitur: "Oh, we learned if we didn't electric shock them, they would get out of here six weeks earlier in each case." Yet he has to electric shock everybody, see? He even knows it doesn't help anybody. He's gotten that brave. See, he's gotten that blatant.

Now, my only quarrel with psychiatry, in actual sober fact, is that it's not cleaned up its profession. It's got dirty hands. It's not cleaned up its profession, because if it cleaned up its profession, it would be able to view the fact that some of the things they do get results, and 90 percent of the things they do don't. And that the cruelty and brutality which they levy against the insane, or wage against the insane, is not getting results. If they knew about the mind, they would know how to handle their own people.

So my only quarrel with psychiatry is their ethics are out. Do you follow me?

Now, Frieda Fromm-Reichmann – this is not my own opinion. Frieda Fromm-Reichmann wrote a book on it. Someday you'll want to look it up. It's Frieda Fromm-Reichmann, and she was one of the greatest of great – I think she's still alive – and she wrote a book in which she begged throughout the book for the psychiatrist and his profession to get in his own ethics on his own practitioners. That book is available – Library of Congress and other places. And she is probably the dean of all American psychiatry. She was making a feeble effort to get it in. But that's the trouble.

Now, my only complaint against government is, being bodies charged with the responsibility of getting in law and order, never having isolated what puts lawlessness and disorder into the society, never having made any effort to understand it, but just shoots everybody. So my quarrel with them is, their ethics are out.

My only quarrel with politics and political theories and political practices just sum up to the same thing: They do not produce an orderly society. Any system of politics which lets a madman rise to supreme power is an evil system.

Now, you as an auditor are only able to push ethics in or blame SP or PTS for your lack of results if you yourself have clean hands with your GAEs. If you yourself do not commit gross auditing errors, then you are perfectly at liberty to handle ethics. But as long as you yourself have any question, then you will never quite know. And this is the difference between a confident auditor and an unconfident auditor, and is the primary difference.

"Is it my auditing or is it the case I'm auditing?" That is the unresolved question. "Is it *my* auditing which is getting no gain, or is it not possible to get gain on this case?"

And that is why I started this lecture by telling you I don't have to make any apologies now. We're taking them all the way to Clear, and there's nothing going to be changed of any kind whatsoever in the lower-grade processing, because the only time we're flumping and flubbing is when ethics go out or technology is not followed. It is omitted or added to. You omit pieces of technology or you add to technology, it will cease to work.

Right now they've got one going; they've got one going now which I'm sure is ended as of this afternoon. They've had one going about "below 2." "If the tone arm goes below 2, then horrible things will happen, because a person who is a low-tone-arm case will never experience any gain except on Power Processing." That is the wildest misinterpretation. I just wish they'd just forget about it. I don't care anything about it anymore. I don't want to hear about it anymore. If the tone arm goes to 1.0 and stays there, I don't want – even want an Instructor to say "That is a peculiar and particular and interesting phenomenon." I don't want nobody to do nothing, because apparently this is a very dangerous cat, and it will suddenly run and get all over and scratch everybody up like mad.

You see, in actual fact, this tone arm quite often, in processing, will go through 7. There's 7. And you go down there, and you have to come back up over here. Or it goes all the way up through here and comes back on the dial there. And this quite commonly happens in Power Processing. And it'll happen in lower-grade processing, too. This guy's bank going up-up, up-up-up-up-up, up-up-up-up-up-up-up, and all of a sudden you can't go any up-up-up. Well, don't – don't be – don't despair, because you'll catch it over here. You see, bring it back over here to below 1. And all of a sudden you'll find it's going up-up-up, up-up-up. Cases are circular.

And the actual remark on this is that a *chronic* low-TA case – that is a symptom of rather chronic apathy; he's not a dangerous case; he's simply apathetic – a chronic low-tone-arm case, which is somebody who's chronically below 2, won't really get over it until he's on Power Processing. And that is the total substance of the remark that started this whole thing.

So, if I had a very low tone arm case, and I wanted to be very kind, I would run the Power Process on him which would bring his tone arm up, and then start him into auditing. You see, if I wanted to be very kind. But if I had any doubts about its success or anything like that, I would just audit him any old way. He's going to get some gains in an apathetic way. [laughter, laughs]

That's an additive; that's an additive. People are trying to get interpretations about "below 2" – "If the tone arm goes below 2 you do this or you do that, or if the tone arm goes below 2, you can't get on the Clearing Course," or... You know, it's wild. So a tone arm goes below 2; it also goes to 7. I've seen an auditor practically faint when he's seen a tone arm... [laughter] How the hell do you audit anybody at 7? You can't get the meter to go through!

Actually, there is a way to do it. You throw your trim knob. You just flip your trim knob, and you'll come back on the dial. Of course, it's a totally inaccurate read, but you can make the meter go through 7 without catching it over – up to 6 and then over to 1 and up. Throw your trim knob, and you'll throw him back on the dial. Then don't forget to compensate your meter before you say the next guy is released. [laughs]

So there's an additive. There's an additive. I don't know how many people this additive has shot down in flames up to this moment. It's several, several. You know? There are some fat folders around, and so forth. And fortunately it isn't I finding all this, and so forth. It is I that found this "below 2" thing, but it was already been stated to me by somebody in the Qual Division that – this... There was a common denominator in those folders: they each one had a "below 2" trouble. And so I'm getting a shakedown of the relationship of a fat folder to a "below 2" phenomena, just as a peculiarity that's going on at the moment. That's an additive. That's an additive.

Now, you get an omission, and an omission can be very, very deadly. We cease to have sessions that start and end. You know? We don't start any sessions anymore and we don't end any sessions anymore; we just sit down and start auditing, you know? Pretty wild, because it never completes a cycle of action for the pc and has a tendency to make him obsessively go on. That's how bad an omission could be.

But your little omissions can cause you equal amounts of trouble – your little omissions, you see?

How about the omission of acknowledging? Supposing you never acknowledged anything; you just omitted that totally: You'd destroy the entire technology. Do you see? It could be very serious.

But your problem, to get right back down to it again, is how can you be sure – you see, it used to be that we had three problems here: Ron could be wrong, you see; and it could be the auditor; and it could be the pc, see? Well now, because of all the Clears, we have to drop the first one out. [laughter] Now – so therefore, it leaves an auditor with this problem. And I don't give it to you as a light thing; I give it to you as something that's probably worried quite a few of you from time to time: Is it the way you're applying the technology? Or is it the pc you are auditing?

And I have seen that auditors – bless them – always err on the side that it's their own auditing. I have tried to reason with an auditor who was trying *desperately* to audit a PTS, who just kept on blaming her own auditing – couldn't even hear the technology of PTS because she was blaming her own auditing so hard. Yet her own auditing wasn't that bad; she was auditing a PTS. And it was very, very hard to convince this auditor that a PTS was the only reason somebody roller-coastered unless the auditing was very omitted or committed along various lines. Do you follow? Very hard to convince this person there could be some-

thing wrong with the pc, because this person was too fixated on the idea that she really didn't know quite how to audit. Do you see that?

Now, therefore, you've got to be satisfied that you don't commit GAEs, and after that your judgment on an ethics problem will be sound. But until you are able to know completely, yourself, that your auditing is smooth and your technology is correct, you will not, with any certainty, be able to spot an ethics problem! Makes sense, huh?

*Audience voices: Yes.*

Now, that's the primary bugaboo of the auditor. You're trying to help people. Now, is it something wrong with the person you're trying to help, or is it something wrong with the way you're helping?

And there's a very easy way to decide this – very, very, very easy way to decide this – and that is to know what are the five GAEs.

Now, we say GAE, and we mean gross auditing error. There it is: a gross auditing error. And there are only five of them! You can't commit 105 because there aren't 105. You can only commit five. That's a good thing, because they can be spotted and isolated. And they are very, very elementary. Anybody could spot them.

You could make a tape of yourself auditing some pc and then listen to the tape back and knew – know whether or not you committed GAEs. It's that elementary. First GAE, particularly, would surrender to that test: auditing cycle out.

Do you give an auditing command, have the pc answer it, and then acknowledge it? Elementary. Do you do that? Or do you give an auditing command, not let the pc answer it, and acknowledge? Do you let the pc talk for half an hour before you finally wake up that you should acknowledge? Do you see? Or do you have this smoothly down? Can you do this thing?

Boy, it's an elementary thing there, isn't it? Well, not to do it is a gross auditing error. It's one of the reasons Scientology works, is because of its communication drill. Communication is a basic – so fundamental that when you use the communication cycle of action known in Scientology (man didn't know it) – you can just use a cycle of action and cure things up. It's the most remarkable thing.

You can sit down with the training drills, which just handle a cycle of action, and with a bunch of people that have just dropped into the org, or something of the sort, and two or three of them will get rid of some somatics and upsets and feel better. What's doing that? It's just the exercise of the drill itself.

So, woven through auditing are all kinds of little side benefits. But this is not a little side benefit. When you omit this one, man, you've had it! So, do you handle your comm cycle well? Or do you give an auditing command, not let it be answered or make it be answered *exhaustively* before you finally acknowledge.

Or do you hit it on the button? Do you err over or under? Because if you err in not acknowledging, your pc will go into an obsessive outflow.

Wherever I see a PC who's just talking on and on and on and on and on and on and on, the auditor giving no commands – only four commands issued in a two-and-a-half-hour session, see. When I see this I know what's wrong:

It's a GAE; the auditing cycle is out. The pc is trying to find that last step. Can't find that last step, and he's gotten so accustomed to this.

Now, some pcs are this way obsessively in life, but you, oddly enough, by a precise auditing cycle, snap them right out of it. A proper auditing command cycle, and so forth, will straighten them right up.

Now, you'll notice people out in the society – you should listen to their auditing cycles just for a gag. Does your auditing cycle sound anything like that? You should listen to a few of them, you know? Lean up against a lamppost with your back to the two that are discussing it all, or sit in the lobby of a hotel for a while. Just listen to those auditing cycles. (They're not auditing cycles; listen to comm cycles.) You'll be *fascinated*, man. You've got a treat in store if you've never done this. You say, how could anybody call *that* communication?

Now, that's the first GAE.

Now, the second GAE is: the repetitive auditing cycle is out. Now, the repetitive auditing cycle is quite something else than the auditing cycle. It's being able to do it again. [laughter] And people who aren't able to do it again cannot give a repetitive auditing command on and on. They can't do it. So, they do what we call Q and A; they change. The PC makes a remark so they change the process. Every time the PC gives something offbeat, then the auditor changes the process. Do you see? They Q-and-A.

Here's an example of Q and A: or – well, just the inability to "Do birds fly? Do birds fly? Do birds fly?" and acknowledge it each time and so forth. It's "Do birds fly? Are the jolly little sparrows a-wing? Are birds flopping about? Are birds? Have you ever been an ornithologist? Do you swim?" Where'd he go? See?

The Q and A is simply the – the shift with the PC. It leaves the PC in control of the session. The auditor starts out, "Do birds fly?"

And the pc says, "Yes. Yes, I had a canary once."

And the auditor says, "Where was that?"

Pc says, "In Des Moines."

And the auditor says, "Were you there when you were a child?"

And the PC says, "In se...", about... If you ever listen to this as a gag going on – I mean, it'll – really happens. And when you listen to this going on you will begin to detect a note of exasperation in the pc's voice. A bit of asperity will enter at this point. "Well, yes, I lived there, when I was four." Q-and-A, Q-and-A, Q-and-A. Drift.

You ask an auditor – an auditor who does this – you ask this auditor and you say to him, "Now, get the overt." And he comes back with the life story of the fellow's brother. Well, that'll be compounded of Q and A, but also this – this – another one: He just wouldn't do what you said, you see? He wouldn't audit it at all. He didn't even come near it.

Now, the next GAE is just bad meter reading. And you would just be amazed – you would just be amazed – until you have stood around teaching people to meter read, you'd just be amazed how, in that group, two or three of them won't even vaguely come near reading that meter.

If you ever want to find out what's wrong with some auditing session sometime, and you've got an HGC auditor, and you're D of P, or something like that, and you're tearing your hair out about this pc, remember these GAEs, man.

You get suspicious about things, like "How about the meter?" Well, the auditor has been auditing the pc with his meter uncharged. Well, that would be a understandable error. But how about the fellow auditing the pc without the meter turned on? Could happen. How about the auditor auditing the PC without the cans plugged in? Now, that's what we mean when we say GAE. And you, in trying to examine auditing, will always err in the favor of being too reasonable about the thing.

You argue and argue, and you argue and argue; you talk and talk and talk with this auditor about the PC, and then you find out that the auditor doesn't believe in meters and so doesn't use them in his session, or something like this, see? I mean it's *gross*. And that's why we have "gross," you see – it's a *gross* error. It's always something *big*, you see?

You're blowing your brains out trying to find this little thing: "Do you have the trim knob set exactly right?" and all that sort of thing. Trim knob set right? Why, the meter's been out of repair for the last two months – hasn't been functioning at all. Auditor rocks the meter to get his reads. [laughter]

Now, an old, experienced Director of Processing like Mary Sue could tell you some wild ones. She's tried to run down, and tried to run down, and – you know, the mysterious non-recovery of somebody, you see? And she's finally run it down to something like, well, they never turned on their meter. You know? I mean, it's incredible. Here she's beating her brains out trying to help the PC, you see, but – gross auditing error sitting right there.

Now, the fourth one impinges a bit on the second one. You told him to run one process and he ran something else. It goes worse than that. He's not able to read, understand and follow procedure. That's a simple test. That's a simple test. Can you read and understand an HCOB? See, that is a simple test.

You would just be surprised. When that gets to be a gross auditing error, the person didn't even read the HCOBs related to the processes they were supposed to be auditing. And to our shame it once happened here at Saint Hill. There was no checkouts required for a short period of time, many, many months ago. There were no checkouts required. Nobody in Tech or Qual is there now – not because of that totally. But before they audited the hottest processes in the world, nobody was requiring a checkout on them. Boy, that's a gross auditing error, man.

Now, one of the reasons Tech was having a hard time in 1965 in organizations is there apparently wasn't a D of P anywhere in any organization in the world outside of Saint Hill that was requiring star-rated checkouts on the lower-grade processes his auditors were supposed to be running on the pcs. *Tsk!* Interesting, huh?

Oh, I get on to these things, and I follow them up, and don't think we're all bad. But that accounted for lack of Releases. Of course they weren't making any Releases; they weren't running any of the processes that released anybody. See, that's a gross auditing error, is not being able to read and comprehend what they're supposed to do.

Or, not reading it at all! See how gross this is? You say, "You don't – you just seem to be an awful long time, Mr. Jones, on the subject of making your – that pc – you just making that PC a Grade 0. This is – seems to have been on – this is going on to the third month. Seems to be just a little bit long – long... So what's wrong? What are you doing?"

Well, actually, the way you'd find out what he's doing: Is his auditing cycle out? His repetitive auditing cycle out? Is he reading the meter badly?

And what you're liable to find is something like number four: He has never run, to date, any of the processes that make a Grade 0 Release. He's never run *any* of them. It's that – it's *that* which you normally find at the bottom of no results in auditing. Or it's an ethics problem.

And the fifth one is, unable to handle and keep a pc in-session.

Well, you'd say, well that automatically is covered in one, two, three, four. Oh, no, it is not! Who does that? Well, Ron does it, of course; he does everything else! No, that's something that you do; that is up to the auditor.

It is sometimes necessary to be quite forceful; it's sometimes necessary to be quite persuasive; it's sometimes necessary to do most extraordinary things to handle and keep a pc in-session.

For instance, you've got somebody who's very blowy. You're trying to pull some overts of one kind or another. It's – this session is going rough, man, and you finally have to back up your back to the door, turn the lock, put the key in your pocket. The guy finally gives you the overts. See?

Now, this pc doesn't seem to be running well, and you just never take out a moment to find out why or examine the pc or talk about anything or have any two-way comm. You see that the pc is disinterested; you don't make it your business to find out "Why is the pc disinterested?" Pc can't seem to answer the question, for the last four hours of auditing, doesn't seem to have had any answer to the auditing question, is sitting in the chair crying. Why, four hours ago, didn't you wonder why this pc was unhappy? Do you see?

Now, that's actually a matter of quick perception. I used to say that it used to take me about an hour – I could find from forty-five minutes to an hour and a half before the auditors in the org would notice that an ARC break was coming or a blow was going to occur. It was forty-five minutes to an hour and a half I used to do this with a squawk box, you know, patrol. We used to listen in on the sessions, and so forth. I could find it on an average of forty-five minutes to an hour and a half before the auditor noticed it. "That Pc is going to blow. That pc is ARC broken. It's coming right over the hill" – just from tone of voice.

Well, the auditor in this particular instance had the advantage of sitting across from the PC, having a meter in his hands, actually being able to observe what the PC was doing, do

you see, and didn't notice it for another forty-five minutes or an hour and a half; until it became terribly obvious.

So you want to pick up your perception. And that is a place where nearly all auditors fall down a bit. Pick up the perception of what's going on with the PC. Be a little bit interested in what's going on with the PC, and do something about it. And don't do so much that you completely destroy all effects of processing, but do enough to keep the pc in-session.

Now, what is "in-session"? Well, he's willing to sit there and answer the auditing question; he's fairly cheerful, and so on. It has some precision definitions but, crudely, a PC ought to be fairly happy about being audited, even when he is running through sadness. So that would be ability to look at the pc and see what was going on with the Pc. And that comes under the heading of willingness to confront a PC, doesn't it?

Well, those are the gross auditing errors: auditing cycle out; repetitive auditing cycle out; bad meter reading; not able to read, understand and follow procedures or bulletins or auditing directions; and five, unable to handle and keep a pc in session. And those are the five gross auditing errors.

You can verify, then, your own auditing. And if you look over the whole thing – and you look over the thing and you say to yourself; "Well, I do those things pretty well," now you know whether the pc is or is not an ethics case. Because if you do those things well, and the pc doesn't run well, that pc is an ethics case every time. Do you see?

Now, there's how you disentangle the "myskery."

The whole problem of ethics is a universal problem. It is a problem in mental troubles. Ethics would never get in on discipline alone. Never! It would only get worse.

Justice can never occur in the absence of an understanding of the human mind. Never! You get nothing but goofs.

Now, that doesn't necessarily make somebody who is an expert on the human mind, such as a Scientologist, the only person who should have anything to do with justice on the planet. Or does it? But I would not for a moment guide you over into a realm of high specialization in the field of justice, because ethics simply exists to get tech in. Once you've got tech in you no longer need justice.

We are the only road which leaves artificial measures of law and order behind us. And it's only the fact that we are handling aberration itself that makes it necessary for us to be in the zone of ethics now. The amount of ethics action necessary in actual OTs would be practically zero. Big difference.

And we notice that we're not having any trouble with Clears. I noticed earlier that the divisional statistics exactly matched the case state of each Divisional Secretary – how far he had gone – or he or she had gone, toward Clear. It was very interesting.

So therefore, the problem of justice and the problem of ethics is involved with the problem of human – human aberration. Unless you've solved the latter, the former can never be solved. Not all the gunpowder in the world could blow people into being good, because they're good naturally, and they resent gunpowder

So, there also is how you can solve the problem of whether or not you're a good auditor or not, and why you should solve the problem. And I hope this has been of some assistance to you.

Thank you.



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 1 NOVEMBER 1974RA

Revised 5 September 1978

(Revised to correct the definition of a rock slam.  
Revisions in this type style.  
Ellipsis indicates deletion.)

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

## ROCK SLAMS AND ROCK SLAMMERS

Reference: HCOB 3 September 1978 DEFINITION OF A ROCK SLAM

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

### R/Ses

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

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

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

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

## ROCK SLAMMERS

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

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

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

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

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

## CHECKLIST

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

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

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

Ref: *E-METER ESSENTIALS*; *BOOK OF E-METER DRILLS*; *THE BOOK INTRODUCING THE E-METER*;

HCOB 8 Nov 62 "SOMATICS, HOW TO TELL TERMINALS AND OPPOSITION TERMINALS" pg 2 and 4;

HCOB 6 Dec 62 "R2-10, R2-12, 3GAXX";

*BTB* 14 Jan 63 "RINGS CAUSING ROCK SLAMS";

HCOB "FALSE TA SERIES" 24 Oct 71R, 12 Nov 71RA, 15 Feb 72R, 18 Feb 72R, 21 Jan 77R, 23 Nov 73RA.

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

3. Pc is slow or no case gain. \_\_\_\_\_

- 3A. Pc is in a chronically nattery or critical state. \_\_\_\_\_

Ref: HCOB 23 Nov 62 "ROUTINE TWO-TWELVE";...

HCOB 6 Dec 62 "R2-10, R2-12, 3GAXX";

HCOB 28 Nov 70 C/S Series 22 "PSYCHOSIS";

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. The people near him get in trouble.

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

### LIST ONE R/Ser

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

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

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

### PCs WHO R/S

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

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

### SUMMARY

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

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

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

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

LRH:dr

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 10 AUGUST 1976

Remimeo  
All Sec Checkers  
All HCO Personnel  
All Meter Operators

## **R/Ses, WHAT THEY MEAN**

(Integrity Processing Checksheets)  
(PTS Processing Checksheets)  
(Expanded Dianetics Checksheets)  
(Meter Operation Checksheets)  
(Various Rundown Checksheets)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Another apparent way the R/S can get "handled" and isn't is to take the R/Ser earlier-similar on the subject of the R/S. The R/S will probably cease, go "clean." But in actual fact it is still there, hidden.
3. The third way an R/S can be falsely "handled" is to direct the person's attention to something else. If, when this is done, the exact subject of the R/S is not noted by the auditor, it will be difficult to find it again when the person goes into Expanded Dianetic auditing.
4. Yet another, and probably the last way to falsely "handle" an R/S is to abuse the person about his conduct or behavior or the R/S, or to "educate" him to do better, or to "modify" his behavior with shocks or surgery or other tortures like the psychiatrists do. In other words one can seek to suppress the R/S in numerous ways. Maybe the R/S

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:nt

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 27 OCTOBER 1964

(Re-issued on 23 June 1967)  
(Replaces HCO Pol Ltr 5 Nov 1964)

Remimeo  
Franchise  
All Students  
All staff  
Registrars' Hats  
Tech Hats  
Qual Hats  
HCO Hats

**POLICIES ON PHYSICAL HEALING, INSANITY  
AND POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES**

It has been the long standing policy of Central Organizations to handle physical illness and insanity in the following manner.

**HEALING**

Any process labelled "healing", old or new refers to healing by mental and spiritual means and should therefore be looked upon as the relief of difficulties arising from mental and spiritual causes.

The proper procedure in being requested to heal some complained of physical disability is as follows:

1. Require a physical examination from whatever practitioners of the physical healing arts may be competent and available;
2. Clearly establish that the disability does not stem from immediately physical causes;
3. If the disability is pronounced to be curable within the skill of the physical practitioner and is in actual fact a disease or illness which surrenders to contemporary physical treatment, to require the person to be so treated before Scientology processing may be undertaken;
4. If, however, the physical practitioner's recommendation includes surgery or treatment of an unproven nature or the illness or disease cannot be accurately diagnosed as a specific physical illness or disease with a known cure, the person may be accepted for processing on the reasonable assumption that no purely physical illness is proven to exist, and that it is probably mental or spiritual in origin.

## **POLICIES REGARDING THE INSANE**

With insane persons or persons with a proven record of insanity, do the following:

1. Establish to the best of your ability within reasonable administrative limits and known tests that any HGC pc accepted for processing does not have a history of deserved institutionalization in an insane asylum or similar place;
2. Process only those persons who have no such history;
3. Do not recommend any other treatment by practitioners in the field of insanity where there exists any evidence that such practitioners injure, disable or maltreat patients by violently reacting drugs, by painful shocks, surgery or other barbaric and outdated means of "mental treatment";
4. If no recommendation is possible under (3) above, recommend only rest and a change of environment, but not in a professional capacity.

## **POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES**

Policies similar to those regarding physical illness and insanity exist for types of persons who have caused us considerable trouble.

These persons can be grouped under "Potential Trouble Sources". They include:

- (a) Persons intimately connected with persons (such as marital or familial ties) of known antagonism to mental or spiritual treatment or Scientology. In practice such persons, even when they approach Scientology in a friendly fashion, have such pressure continually brought to bear upon them by persons with undue influence over them that they make very poor gains in processing and their interest is solely devoted to proving the antagonistic element wrong.

They, by experience, produce a great deal of trouble in the long run as their own condition does not improve adequately under such stresses to effectively combat the antagonism. Their present time problem cannot be reached as it is continuous, and so long as it remains so, they should not be accepted for auditing by any organization or auditor.

- (b) Criminals with proven criminal records often continue to commit so many undetected harmful acts between sessions that they do not make adequate case gains and therefore should not be accepted for processing by organizations or auditors.
- (c) Persons who have ever threatened to sue or embarrass or attack or who have publicly attacked Scientology or been a party to an attack and all their immediate families should never be accepted for processing by a Central Organization or an auditor. They have a history of only serving other ends than case gain and commonly again turn on the organization or auditor. They have already barred themselves out by their own overts against Scientology and are thereafter too difficult to help, since they cannot openly accept help from those they have tried to injure.

- (d) Responsible-for-condition cases have been traced back to other causes for their condition too often to be acceptable. By Responsible-for-condition cases is meant the person who insists a book or some auditor is "wholly responsible for the terrible condition I am in". Such cases demand unusual favours, free auditing, tremendous effort on the part of auditors. Review of these cases shows that they were in the same or worse condition long before auditing, that they are using a planned campaign to obtain auditing for nothing, that they are not as bad off as they claim, and that their antagonism extends to anyone who seeks to help them, even their own families. Establish the rights of the matter and decide accordingly.
- (e) Persons who are not being audited on their own determinism are a liability as they are forced into being processed by some other person and have no personal desire to become better. Quite on the contrary they usually want only to prove the person who wants them audited wrong and so do not get better. Until a personally determined goal to be processed occurs, the person will not benefit.
- (f) Persons who "want to be processed to see if Scientology works" as their only reason for being audited have never been known to make gains as they do not participate. News reporters fall into this category. They should not be audited.
- (g) Persons who claim that "if you help such and such a case" (at great and your expense) because somebody is rich or influential or the neighbours would be electrified should be ignored. Processing is designed for bettering individuals, not progressing by stunts or giving cases undue importance. Process only at convenience and usual arrangements. Make no extraordinary effort at the expense of other persons who do want processing for normal reasons. Not one of these arrangements has ever come off successfully as it has the unworthy goal of notoriety, not betterment.
- (h) Persons who "have an open mind" but no personal hopes or desires for auditing or knowingness should be ignored, as they really don't have an open mind at all, but a lack of ability to decide about things and are seldom found to be very responsible and waste anyone's efforts "to convince them".
- (i) Persons who do not believe anything or anyone can get better. They have a purpose for being audited entirely contrary to the auditor's and so in this conflict, do not benefit. When such persons are trained they use their training to degrade others. Thus they should not be accepted for training or auditing.
- (j) Persons attempting to sit in judgement on Scientology in hearings or attempting to investigate Scientology should be given no undue importance. One should not seek to instruct or assist them in any way. This includes judges, boards, newspaper reporters, magazine writers, etc. All efforts to be helpful or instructive have done nothing beneficial as their first idea is a firm "I don't know" and this usually ends with an equally firm "I don't know". If a person can't see for himself or judge from the obvious, then he does not have sufficient powers of observation even to sort out actual evidence. In legal matters, only take the obvious effective steps – carry on no crusades in court. In the matter of reporters, etc. it is not worth while to give them any time contrary to popular belief. They are given their story before they leave their editorial rooms and

you only strengthen what they have to say by saying anything. They are no public communication line that sways much. Policy is very definite. Ignore.

To summarize Potential Trouble Sources, the policy in general is to cut communication as the longer it is extended the more trouble they are. I know of no case where the types of persons listed above were handled by auditing or instruction. I know of many cases where they were handled by firm legal stands, by ignoring them until they changed their minds, or just turning one's back.

In applying such a policy of cut-communication one must also use judgement as there are exceptions in all things and to fail to handle a person's momentary upset in life or with us can be quite fatal. So these policies refer to non-Scientology persons in the main or persons who appear on the outer fringes and push toward us. When such a person bears any of the above designations we and the many are better off to ignore them.

Scientology works. You don't have to prove it to everyone. People don't deserve to have Scientology as a divine right, you know. They have to earn it. This has been true in every philosophy that sought to better man.

### **THE STRESS OF POLICY**

All the above "Potential Trouble Sources" are also forbidden training and when a person being trained or audited is detected to belong under the above headings (a) to (j) he or she should be advised to terminate and accept refund which must be paid at once and the full explanation should be given them at that time. Thus the few may not, in their own turmoil, impede service to and the advance of the many. And the less enturbulence you put on your lines, the better, and the more people you will eventually help.

Scientology is an applied philosophy designed and developed to make the able more able. In this sphere it is tremendously successful.

Efforts to involve philosophy with medical imperialism, psychiatric sadism, the bigoted churchman, bring about a slowing of our progress.

These people are sick spiritually because of their own continuous harmful actions against patients and the society and are beyond our normal means to help.

These policies will continue in existence until such time as those interested care to invest the time and treasure necessary to build the institutions and re-educate the professions which now practice medical and physical mental healing, and this is definitely not within our time, but would belong to some remote future when more men are sane.

However, such a programme would depend upon the continued existence of the medical imperialist and the psychiatrist and as their more reprehensible activities are rather new and very radical they may be abandoned by public and government long before Scientology could help them. This is probably the more likely occurrence as even in Russia, the Communist has now forsworn all violent treatments of the insane according to their delegates to the

London Medical Conference of this year, and Russian practitioners look with contempt and scorn upon the Western psychiatrist. The medical doctor of England, taken over by Socialism, has lost his ambition for medical imperialism and has no contest with Scientology. In the United States the American Medical Association has become locked in mortal combat with the government and probably will be socialized entirely in a few years due to fee abuses and lack of gains. The medical doctor remains strong only in more backward small nations such as Australia where world trends are late in arriving.

Even the Church in Rome is considering a surrender of principles and amalgamation with other faiths in an effort to save a dwindling religious membership.

Thus there may be no medical practitioner as we know him left in a few decades. Membership in the psychiatric profession is declining.

In the place of these institutions, if we ever get around to them, we may find ourselves dealing with completely different practices in the fields of physical healing and the treatment of the insane. All we ask of them is that they are competent in their treatments and less greedy for monopoly than their predecessors. And if this is so, then our policies will then remain fully in force, but in a spirit of co-operation, not with the desire to protect ourselves and the public from them and the products of their bungling.

*Ours* are the powerful communication lines. They are powerful because they are theta lines. Entheta (enturbulated theta) obtains all its apparent power by being parasitic on theta lines. Only when you add the power of our lines to the weakness of entheta lines can they have strength.

Example: It was the FCDC communication to its own field about that government raid that (a) cost the most in cash and (b) did the most damage. You can actually ignore an entheta line in almost all cases without the faintest consequence. It only has power when we let it have power by answering it.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:jw.cden

[See also HCO P/Ls 7 April 1965, Issue II, HEALING POLICY IN FIELD; 21 February 1969, CANCELLATION OF "CORRECTIONS TO HCO POLICY LETTERS – POL LTR OF NOVEMBER 5, 1964; 13 March 1969, ADDITION TO HCO POL LTR OF 23 JUNE 1967 "POLICIES ON PHYSICAL HEALING, INSANITY AND POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES – POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES (b); and 7 May 1969, POLICIES ON "SOURCES OF TROUBLE".]



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 APRIL 1965  
Issue II

Gen Non-Remimeo  
A future Issue of The Auditor

## HEALING POLICY IN FIELD

The HCO Policy Letter of October 27, 1964 is now binding on all field auditors and field staff members.

Many field auditors do not realize that they damage their own dissemination and usefulness by becoming involved with the very ill and the insane.

The only thing a field auditor can do, really, without going down, is to promote, run meetings and do short assists as field staff members of their nearest org. But whether they are or not, all Field Auditors including HBA, HAS and HQS must abide carefully by this policy and inform those persons who seek to persuade them to help the insane or very ill that "it is a Committee of Evidence offense to break HCO policy" and thus get themselves free. I have seen too many field auditors fail by their becoming entangled with psychos and chronically sick cases to fail to protect them from such a mistake.

Excerpt from HCO Pol Ltr Oct 27 '64:

### "HEALING

"Any process labelled 'healing', old or new refers to healing by mental and spiritual means and should therefore be looked upon as the relief of difficulties arising from mental and spiritual causes.

"The proper procedure in being requested to heal some complained of physical disability is as follows:

1. Require a physical examination from whatever practitioners of the physical healing arts may be competent and available,
2. Clearly establish that the disability does not stem from immediately physical causes;
3. If the disability is pronounced to be curable within the skill of the physical practitioner and is in actual fact a disease or illness which surrenders to contemporary physical treatment, to require the person to be so treated before Scientology processing may be undertaken;

4. If, however, the physical practitioner's recommendation includes surgery or treatment of an unproven nature or the illness or disease cannot be accurately diagnosed as a specific physical illness or disease with a known cure, the person may be accepted for processing on the reasonable assumption that no purely physical illness is proven to exist, and that it is probably mental or spiritual in origin."

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH jw.cden

[See also HCO PLs 21 February 1969, Cancellation of "Corrections to HCO Policy Letters" – Pol Ltr of November 5, 1964; 13 March 1969, Addition to HCO PL of 23 June 1967 "Policies on Physical Healing, Insanity and Potential Trouble Sources" - Potential Trouble Sources (b); and 7 May 1969, Policies on "Sources of Trouble".]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 5 APRIL 1965

Gen Non-Remimeo  
HCO Sec Hat  
D of P Hat  
D of T Hat

*HCO Justice Data re Academy & HGC*

**HANDLING THE SUPPRESSIVE  
PERSON THE BASIS OF INSANITY**

The suppressive person (whom we've called a Merchant of Fear or Chaos Merchant and which we can now technically call the *suppressive person*) can't stand the idea of Scientology. If people became better, the suppressive person would have lost. The suppressive person answers this by attacking covertly or overtly Scientology. This thing is, he thinks, his mortal enemy since it undoes his (or her) "good work" in putting people down where they should be.

There are three "operations" such a case seeks to engage upon regarding Scientology: (a) to disperse it, (b) to try to crush it and (c) to pretend it didn't exist.

Dispersal would consist of several things such as attributing its source to others and altering its processes or structure.

If you feel a bit dispersed reading this Policy Letter, then realize it is about a being whose whole "protective colouration" is to disperse others and so remain invisible. Such people generalize all entheta and create ARC Breaks madly.

The second (b) is done by covert or overt means. Covertly a suppressive person leaves the org door unlocked, loses the E-Meters, runs up fantastic bills, and energetically and unseen seeks to pull out the plug and get Scientology poured down the drain. We, poor fools, consider all this just "human error" or "stupidity". We rarely realize that such actions, far from being accidents, are carefully thought out. The proof that this is so is simple. If we run down the source of these errors we wind up with only one or two people in the whole group. Now isn't it odd that the *majority* of errors that kept the group enturbulated were attributable to a *minority* of persons present? Even a very "reasonable" person could not make anything else out of that except that it was very odd and indicated that the *minority* mentioned were interested in smashing the group and that the behaviour was not common to the whole group – meaning it isn't "normal" behaviour.

These people aren't Communists or Fascists or any other ists. They are just very sick people. They easily become parts of suppressive groups such as Communists or Fascists because these groups, like criminals, are suppressive.

The Suppressive Person is hard to spot because of the dispersal factor mentioned above. One looks at them and has his attention dispersed by their "everybody is bad".

The Suppressive Person who is *visibly* seeking to knock out people or Scientology is easy to see. He or she is making such a fuss about it. The attacks are quite vicious and full of lies. But even here when the Suppressive Person exists on the "other side" of a potential trouble source, visibility is not good. One sees a case going *up* and *down*. On the other side of that case, out of the auditor's view, is the Suppressive Person.

The whole trick they use is to generalize entheta. "Everybody is bad." "The Russians are all bad." "Everybody hates you." "The People versus John Doe" on warrants. "The masses." "The Secret Police will get you."

Suppressive groups use the ARC Break mechanisms of generalizing entheta so it seems "everywhere".

The Suppressive Person is a specialist in making others ARC Break with generalized entheta that is mostly lies.

He or she is also a no-gain-case.

So avid are such for the smashing of others by covert or overt means that their case is bogged *and won't move under routine processing*.

The technical fact is that they have a huge problem, long gone and no longer known even to themselves which they use hidden or forthright vicious acts continually to "handle". They do *not* act to solve the environment they are in. They are solving one environment, yesterday's, in which they are stuck.

The only reason the insane were hard to understand is that they are handling situations which no longer exist. The situation probably existed at one time. They think they have to hold their own, with averts against a non-existent enemy to solve a non-existent problem.

Because their overts are continuous they have withholds.

Since such a person has withholds, he or she can't communicate freely to as-is the block on the track that keeps them in some yesterday. Hence, a "no-case-gain".

That alone is the way to locate a Suppressive Person. By viewing the case. Never judge such a person by their conduct. That is too difficult. Judge by no-case-gains. Don't even use tests.

One asks these questions:

1. Will the person permit auditing at all? or
2. Does their history of routine auditing reveal any gains?

If (1) is "No", one is safe to treat the person as suppressive. It is not always correct but it is always safe. Some errors will be made but it is better to make them than to take a chance on it. When people refuse auditing they are (a) a potential trouble source (connected to a Suppressive Person); (b) a person with a big discreditable withhold; (c) a Suppressive Person or

(d) have had the bad luck to be "audited" too often by a Suppressive Person or (e) have been audited by an untrained auditor or one "trained" by a Suppressive Person.

[The last category (e) (untrained auditor) is rather slight but (d) (audited by a Suppressive Person) can have been pretty serious, resulting in continual ARC Breaks during which auditing was pressed on without regard to the ARC Break. ]

Thus there are several possibilities where somebody refuses auditing. One has to sort them out in an HGC and handle the right one. But HCO by policy simply treats the person with the same admin policy procedure as that used on a Suppressive Person and lets HGC sort it out. Get that difference – it's "with the same admin policy procedure as" not "the same as".

For treating a person "the same as" a Suppressive Person when he or she is not only adds to the confusion. One treats a real Suppressive Person pretty rough. One has to handle the bank.

As to (2) here is the real test and the only valid test: Does their history of routine auditing reveal any gains?

If the answer is **no** then *there* is your Suppressive Person, loud and very unclear!

That is the test.

There are several ways of detecting. When fair auditors or good ones have had to vary routine procedure or do unusual things on this case in an effort to make it gain, when there are lots of notes from Ds of P in the folder saying do this – do that – you know that this case was *trouble*.

This means it was one of three things:

- 1.a potential trouble source
- 2.a person with a big withhold
- 3.a Suppressive Person.

If despite all that trouble and care, the case did not gain – or if the case simply didn't gain despite auditing no matter how many years or intensives, then you've caught your Suppressive Person.

That's the boy. Or the girl.

This case performs continual calculating covert hostile acts damaging to others. This case puts the enturbulence and upset into the environment, breaks the chairs, messes up the rugs and spoils the traffic flow with "goofs" done intentionally.

One should lock criminals out of the environment if one wants security. But one first has to locate the criminal. Don't lock everybody out because you can't find the criminal.

The cyclic case (gains and collapses routinely) is connected to a Suppressive Person. We have policy on that.

The case that continually pleads "hold my hand I am so ARC broken" is just somebody with a big *withhold*, not an ARC Break.

The Suppressive Person just gets no-case-gain on routine student auditing.

This person is actively suppressing Scientology. If such will sit still and pretend to be audited the suppression is by hidden hostile acts which include:

1. Chopping up auditors;
2. Pretending withholds which are actually criticisms;
3. Giving out "data" about their past lives and/or whole track that really holds such subjects up to scorn and makes people who do remember wince;
4. Chopping up orgs;
5. Alter-ising technology to mess it up;
6. Spreading rumours about prominent persons in Scientology;
7. Attributing Scientology to other sources;
8. Criticizing auditors as a group;
9. Rolling up Dev-T, off policy, off origin, off line;
10. Giving fragmentary or generalized reports about entheta that cave people in – and isn't actual;
11. Refusing to repair ARC Breaks;
12. Engaging in discreditable sexual acts (also true of potential trouble sources);
13. Reporting a session good when the pc went bad;
14. Reporting a session bad when the pc went up in tone;
15. Snapping terminals with lecturers and executives to make critical remarks or spread ARC Break type "news" to them;
16. Failing to relay comm or report;
17. Making an org go to pieces (note one uses "making" not "letting");
18. Committing small criminal acts around the org;
19. Making "mistakes" which get their seniors in trouble;
20. Refusing to abide by policy;
21. Non-compliance with instructions;
22. Alter-is of instructions or orders so that the programme fouls up;
23. Hiding data that is vital to prevent upsets;
24. Altering orders to make a senior look bad;
25. Organizing revolts or mass protest meetings;
26. Snarling about Justice.

And so on. One does not use the catalogue, however, one only uses this *one* fact – *no case gain by routine auditing over a longish period*.

This is the fellow that makes life miserable for the rest of us. This is the one who overworks executives. This is the auditor killer. This is the course enturbulator or pc killer.

There's the cancer. Burn it out.

---

In short, you begin to see that it's this one who is the only one who makes harsh discipline seem necessary. The rest of the staff suffers when one or two of these is present.

One hears a whine about "process didn't work" or sees an alter-is of tech. Go look. You'll find it now and then leads to a Suppressive Person inside or outside the org.

Now that one knows who it is, one can handle it.

But more than that, I can now crack this case!

The technology is useful in all cases, of course. But only this cracks the "no-gain-case".

The person is in a mad, howling situation of some yesteryear and is "handling it" by committing overt acts today. I say condition of yesteryear but the case thinks it's *today*.

Yes, you're right. They are nuts. The spin bins are full of either them or their victims. There's no other real psycho in a spin bin!

What? That means we've cracked insanity itself? That's right. And it's given us the key to the Suppressive Person and his or her effect on the environment. *This* is the multitude of "types" of insanity of the 19<sup>th</sup> century psychiatrist. All in one. Schizophrenia, paranoia, fancy names galore. Only one other type exists – the person the Suppressive Person got "at". This is the "manic-depressive" a type who is up one day and down the next. This is the Potential Trouble Source gone mad. But these are in a minority in the spin bin, usually put there by Suppressive Persons and not crazy at all! The real mad ones are the Suppressive Persons. They are the *only* psychos.

Over simplification? No indeed. I can prove it! We could empty the spin bins now. If we want to. But we have better uses for technology than saving a lot of Suppressive Persons who themselves act only to scuttle the rest of us.

You see, when they get down to no-case-gain where a routine process won't bite, they can no longer as-is their daily life so it all starts to stack up into a horror. They "solve" this horror by continuous covert acts against their surroundings and associates. After a while the covert ones don't seem to hold off the fancied "horror" and they commit some senseless violence in broad daylight – or collapse – and so they can get identified as insane and are lugged off to the spin bin.

Anybody can "get mad" and bust a few chairs when a Suppressive Person goes too far. But there's traceable sense to it. Getting mad doesn't make a madman. it's damaging actions

that have no sensible detectable reasons that's the trail of madness. Any thetan can get angry. Only a madman damages without reason.

All actions have their lower scale discreditable mockery. The difference is, does one get over his anger? The nocase-gain of course can't. He or she stays misemotional and adds each new burst to the fire. It never gets less. It grows. And a long way from all Suppressive Persons are violent. They are more likely to look resentful.

A Suppressive Person can get to one solid *dispassionate* state of damaging things. Here is the accident prone, the home wrecker, the group wrecker.

Now here one must realize something. The Suppressive Person finds outlet for his or her unexpressed rage by carefully needling those they are connected with into howling anger.

You see the people around them get dragged into this long gone incident by mistaken identity. And it is a maddening situation to be continually mix-identified, accused, worked on, doubled crossed. For one is *not* the being the Suppressive Person supposes. The Suppressive Person's world is pretty hard to live around. And even ordinarily cheerful people often blow up under the strain.

So be careful who you call the Suppressive Person. The person connected with a Suppressive Person *is liable to be only visible rage in sight!*

You have some experience of this – the mousey little woman who rarely changes expression and is so righteous connected to somebody who now and then goes into a frenzy.

How to tell them apart? Easy! Just ask this question:

Which gets a case gain easily?

Well, it's even simpler than that! Put the two on an E-Meter. Don't do anything but read the dial and needle. The Suppressive one has the high stuck T.A. The other has a lower T.A. Simple?

Not all Suppressive Persons have *high* T.A. The T.A. can be anywhere especially very low (1.0). But the needle is weird. It is stuck tight or it RSeS without reason (the pc wearing no rings to cause an RS).

Suppressive Persons also can have the "dead" thetan clear read!

You see people *around* a Suppressive Person Q and A and disperse. They seek to "get even" with the Suppressive Person and often exhibit the same symptoms *temporarily*.

Sometimes *two* Suppressive Persons are found together. So one can't always say which is the Suppressive Person in a pair. The usual combination is the Suppressive Person and the Potential Trouble Source.

However you don't need to guess about it or observe their conduct.

For this poor soul can no longer as-is easily. Too many averts. Too many withholds. Stuck in an incident that they call "present time". Handling a problem that does not exist. Supposing those around are the personnel in their own delirium.

They look all right. They sound reasonable. They are often clever. But they are solid poison. They can't as-is anything. Day by day their pile grows. Day by day their new overts and withholds pin them down tighter. They aren't here. But they sure can wreck the place.

There is the *true* psycho.

And he or she is dying before your very eyes. Kind of horrible.

The resolution of the case is a clever application of problems processes, never overts/withholds. What *was* the condition? How did you handle it? is the key type of process.

I don't know what the percentage of these are in a society. I know only that they made up about 10% of any group so far observed. The data is obscured by the fact that they ARC Break others and make them misemotional – thus one of them seems to be, by contagion, half a dozen such.

Therefore simple inspection of conduct does not reveal the Suppressive Person. Only a case folder puts the seal on it. No-Case-Gain by routine processes.

However this test too may soon become untrustworthy for now we can crack them by a special approach. However we will also generally use the same approach on routine cases as it makes cases go upward fast and we may catch the Suppressive Person accidentally and cure him or her before we are aware of it.

And that would be wonderful.

But still we'll have such on our lines in Justice matters from now on. So it's good to know all about them, how they are identified, how to handle.

HCO must handle such cases as per the HCO Justice Codes on Suppressive Acts when they blow Scientology or seek to suppress Scientologists or orgs. One should study up on these.

The Academy should be careful of this and report them to HCO promptly (as they would potential trouble sources or withholds that won't be delivered). The Academy *must not* fool about with Suppressive Persons. It's a sure way to deteriorate a course and cave in students.

## POLICY

When an Academy finds it has a Potential Trouble Source, a "withholdy case that ARC Breaks easily" or a Suppressive Person enrolled on a course or a blow the Academy *must* call for HCO Department of Inspection & Reports, Justice section. This can be any HCO personnel available, even the HCO Sec.

The HCO representative must wear some readily identified HCO symbol and must take a report sheet with a carbon copy on a clip board.

HCO must have present other staff adequate to handle possible physical violence.

The student, if still present, must be taken to a place where an interview will not stop or enturbulate a class, by Tech Division personnel. This can be any Tech Division office, empty auditing room or empty classroom. The point is to localize the commotion and not stir up the whole Tech Division.

If Tech Division personnel is not available HCO can recruit "other staff" anywhere by simply saying "HCO requires you" and taking them into the interview place.

HCO has a report sheet for such matters, original and one copy for Justice files.

The HCO representative calls for the student's folder and looks it over quickly for TA action. If there is none (less than 10 divs/sess) that's it. It is marked on the report sheet, "No TA action in auditing" or "Little TA". HCO is not interested in what processes were run. Or why there is no TA. If the course requires no meters the folder is inspected for alter-is (which denotes a rough pc) or no case changes.

If there are no TA notations in the folder HCO should put the person on a meter, making sure the person is not wearing a ring. One asks no questions, merely reads the TA position and notes the needle and marks these in the report sheet. The Tone Arm will be very high (5 or above) or very low (2 or less) or dead thetan (2 or 3) and the needle would be an occasional RS or stuck or sticky if the person is a Suppressive Person. This is noted in the report sheet.

If the folder or the student in question says he has had no case gain this is again confirming of a Suppressive Person.

If two of these three points (folder, meter, statement) indicate a Suppressive Person, HCO is looking for *two* possible students when so called in – the one who caused the upset and that student's coach or student's auditor. There very likely may be a Suppressive Person on the course that is not this student. Therefore one looks for that one too, the second one.

If a bit of questioning seems to reveal that the student's auditor was responsible, test that student too, and enter it on a second HCO report form. And order the other one to auditing at the student's own expense.

In short be alert. There's been an upset. There may be other persons about who caused it. Don't just concentrate on the student. There is a condition on the course that causes upsets. That is really all one knows.

When one walks in on it, find out why and what.

If the HCO tests indicate some doubt about either student being a Suppressive Person, HCO asks about a possible withhold and enters any result on the sheet and sends the students and sheet separately to the Tech Division, Dept of Estimation. The procedure is the same for a Suppressive Person but is "a withholdy pc who ARC Breaks easily" or simply "a withholdy pc" if no ARC Breaks are noted. "Auditing recommended".

But there is a third category for which HCO is very alert in this interview. And that is the **Potential Trouble Source**.

For this person may only be audited further if he or she disconnects or handles the Suppressive Person or group to which he or she is connected and can't be sent to the HGC or back to the course either until the status is cleared up.

If this seems the case, there is no point in continuing the person in the Tech Division and HCO takes over fully, applying the policy related to Potential Trouble Sources.

This type of case will probably not be dangerous but quite co-operative, and probably dazed by having to *do* something about his situation. He or she has been hammered with invalidation by a Suppressive Person and may be rather wobbly but if the Justice steps are taken exactly on policy there should be no trouble. HCO can take a Potential Trouble Source (but never a Suppressive Person) out of the Tech Division premises and back to HCO to complete such briefing. Remember, it is all one to us if the Potential Trouble Source handles it or not. Until it's handled or disconnected we don't want it around as it's just more trouble and the person will cave in if audited under those conditions (connected to a Suppressive Person or group).

A Suppressive Person found in an Academy is ordered to HGC processing always. And always at his or her own expense.

If the Suppressive Person won't buy auditing, or co-operate, HCO follows steps A to E in policy on Suppressive Persons in the Justice Codes; HCO may be assisted in this by Tech personnel.

The point is, the situation must be handled fully there and then. The student buys his auditing or gets A to E. There is no "We'll put you on probation in the course and if..." because I've not found it to work. Auditing or Suppressive Person A to E. Or both.

### **THE BLOWN STUDENT**

The student however may have blown off the premises or he has gone entirely. On a minor, momentary blow, where all it took was the student's auditor and a few words to get the student back, the matter is not a real blow.

But where the student leaves the premises in a blow or doesn't turn up for class, the Tech Division must send an Instructor and the student's auditor over to HCO Department of Inspection and Reports. An HCO representative should go with them at once to pick up the student.

The student is brought back with as little public commotion as possible and the procedure of HCO checkout, etc is followed as above.

### **THE GONE STUDENT**

Where the student can't be gotten back (or in all such cases) the real cause may be a Suppressive Person in the Course itself, not the blown student or the upset student.

If the Suppressive Person is on the course (and is not the blown student) HCO will want to know this. In all such cases the one who caused the environment may not be the culprit.

The HCO representative calls for the blown student's case folder and looks for TA. If there is none or for some reason the student wasn't audited, or if no meters were used on that course, HCO Secks to find out what the case's responses were to processing.

If the case seemed to change or improve yet the student is gone, HCO looks over the blown student's ax-auditor for suppressive characteristics such as satisfaction the pc blew, critical statements about tech or instructors, case rough or difficult, lies about the circumstances, etc. and if such signs are present, HCO orders the blown student's ax-auditor to the HGC at the student's own expense.

If this interview with the blown student's auditor seems to indicate a Suppressive Person beyond any doubt HCO orders the student to the HGC at the student's own expense.

The blown student's course auditor will not be found usually to be a Potential Trouble Source as these are seldom bad or rough auditors, so questions about this possibility don't really apply.

But if this student (the blown student's auditor) is Suppressive, it's HGC or A to E. If the student gives on A to E he or she may be returned to course or to the HGC as HCO deems best.

---

In all such cases where a Suppressive Person is found, watch out for legal repercussions by having reliable witnesses present during such negotiations or upsets and take liberal notes for possible Comm Ev. This is why there also must be an HCO representative handling it.

If there is no agreement to be audited and the student who is found to be a Suppressive Person will not respond to A to E (because student has blown and can't be found or because the student flatly refuses), the student is considered terminated.

A waiver or quit claim is given or sent the student stating:

Date:

Place:

I \_\_\_\_\_ having refused to abide by the Codes of (name and place of org) do hereby waive any further rights I may have as a Scientologist and in return for my course fee of \_\_\_\_\_ I do hereby quit any claim I may have on (name of org) or any Scientologist personnel or any person or group or organization of Scientology.

Signed:

2 Witnesses:

Only when this is signed the student may have his course fee returned, but no other fees as he accepted that service.

The ax-student should realize this makes him Fair Game and outside our Justice Codes. He may not have recourse of any kind beyond refund. And after signing can only return to Scientology as per policy on Fair Game.

The HGC audits such a Suppressive Person sent to it on special processes specially issued by HCO B for Suppressive Persons. It will be found that adherence to these policies will make Academies very calm.

Note: Nothing in this policy letter waives or sets aside any policy concerning the auditing of known institutional cases in an HGC. Persons with histories of institutionalized insanity may not be audited in HGC.

L. RON HUBBARD

P.S. If you've wondered if you are a Suppressive Person while reading this – you aren't! A Suppressive Person never does wonder, not for a moment! **They know they're sane!**

LRH:wmc.cden

**Cancellation of Fair Game:** The practice of declaring people **Fair Game** will cease. **Fair Game** may not appear on any Ethics Order. It causes bad public relations. This P/L does not cancel any policy on the treatment or handling of an SP. [From HCO P/L 21 October 1968.]



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 5 APRIL 1965  
Issue II

- 
- Remimeo
- All Instructors Hats
- HCO Personnel Hats
- HGC Auditors Hats
- Sthil Executives
- Sthil Instructors
- Sthil Staff Auditors

*Division 4*

*Technical*

**ACADEMIES RELATION TO HCO JUSTICE STUDENT TRAINING**

**THE NO-GAIN-CASE STUDENT**

Instructors **must** be alert for no-case-change cases on course and for "withholdy pcs who ARC break easily", "blowy students" and "unstable gains" cases.

Even indifferent auditing on even a haphazard course causes good case gains.

The minority group of no-case-change in routine course auditing and "withholdy" is very minor. These categories contain *all* the students who disturb your course, are insolent to instructors, rant against rules, etc.

You are under no orders from me that you must please them but you are under orders to report such cases to HCO.

**You only use difficult case or student in the Academy as an indicator of something worse.** You aren't a staff auditor but an instructor. You want proper auditor and case gain of course, and you'll get it (providing when some student says **it** didn't work to find out exactly what the student did that didn't work and you'll find it was never what was ordered).

However, on cases that are *very* difficult, watch it! These difficult cases are more than cases. They mean trouble for you from that student and for your class in ways you wouldn't look for. By concentrating on "tough cases" you miss the fact that you have a whole class to handle. If you want it handled, look rather at what these tough cases do to your class and handle the "tough case" in a way to protect your course, not to make their cases move.

**In an Academy, don't try to handle your course environment with student auditing!**

Handle your course environment with good data, good 8C and discipline and HCO justice machinery.

Your students now have their old course regulations suspended. Instead, the justice codes are in. The students are Scientologists. Becoming students gives them no new rights. And it doesn't remove their justice rights either.

I've been through all you go through and I have found, by comparing conduct on a course to conduct in the field afterwards, that the turbulent student is a pc, not a student. He or she makes trouble. On the course and afterwards.

The total symptom that alerts you to such a person is "tough case".

This is *very* easy to notice. Just look over the student case folders and note that one or another student doesn't seem to get going. Note the folder you have to work on. That's it. That's your trouble spot on the course. **Don't** judge students by "conduct" or speed of study. Judge on "tough case" only.

Routine auditing is good unless it's been alter-ised. Routine processes work on good people.

The no-case-gain case makes you hunt for magical processes and fatally leads to alter-is.

Now hear this:

**The processes you have, even when only fair, are better than the processes that will be dreamed up by students or anyone around your course.**

The processes you use, if altered to "fit" some tough case will cease to work on standard cases when so altered.

The "tough case" (who is also the difficult student) is the *sole* reason one has an urge to alter a process.

You must be sure to push routine processes done routinely. When you see a process being altered look for a "tough case" in the pc or the student and call HCO promptly if you find the poor TA type case, the "no change" response to routine processes.

*Your* approach is to run the standard processes in the right grade in the right sequence. That's all you teach students to do and it's all *you* do in case supervision.

When these "don't work" even when you force them to be correctly applied, you have a tough case there. Don't louse up Scientology technology to handle a "tough case". You don't have to invent the processes for it. They already exist in the HGC. When you see alter-is, look for the tough case and let HCO take it from there. We are, after all a team, and as a team we can handle our environment. Your job is just teach and get run the processes of the grade in the right sequence. Your job is to teach students to do just that. Your job is to force the student to run the process that should be run and run it right and to correct any alter-is savagely.

Never let some student tell you "it didn't work" without at once plowing in there to look. You will find only one of two things wrong:

1. Your student erred in the wording, sequence or application of the process through lack of study.

or

2. Either the student auditor or the student pc is a "tough case".

*Don't* let anybody try to vary a process to fit a case. If you do your *indicator* is *obscured* in letting anybody fool about in "trying to make a process work" or trying to get inventive just to crack a "tough case".

The majority of your course trouble and the tendency to alter-is material comes from trying to force a "tough case" to get gains. Should you alter or advise alteration of a process you are letting our side down. *It leads you into teaching students to alter-is* and there goes the balloon. It means they won't be able to run standard stuff successfully. And *that* means (let's be brutal) they will miss, by non-standard auditing, on 90% of their cases, the good people. They will slant all Scientology toward one nut and we'll be a failed mess like psychiatry with our clinics full of psychiatric cases not people.

The HGC (and perhaps *one* course level) is taught to handle "tough cases". The processes for them are standard, too. You *must* hold the line and answer a student's "didn't work" with "Exactly *what* didn't work?" and "Exactly *what* did you do?" and you'll find they didn't do it, or it's a tough case. Either way follow policy.

**You must report a tough case to HCO at once.**

For *there* sits a *justice* matter, not an Academy problem. It's not your hat.

You see the no-gain-case, the "withholdy case that ARC breaks easily", "the blowy student", "unstable gain student" and your tendency may be to do something original or give the student some different process. If you do you are madly off-policy. In the ordinary Academy Course you are not teaching a "tough case" course. You are teaching a nice fast, workable course for decent average cases. Your majority is composed of good students. They deserve your time.

So this makes the "tough case" student the odd man (or woman) out. They make a lot of commotion so one may think they are "everybody" on a course. They're not. They are seldom higher than 10%. So you risk the 90% of your course and all Scientology just to handle 10%.

Could I point out that the Protestant idea of recovering at any expense and considering very valuable any sheep who strayed, was batty. How about the whole flock? Leave them to the wolves while one ran off after one? No, *please* don't go the route by doing that. It's pretty awful.

No, this "tough case" is for the HGC and HCO. And I'd darn well rather you didn't give the person the technology before he straightens out as he'll hurt people with it.

Such "tough cases" are possible to salvage. They're just cases. But it takes an HGC to run them and it takes HCO to hold them still so they'll be audited. Remember, we're a team. HCO and HGC are part of the team. Don't steal their hats.

The "tough case" is judged *only* on the basis of case gain or lack of it.

The Academy does **not** send students to the HGC for "slow study" or dullness or any other reason except "tough case". That's firm policy. The "tough case" is the only one you send.

There are 3 categories of these "tough cases".

### 1. The Roller Coaster Case.

The Potential Trouble Source. A suppressive person is on the other side of this one. The case will get a gain and slump, get a gain and slump over and over. It isn't a "manic-depressive" as the old 19th Century psycho-analyst thought. It's a guy whose marital partner or family is going into fits over this person's connection with Scientology. This is purely a justice matter and belongs to HCO. He either disconnects or acts to settle his or her situation. No halfway measures. But you can't do much about that in an Academy. If you did you'd leave your class to the wolves. Get on-line and route this mysterious fellow who can't get a gain without losing it the next day or week over to HCO with a "Please investigate. Possible Potential Trouble Source." Don't even bother to question the student. HCO will find out. It's also illegal to audit them so HCO won't even route to the HGC but will act as per policy on such.

Always err on the side of sending HCO too many students rather than risk keeping one who is a liability to us all. But never send merely a course "cut-up" or a lazy student whose case runs well. This policy is only faintly discipline. It is actually excellent technology to a recurring course problem.

### 2. The Withholdy Case.

The withholdy case is routinely ARC breaking and having to be patched up, commonly blows, has to have lots of hand-holding. As your course possibly isn't at that level it is too much to handle anyway and you're not equipped to handle. But even if your course is equipped to handle the *right* action is again HCO. Report this student to HCO with the label "withholdy case that ARC breaks easily" or "Blow type case". And get HCO over to the Academy. HCO may route to HGC at the student's own expense or get two tough staff members to stand by while the withholds are explored on a meter in case this is a real justice case or just a student lunch thief. The reason for all that weird behaviour is *always* a withhold condition. You can't be bothered. HCO, however, is interested in the **No Report** aspect of such a case. This person hasn't told all that's sure. HCO can send to HGC or refund or even Comm Ev.

### 3. The Suppressive Person.

The suppressive person *does* turn up to get trained. And when you train them (a) their case doesn't change, (b) they cheer when their course pc loses and gloom when their course pc wins and (c) they chatter about the horrors of discipline and seek to lead student squirreling or revolt.

Their dream is a society wherein the criminal may do anything he pleases without any faintest restraint. We sometimes get loaded up with these characters but they run about 1 or 2 in 80 students usually. *This* person has no faintest chance of making it unless handled for what he or she is in an HGC. And if you train such you lend our name to all the chicanery and injury they do with our tech and protect them with our name.

You've seen this case in another guise of squirreling – chatter-chatter about phoney past lives when they were Cleopatra and so on invalidating others' actual memories, talking only whole track to raw meat. You've seen this one. It's suppression pure and simple and *they* know it! And they don't ever get a case change and their ARC breaks don't heal, etc. etc. etc!

The secret here is **Continuous Overts** which are then withheld. The technical fact is they are quite gone and are **solving a personal but long gone problem by Continuous Overts**. One can actually handle them if one knows this seemingly tiny fact. One finds of course the PTP, *not* the overts. For one has about as much chance pulling this fellow's overts as moving the Earth by pulling weeds.

The suppressive acts this person does are *solutions* to solve some long long ago problem in which the pc is stuck. To an HGC this is finding conditions of environment the pc has had and discovering how he or she handled them. But this is HCO-HGC business. The longer you wait to notify HCO, the more harm will be done and HCO will get inquisitive as to why there was *no report* from you on this. For here is the auditor heart breaker, the natterer, the rumour factory, the 1.1 and the course and group wrecker. Here's "Whee, kill everybody!" in person. Here also is the possible government agent, the AMA BMA<sup>4</sup> stooge. Here is the guy who plans to "squirrel" and "grab Scientology". Here is the boy. Or here is the girl. But here is also a thetan buried in the mud. And if you let this person go without attention he or she will soon become ill or die – or worse will mess up or kill others. The person is the only real psycho. And if you let him drift he'll soon wind up in the brain surgeon's suppressive hands. So it's nothing to overlook.

People who have to solve their problems by shooting the rest of us down are what made life such a hell in this universe. You have your hands on the implanted, the warmonger, the wrecker. But still, this is what's left of a human being and he or she can be salvaged. But only in an HGC, not a course. Please! Here also is the criminal or the sex crazy guy or the pervert who just *had* to break old rule 25 (the old no-sex Academy rule). People who are sex crazy are over their heads in a collapsed bank that they've collapsed themselves with overts.

Let's be real. This person throws people back in twice as fast as we can pull them out! So why arm him with tech. Put on your label when you send for HCO "No-Case-Change de-

---

<sup>4</sup> BMA: BRITISH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

spite good tries with the routine processes taught on this course that was closely supervised in correct application". Let HCO take it from there. It's not Academy business.

Your routine procedure on any of the 3 types of case is:

1. Call HCO Department of Inspection and Reports;
2. Minimize disturbance;
3. Hold the student in an empty classroom or auditing room;
4. Stand by to help if things get rough;
5. Help HCO complete its report;
6. Let HCO (and probably HGC) take over from there and get back to your students.

If you're going to grow and get your own case changes and have a good time instructing you'll read this very, very carefully and put it very briskly into practice.

At first you may not agree that you should be so sharp. It may be a blow to feeling you can crack all cases. You probably can. But man, that's an HGC hat. What are you doing wearing it as an instructor? By all means crack the routine cases. But the tough ones? That's HCO and HGC.

The bigger we get, the easier all this will be.

But now let's mark a start in teaching courses that are fun for all by giving the deep six<sup>5</sup> to those who want a mess.

Okay?

Well, do it, do it, do it.

L. RON HUBBARD

- LRH:ml.cden

---

<sup>5</sup> deep six: throw overboard (World Book Dictionary)

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 16 AUGUST 1965

Issue II

- 22.
- 23. Gen Non-  
Remimeo
- 24.
- 25.

**COLLECTION FROM SPs AND PTSs**

On any Declared Suppressive Person an additional condition for return to status (Steps A to E of HCO Pol Ltr 1 March 1965) is Step B(1) which is the requirement that the SP pay off all debts owed to Scientology organizations.

Any Potential Trouble Source owing money to any Scientology organization is handled the same as any other Scientologist. Failure to discharge a financial obligation becomes a civil Ethics matter after normal, within org avenues of collection have been exhausted.

Any PTS who fails to either handle or disconnect from the SP who is making him or her a PTS is, by failing to do so, guilty of a Suppressive Act.

Civil Court action against SPs to effect collection of monies owed may be resorted to, as they are Fair Game.

L. RON HUBBARD

- 26. LRH:ml.cden
- 27.
- 28.

[Note: See HCO P/L 21 October 1968, CANCELLATION OF FAIR GAME]



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 30 JULY 1965

- 29.
- 30. Sthil
- 31. Tech Div
- 32. Qual Div
- 33.
- 34.

**PRECLEAR ROUTING TO ETHICS**

There is no direct routing of preclears to the Ethics Officer except through the channels of the Qualification Division and Review.

This, therefore, cancels the direct routing to Ethics as covered in the Class VII, Confidential, HCO Bulletin of 28 June 1965.

L. RON HUBBARD

- 35. LRH:ml.rd



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 14 OCTOBER 1965

- 36.
- 37. Remimeo
- 38. All Staff
- 39. Ethics Hat
- 40. Tech Hats
- 41. Qual Hats
- 42. Income Hats
- 43.

*Important*

**POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE ROUTING**

The Ethics Officer, when receiving a person who has roller coasted (case improved then dropped), must route that person to Review. Review only must locate the correct Suppressive Person, repeat the correct SP, the right SP.

Review then states:

1. Who the SP is (or who they are if more than one);
2. That good indicators came in and stayed in visibly when the SP (or SPs) was found.

Review then sends the person to Ethics.

Ethics must require the person as per policy to handle or disconnect.

If the person will not handle or disconnect, the person is sent again to Review as the right SP has **not** been found.

Further **until the person has paid in cash for the review search and discovery** Ethics may not declare the person no longer PTS. (The reason for this is that the person will not pay if the wrong suppressive is found.) HGC Auditors, similarly must send a PTS to *Review* not Ethics.

Supervisors must send any student PTS only to Review.

Review always sends to Ethics but **only** when the right SP has been found and indicated.

## REVIEW AUDITOR

The Review Auditor uses "Search and Discovery" as will be covered in an HCO B. If this is not to hand, simply find the right SP, indicate it to the person and watch the good indicators come in.

PTSs may not be handled in **any** other way.

The routing is not from Ethics to the Chaplain. Ethics does not route to the Chaplain.

L. RON HUBBARD

44. LRH:ml.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 30 DECEMBER 1965

45.

46. Gen Non-  
Remimeo

47.

## PTS AUDITING AND ROUTING

**A PTS cannot be audited or trained until the PTS situation is handled.**

The handling of PTS cases will remain with Ethics. Ethics may do a casual location of SPs or may order a Stabilization Intensive in the HGC. (See below.)

## SEARCH AND DISCOVERY

In cases where a handle or disconnect does not resolve the PTS situation, or in auditing a preclear to maintain stability of Release Levels, the action follows Search and Discovery technology.

This will be called a Stabilization Intensive and may be ordered by Ethics in severe cases or may be sold by the Registrar. This intensive may be sold only as a five hour package, continued in 5 hour minimum amounts, delivered by the HGC as a special action and sold for \$100.00 or its Sterling equivalent. It will be done in the HGC, and may not be done as part of Power Processing.

A Stabilization Intensive may not be concluded, whether bought casually to assist reaching more Release Grades faster or ordered by Ethics without the Ethics Officer passing upon the Suppressive Person or Group located as being correct.

If Ethics declares the Suppressive Person or Group is incorrect, the preclear must be sent to Review, not back to the HGC, and a more basic (earlier) Suppressive or Group found, with Ethics passing on the final result.

L. RON HUBBARD

48. LRH:ml.cden



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 9 NOVEMBER 1967

Remimeo

*Review Auditors*

*Book of Case Remedies*

**REVISION OF REMEDY A,  
REMEDY B, AND S&Ds**

(Note: To be reprinted for insertion in every  
copy of *The Book of Case Remedies*.)

This bulletin is to be inserted in and changes *The Book of Case Remedies Procedures* for Remedy A, Remedy B and S and Ds (Search for and Discovery of Suppressives).

Recent analyses made of Qualifications Divisions Departments of Review and of the flow of students and pcs through the Saint Hill org show:

1. The **Key** processes so far as orgs are concerned are Remedy A, Remedy B and S&Ds.
2. Auditors need direct mechanical technology to do these three processes effectively.

**REMEDY A**

Remedy A locates the **misunderstoods** a person has in Scientology. Originally it read "Misunderstood words". Words of course will emerge in the general run of misunderstands.

**Remedy A** is done *only* by **Listing**. It must not be done verbally alone. It is a Level III process.

The listing question is "In the subjects of Dianetics or Scientology who or what has been misunderstood?"

The item is found on the list and given to the student. That is all. There is no other step.


The rules of listing all apply.

If the student won't have the item it is not correct and the list must be straightened up with the general auditing rules that govern listing.

## REMEDY B

The form of this process is changed. It is done by *three* lists. These three may only be done by formal LISTING and the general tech of listing as governed by Level III tech.

The lists make the form of an I



## LIST 1B

This is done to locate what in the Scientology PT is giving trouble. It is done as a *list* and the item is found.

The listing question is

"In your studies of Dianetics and Scientology who or what are you having trouble with?"

The item is found and given to the student.

This step is governed by all the tech of listing.

## LIST 2B

The item found on List 1B is now listed in order to find the past track subject similar to what is giving trouble in present time.

The listing question is

"In your past, who or what was similar to ... (item found in List 1B)?"

It is highly illegal to limit the question to this lifetime.

All the rules of listing apply.

The item is found and given to the student.

## LIST 3B

The third list of the process is now done.

The listing question is

"Who or what was misunderstood in ... (the item found on list 2B)?"

The listing is covered by the general tech of listing as found in Level III.

The item is found and given to the student.

---

This completes the Remedy B.

If a floating needle occurs any time during the process with good indicators thoroughly visible in the student the process is concluded at that point.

The process is used on anyone having trouble studying Dianetics or Scientology. The trouble, as it doesn't clear up with Remedy A, is coming from some prior subject.

More than one of these can be done if all steps are done for each one.

### S&D

Search and Discovery of Suppression is called an "S and D". It locates the suppressives on the case.

I have several times undercut (gotten processes that reach deeper) on S&Ds.

The earliest process asked merely who might have been suppressive to the pc. This is still valid but I have found 2 flaws in it.

1. The auditor does not do a listing type S&D at all but just chattily brushes it off.
2. The list from this question contains an actual suppressive that is passed right over.

Therefore I undercut the question and obtained much better results because the new question reached deeper.

The new question was "Who or *what* might have suppressed you?"

Then I recalled an even deeper question. This was "What purpose has been suppressed?" This was given to Qual Div SH some time ago. It would have 2 lists. The first is for the purpose as above and the second would be "Who or what suppressed ... (purpose found)?"

For some reason, probably because no one did 2 lists, this undercut was neglected.

Therefore I researched further and developed what we will now use as an S&D.

It is one of these killer processes. It is **very** strong. So it isn't to be carelessly done.

If you get a wrong item on an **S&D you can make the pc ill**. So one has to do an S&D right and follow all the rules of listing as given in Level III tech.

Also I find now that when a list item found is a generality (multiple subject, not specific such as "dogs" or "the public") the list is simply not complete. One does not have to settle for a generality and then list the generality. He will find *that* the pc will eventually list the

specific non-general item anyway. Of course one can also do a represent list of a general item found if that seems best.

The real question for an S&D was established only when I found a purpose all Suppressives have in common and is a very fundamental effort in suppressives. This effort by suppressives, when found, then permitted me to form the question.

The key S&D question is:

"Who or what has attempted to unmock you?"

*Unmocking* (an effort to reduce or make disappear) is the primary effort of suppressives.

Therefore the listing question on test delivers up items totally overlooked by the earlier types of S&D.

The question needs to be cleared carefully for non-Scientology. If it has to be re-phrased, watch out as the meaning may vanish. "Tried to make nothing of you" might substitute but at this writing only unmock has been tested and a question for others than educated Scientologists will be developed and issued and made part of the enclosure for the book.

This S&D question must be done by **Listing** only and with great care to follow Level III Listing tech as it, being powerful, will backfire on the pc if done carelessly and a wrong item is found.

The item is found by listing and given to the pc, which is the end of the process. If a generality results it may be represented. But listing continued will give the same result of a single item. A general item must not be given to the pc as the final result.

This process will now be standard review S&D.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:jp.cden

[This HCO B is modified by HCO B 28 November 1967,  
*The Key S&D Question*, page 210.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 23 DECEMBER 1965  
(Replaces HCO Policy Letter of 7 March 1965, Issue I.  
This was originally misdated as 1 March 1965)

Gen Non-Remimeo  
Post Public Bulletin  
Board

*(HCO Division 1)*

*Ethics*

**SUPPRESSIVE ACTS SUPPRESSION OF SCIENTOLOGY  
AND SCIENTOLOGISTS<sup>6</sup>**

Due to the extreme urgency of our mission I have worked to remove some of the fundamental barriers from our progress.

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

**A Potential Trouble Source** is defined as a person who while active in Scientology or a pc yet remains connected to a person or group that is a Suppressive Person or Group.

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

**Suppressive Acts** are acts calculated to impede or destroy Scientology or a Scientologist and which are listed at length in this policy letter.

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

---

<sup>6</sup> Note: Original title: SUPPRESSIVE ACTS SUPPRESSION OF SCIENTOLOGY AND SCIENTOLOGISTS  
THE FAIR GAME LAW

Until the environment is handled, nothing beneficial can happen. Quite the contrary. In the most flagrant of such cases the Scientologist's case worsened and the Suppressive Person or Group sent endless reports to press, police, authorities and the public in general.

Unless the Potential Trouble Source, the preclear caught up in this, can be made to take action of an environmental nature to end the situation one has a pc or Scientologist who may cave in or squirrel because of no case gain and also a hostile environment for Scientology.

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

A Potential Trouble Source may receive no processing until the situation is handled.

A Suppressive Person or Group becomes "fair game".

By **Fair Game** is meant, may not be further protected by the codes and disciplines of Scientology or the rights of a Scientologist.

The families and adherents of Suppressive Persons or Groups may not receive processing. It does not matter whether they are or are not Scientologists. If the families or adherents of Suppressive Persons or Groups are processed, any auditor doing so is guilty of a misdemeanor. (See HCO Policy Letter of 7 March 1965, Issue II.)

A Potential Trouble Source knowingly permitting himself or herself or the Suppressive Person to be processed without advising the auditor or Scientology authorities is guilty of a crime. (See HCO Policy Letter of 7 March 1965, Issue II.)

## SUPPRESSIVE ACTS

Suppressive Acts are defined as actions or omissions undertaken to knowingly suppress, reduce or impede Scientology or Scientologists.

Such Suppressive Acts include:

- public disavowal of Scientology or Scientologists in good standing with Scientology Organizations
- public statements against Scientology or Scientologists but not to Committees of Evidence duly convened
- proposing, advising or voting for legislation or ordinances, rules or laws directed toward the Suppression of Scientology
- pronouncing Scientologists guilty of the practice of standard Scientology
- testifying hostilely before state or public inquiries into Scientology to suppress it
- reporting or threatening to report Scientology or Scientologists to civil authorities in an effort to suppress Scientology or Scientologists from practicing or receiving standard Scientology

- bringing civil suit against any Scientology organization or Scientologist including the nonpayment of bills or failure to refund without first calling the matter to the attention of the Chairman at Saint Hill and receiving a reply
- demanding the return of any or all fees paid for standard training or processing actually received or received in part and still available but undelivered only because of departure of the person demanding (the fees must be refunded but this Policy Letter applies)
- writing anti-Scientology letters to the press or giving anti-Scientology or anti-Scientologist evidence to the press
- testifying as a hostile witness against Scientology in public
- continued membership in a divergent group
- continued adherence to a person or group pronounced a Suppressive Person or Group by HCO
- failure to handle or disavow and disconnect from a person demonstrably guilty of Suppressive Acts
- being at the hire of anti-Scientology groups or persons
- organizing a splinter group to use Scientology data or any part of it to distract people from standard Scientology
- organizing splinter groups to diverge from Scientology practices, still calling it Scientology or calling it something else
- calling meetings of staffs or field auditors or the public to deliver Scientology into the hands of unauthorized persons or [persons] who will suppress it or alter it or who have no reputation for following standard lines and procedures
- infiltrating a Scientology group or organization or staff to stir up discontent or protest at the instigation of hostile forces
- 1st degree murder, arson, disintegration of persons or belongings
- mutiny
- seeking to splinter off an area of Scientology and deny it properly constituted authority for personal profit, personal power or "to save the organization from the higher officers of Scientology"
- engaging in malicious rumour-mongering to destroy the authority or repute of higher officers or the leading names of Scientology or to "safeguard" a position
- delivering up the person of a Scientologist without defense or protest to the demands of civil or criminal law
- falsifying records that then imperil the liberty or safety of a Scientologist

- knowingly giving false testimony to imperil a Scientologist
- receiving money, favours or encouragement to suppress Scientology or Scientologists
- sexual or sexually perverted conduct contrary to the well being or good state of mind of a Scientologist in good standing or under the charge of Scientology such as a student, a preclear, a ward or a patient
- blackmail of Scientologists or Scientology organizations threatened or accomplished – in which case the crime being used for blackmail purposes becomes fully outside the reach of Ethics and is absolved by the fact of blackmail unless repeated.

Suppressive Acts are clearly those covert or overt acts knowingly calculated to reduce or destroy the influence or activities of Scientology or prevent case gains or continued Scientology success and activity on the part of a Scientologist. As persons or groups that would do such a thing act out of self interest only to the detriment of all others, they cannot be granted the rights and beingness ordinarily accorded rational beings and so place themselves beyond any consideration for their feelings or well being.

If a person or a group that has committed a Suppressive Act comes to his, her or their senses and recants, the HCO Secretary:

- A. Tells the person or group to stop committing present time overts and to cease all attacks and suppressions so he, she or they can get a case gain;
  - B. Requires a public announcement to the effect that they realize their actions were ignorant and unfounded and stating where possible the influences or motivations which caused them to attempt to suppress or attack Scientology; gets it signed before witnesses and published broadly, particularly to persons directly influenced or formerly associated with the former offender or offenders. The letter should be calculated to expose any conspiracy to suppress Scientology or the preclear or Scientologist if such existed;
- B(1). Requires that all debts owed to Scientology organizations are paid off;
- C. Requires training beginning at HAS at their expense if Division 4 (Training and Processing) will have the person or the group members;
  - D. Makes a note of the matter with copies of the statement and files in the Ethics files;
  - E. Informs the Chairman at Saint Hill and forwards a duplicate of the original copy which shows signatures.

Any Potential Trouble Source owing money to any Scientology organization is handled the same as any other Scientologist. Failure to discharge a financial obligation becomes a civil Ethics matter after normal, within-org avenues of collection have been exhausted.

Any PTS who fails to either handle or disconnect from the SP who is making him or her a PTS is, by failing to do so, guilty of a Suppressive Act.

Civil Court action against SPs to effect collection of monies owed may be resorted to, as they are Fair Game.

---

Until a Suppressive Person or Group is absolved, but not during the period when the person requests and has a Committee of Evidence, or an amnesty occurs, no Scientology Ethics other than this HCO Policy Letter applies to such persons, no Committee of Evidence may be called to punish any Scientologist or person for any offenses of any kind against the Suppressive Person except to establish in cases of real dispute whether or not the person was suppressing either Scientology or the Scientologist.

The homes, property, places and abodes of persons who have been active in attempting to suppress Scientology or Scientologists are all beyond any protection of Scientology Ethics, unless absolved by later Ethics or an amnesty.

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

The imagination must not be stretched to place this label on a person. Errors, misdemeanors and crimes do not label a person as a Suppressive Person or Group. Only High Crimes do so.

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

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

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

### **POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE**

A Scientologist connected by familial or other ties to a person who is guilty of Suppressive Acts is known as a Potential Trouble Source or Trouble Source. The history of Dianetics and Scientology is strewn with these. Confused by emotional ties, dogged in refusing to give up Scientology, yet invalidated by a Suppressive Person at every turn they cannot, having a PTP, make case gains. If they would act with determination one way or the other – reform the Suppressive Person or disconnect, they could then make gains and recover their potential. If they make no determined move, they eventually succumb.

Therefore this Policy Letter extends to suppressive non-Scientology wives and husbands and parents, or other family members or hostile groups or even close friends. So long as a wife or husband, father or mother or other family connection, who is attempting to suppress the Scientology spouse or child, or hostile group remains continuingly acknowledged or in communication with the Scientology spouse or child or member, then that Scientologist or preclear comes under the family or adherent clause and may not be processed or further trained until he or she has taken appropriate action to cease to be a Potential Trouble Source.

The validity of this policy is borne out by the fact that the US government raids and other troubles were instigated by wives, husbands or parents who were actively suppressing a Scientologist, or Scientology. The suppressed Scientologist did not act in good time to avert the trouble by handling the antagonistic family member as a suppressive source or disconnect fully.

Disconnection from a family member or cessation of adherence to a Suppressive Person or Group is done by the Potential Trouble Source publicly publishing the fact, as in the legal notices of "The Auditor" and public announcements and taking any required civil action such as disavowal, separation or divorce and thereafter cutting all further communication and disassociating from the person or group.

Unwarranted or threatened disconnection has the recourse of the person or group being disconnected from requesting a Committee of Evidence from the nearest Convening Authority (or HCO) and producing to the Committee any evidence of actual material assistance to Scientology without reservation or bad intent. The Committee must be convened if requested.

Before publicly disconnecting, the Scientologist would be well advised to fully inform the person he or she accuses of Suppressive Acts of the substance of this policy letter and seek a reform of the person, disconnecting only when honest efforts to reform the person have not been co-operated with or have failed. And only then disconnecting publicly. Such efforts should not be unduly long as any processing of the Potential Trouble Source is denied or illegal while the connection exists and a person not actively seeking to settle the matter may be subjected to a Committee of Evidence if processed meanwhile.

The real motives of Suppressive Persons have been traced to quite sordid hidden desires – in one case the wife wanted her husband's death so she could get his money, and fought Scientology because it was making the husband well. Without handling the wife or the connection with the woman the Scientologist, as family, drifted on with the situation and the wife was able to cause a near destruction of Scientology in that area by false testimony to the police and government and press. Therefore this is a serious thing – to tolerate or remain connected to a source of active suppression of a Scientologist or Scientology without legally disconnecting the relationship or acting to expose the true motives behind the hostility and reform the person. No money particularly may be accepted as fee or loan from a person who is "family" to a Suppressive Person and therefore a Potential Trouble Source. There is no

source of trouble in Scientology's history greater than this one for frequency and lack of attention.

Anyone absolved of Suppressive Acts by an amnesty or a Committee of Evidence ceases to be fair game. Anyone found guilty of Suppressive Acts by a Committee of Evidence and its Convening Authorities remains fair game unless saved by an amnesty.

This Policy Letter is calculated to prevent future distractions of this nature as time goes on.

### **RIGHTS OF A SUPPRESSIVE PERSON OR GROUP**

A truly Suppressive Person or Group has no rights of any kind as Scientologists and actions taken against them are not punishable under Scientology Ethics Codes.

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

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

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

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

Any effort to use copies of the testimony or findings of a Committee of Evidence called for this purpose or holding it to scorn in a civil court immediately reverses any favourable finding and automatically labels the person or group suppressive.

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

If the findings, as passed upon by the Convening Authority, demonstrate guilt, the person or group is so labelled as a Suppressive Person or Group.

### **RECOURSE OF A POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE**

A person labelled a Potential Trouble Source and so barred from receiving auditing, may request a Committee of Evidence of the nearest HCO as recourse if he or she contests the allegation.

The Committee of Evidence requested must be convened by the nearest Convening Authority.

If evidences of disconnection are given or if the alleged Suppressive Person or Group is clearly and beyond reasonable doubt shown not to be guilty of Suppressive Acts or is shown clearly to have reformed, the Committee of Evidence findings and the Convening Authority must remove the label of Potential Trouble Source from the Scientologist and the label Suppressive Person or Group from the suspected person or group.

But should the former Potential Trouble Source's state of case show no gain after reasonable time in processing, any executive of Division 4 (Training and Processing) may order a new Committee of Evidence in the matter and if it and its Convening Authority reverse the former findings, the labels are applied. But no auditor may be disciplined for auditing either during the period between the two findings.

### **RECOURSE OF AN AUDITOR**

An auditor disciplined for processing a Potential Trouble Source or a Suppressive Person or a member of a Suppressive Group, may request a Committee of Evidence if he can persuade the Potential Trouble Source and the Suppressive Person or a representative of the Suppressive Group to appear before it.

The auditor so requesting may also have named as an Interested Party or Parties with himself the person or persons who supplied the information or misinformation concerning his actions.

---

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

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

### **EVIDENCE OF DISCONNECTION**

Any HCO Secretary may receive evidences of disconnection or disavowal or separation or divorce and, on finding them to be bona fide, may publicly announce them on a public board and legal notices in "The Auditor".

The HCO Secretary must place copies of such evidences in the Ethics file and in the CF folders of all persons named in them.

The disconnecting person then ceases to be a Potential Trouble Source.

The procedure for a recanting Suppressive Person or Group is outlined above.

### EVIDENCES OF SUPPRESSION

It is wise for any Scientologist, HCO Secretary or Committee of Evidence in matters concerning Suppressive Acts to obtain valid documents, letters, testimonies duly signed and witnessed, affidavits duly sworn to and other matters and evidences which would have weight in a court of law. Momentary spite, slander suits, charges of Scientology separating families, etc. are then guarded against.

---

If matters concerning Suppressive Acts are given good and alert attention, properly enforced, they will greatly accelerate the growth of Scientology and bring a new calmness to its people and organizations and far better case gains where they have not heretofore been easy to achieve.

Preclears with present time problems, ARC broken with associated but Suppressive Persons will not obtain case gains but on the contrary, may experience great difficulty.

Observance of these facts and disciplines can help us all.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml.cden

[This 23 December reissue changed Justice to Ethics, and Division 2 (earlier Org Board numbering system) to Division 4, and added B (1) and the three paragraphs following E.]

[Note: See HCO P/L 21 October 1968, CANCELLATION OF FAIR GAME, and HCO P/L 15 November 1968 CANCELLATION OF DISCONNECTION which removes disconnection as a condition.]

[See also HCO P/L 9 August 1971, Issue III, Operation Staff Stability and Personal Security-High Crime Additions, and its second revision of 8 January 1972, same title, in the Year Books.]

[See also HCO P/L 16 March 1971, Issue II, An Operating Standard Rule: *You must keep the door open, only if it's just a crack.*]



# Organization and Ethics

A lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard  
on the 18 May 1965

Thank you for forgiving me.

What's the date?

*Male voice: May 18, AD 15.*

May 18<sup>th</sup>, AD 15, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill, England, Earth, Espinol Confederacy, "This part of the universe is ours!" You don't know your address? [laughter] Well, I like to give people their address and location.

Part missing

Well, I – again, today I'm just filling in time. There's nothing much to talk to you about. Hardly any data. As a matter of fact, it's quite the reverse.

Some poor HCO Secs around the world are beginning to stagger under the burden of new policy letters and that sort of thing that have been coming out, and I should let you in on what that's all about. Very simple. They are the staff status policy letters which add up to the equivalent of about eight staff statuses.

And on the new org board we are going to remedy an old, old evil in organizations by putting on the org board the fellow's certificate initials after the name of the staff member, and then his classification as an auditor, and then the Roman numeral which is his grade as a pc, and then that is followed by an Arabic numeral which will give his staff status. And his staff status simply depends on what studies he has completed on a staff checksheet, and it says, then, for what staff rank he is now qualified.

Now, the way it happened in the past is, in trying to appoint somebody at a far distance, I was utterly unable to plow through all the fog and unknowns and so forth to find out who was there. But under the new system we will be swapping org boards around through the organizations at a mad rate. And these org boards, of course, will be direct copies of the org boards, so that in filling posts and that sort of thing, it is very simple just to look at the org board and to find out, well, who's qualified for promotion, see.

And in that particular way, you'll probably see something like this start appearing on an org board: "HGC staff auditor, HGA, VII, 7, 9," see? Staff auditor. What the hell is he doing as a staff auditor, see? You'll see one of the secretarial levels, and so forth: "BS, blank, blank, 1." Of course, you'd never get anything that bad. It'd have to be a deputy of the deputy of the deputy, don't you see? But nevertheless, there is a slot missing on the org board, and

here's somebody fitted by training, and that staff status also includes a factor of experience, you see?

Now, to get it – to be a general staff member on the new org board, a person has to have – to become a technical staff member – has to have a basic technical certificate, and that is earned in the organization, and it simply has to do with some of the basic and fundamental facts of the organization. That's all. It's a very, very simple thing.

And for an administrative staff member to have anything more than a temporary rating, they have to have just their basic certificate, which is just the basic organization certificate. They know where the comm center is, you know? But nevertheless, have to have studied for those things and passed the little checksheet that goes with them. Then they're qualified as Provisional.

And a Provisional would be a Staff Status I, and a Provisional, of course, can be shifted. Now, a Provisional can be shifted about, don't you see, to balance up personnel and that sort of thing rather easily. You don't have to ask his permission to do so.

And after a period of time, if that person gets his provisional status checksheet filled for his next one, why, he moves up to a general staff member. And at that time, why, he has equality, privilege and fraternity, don't you see? And you have to shoot him in order to transfer him. You get the idea?

In other words, he has worked for and attained a position where he... well, he could be pretty sassy and still have nothing happen to him. But then it goes on up from there. There are the ranks in an organization – just the same old ranks there have always been. There's In-Charge: a rank that we have called from time to time, this has popped up and disappeared, and so forth, we've called something an officer. Well, an in-charge would be the head of a subsection or something like that. It's like Address In-Charge; you've seen that on boards, and so forth. Well, that's your first and lowest executive rating.

And then there is the officer rating, which is simply the section. He's in charge of a section. Like you have here the Cramming Section. Well, that would be the Cramming Officer.

And then you move up and there's a couple of – or three designations that don't have any status as such but they are merely titles. So you understand that there could be quite a few titles on a board which aren't associated with status. Well, there's this thing called a communicator. That doesn't have any rank or status; a fellow is a communicator, see?

And there's this thing called a deputy. You see deputy in front of a name, that doesn't mean there's anybody appointed to it. A post can also have deputies that has a regular appointee. You may see two or three deputies down from an HCO Exec Sec. You see? Deputy HCO Exec Sec. Well, it doesn't mean a thing.

If the post is assigned locally by an organization, why, it may only be assigned as a deputy. If it is appointed from Saint Hill, why, then that becomes an Acting, which is the first rank. And for a while the post is held under an acting status, and then is held in a full status. The "Acting" is simply removed. But you'd know then the difference between a local and a Saint Hill appointment. Don't you see? Your local appointments are all deputy where they are

executive appointments. If they're Saint Hill appointments, why, then they are Acting or nothing in front of it, you see?

That would be, for instance, say you'd have such a thing as Deputy HCO Exec Sec. That would be one of the higher – the highest two ranks in the org. That doesn't mean any permanency of any kind whatsoever. Small breath of air can come in the window and take that title off the board, don't you see?

Because it's not anything but an assigned title. It's just somebody filling time until somebody can be put there or they can be confirmed, don't you see?

Then you see something like Acting HCO Exec Sec. Well, you'd know at once that that was a Saint Hill appointment, and that is an official appointment. And after a short period of time up to a year, why, that title is held as Acting, and then is wiped out on the Acting and becomes just HCO Exec Sec, and that was a full appointment.

Well, when I say that there are some of these statuses that don't have any number after them, don't you see, it's that type of thing, you see?

A deputy – well, that doesn't change anybody's number because they're a deputy, see? But a person would have to have, in actual fact, the staff status *of* the post to be an Acting. So they'd have to pass the checksheets about the organization, and so forth, in order to be an acting appointment.

Two or three things can occur then. You can take a person and put them on and see how they do, don't you see? Well, actually, you can't wait for Saint Hill to investigate something while the post of D of T is going begging, so somebody has to be assigned to this as a deputy situation. Now, that may or may not be reversed by Saint Hill, you see? And so a local org could fill up almost any post with a deputy rating. They don't have to consult anybody. But for that post to have any meaning or draw the pay of that level, it would have to be filled from Saint Hill.

And of course, Saint Hill is enormously assisted on this now because the Department of Examinations will be giving checksheet examinations for these, and right now are giving checksheet examinations without the checksheet. They just take a blank piece of paper and every bulletin the person passes and policy letter they pass, why, they give them an okay on that as having been passed. Well, that's later transferred over to the checksheet where it belongs.

So, what I'm doing at this present moment is simply turning out the bulletins and policy letters and materials which are necessary for these various statuses. And they look an absolute avalanche, you see?

Here is your status for Director, your status for Secretary, your status for Executive Secretary. Relatively undifferentiated, these bulletins are just pouring out. So one will be the theory of the organization itself – the theory of its construction, how it is put together and why, don't you see? Well, this thing is coming right out alongside of, "Pens must be filled at nine o'clock in the morning," don't you see? [laughter] Well, of course, that's an HCO Exec Sec's status – theory of the organization. How do you put it together? What makes it tick? There's an awful lot to know that way.

Now, one of the things that's interesting about these status hat books that will eventually be written – they're not now being written up in the form, but in the eventual hat book, you'll find it an interesting thing (some of these are now being put together), but there's a summary paragraph which takes the whole department. And a little sentence will take up the section. That will be the works.

That's simply heads. You see? Well, we take Department of Review. Now, the whole function and action of the Department of Review and everything that it does is all given in one paragraph – *thrirrrrp-boom!* See? And then each one of its sections is given in one sentence – *prrirup*. But that heads the write-up – the *full* write-up – which just goes on page after page after page of the full write-up of the Department of Review and the full write-up of every one of its sections.

Well, a person working in that zone, who is slated for that quarter of the org, of course knows the big portions. But everybody else at a certain status level has to know the little paragraphs and sentences. That's so they merely know what that's for over there, not how to run it, so that they can work with it. They say, "Oh yes. Yes. That's such and so section. Oh, yeah, well, that's supposed to take the students and so forth. Yeah."

Well, actually, how they do that is quite remarkable but isn't included in the broad training level. So, if a fellow gets assigned then to a department or a division that he has not been in previously, why, in addition to that, his status might not be disturbed, but his appointment would remain Acting. Do you follow? Until he had mastered that particular division, and that's why the difference between the Acting and the Permanent appointment. You get the idea?

So, you never appoint – you could take somebody from a Permanent appointment, let us say, of a Director of a – well, let's take the D of T, he's a Permanent appointment D of T. And you want to upgrade him, and the post is open on Qualifications Division. So, well, the Secretary of Qualifications is open, and there is nobody eligible over in that line for status or longevity or anything else for it, and he's obviously for it, don't you see? Well, you could make this person Acting Qualifications Secretary and then confirm it at the time when he had burned the midnight oil on all of the hat books, you see, of that Division, and at that moment, why, he would become the Qualifications Secretary.

Now, that, you might say, is the long-range look. And true enough you've got to start somewhere to bring order and organization into things. And it is definitely the long-term look, and it's going to take quite a while to build this up. I don't imagine this will be in total operation before next week. [laughter] Now, I'm joking there. I expect it'll be in total operation all over the world by August, in full cry.

It's very interesting that orgs right now are – they haven't got the org board yet. This is a foul trick on my part. It was not meaningful and so on, but there were some other things that had to be gotten out before you could get out the org board. And the org board shifted about a bit, and only a couple of weeks ago settled down into some framework that looked very good and doesn't seem to be a shifting framework at all. There it is.

And now it just depends on the thirty-seventh hour of my day in order to get it done, because I'll have to letter it – write it up and letter it totally. I've just got it in rough draft right

now. I've got to put it in a more amplified rough draft and then letter it and then take it down to the darkroom and make big copies of the thing and then shoot it out all over the place, and they'll have their org board.

But this org board – bits and pieces of it have been released. For instance, the Technical Division was recently released. Well, just their Technical Division. I just told them to get in a Technical Division and appoint an Ethics Officer and appoint a Director of Examinations, see? That was all. Just their Technical Division and that and that.

Well, I showed them a little picture in a Sec ED – maybe you saw the Sec ED – just a crudely hand-drawn picture of the org board of the Technical Division. And that's quite adequate. And I told them to put it over underneath where they used to have the Academy and the HGC and so forth, and just put it down there in that form. Well, they'll get it up there and so forth, and then they'll find this horrible thing occur. Then they'll find that they no more than have that Technical Division more or less set up, they start to be hit by some of the traffic that's begun to move their ways. By the way, organizations are beginning to move off of Emergency right now. London just moved off of Emergency today and was highly congratulated for it. Other organizations are coming up, and things look pretty good.

But *Auditor 8* is going to hit in just a matter of weeks in their areas – to everybody in their areas. And that's going to start building up traffic, and that traffic will build in toward that Technical Division. So I'm trying to get them to get a Technical Division there in order to take care of the traffic and get their courses and so forth stretched out just right, to take the heavier traffic, see?

Well, that's dandy. They'll do all that. That's for sure. And they start moving traffic through their Technical Division, and they'll realize they've got an Ethics Officer, and the Ethics Officer will be finding his feet and straightening out the lines.

All the ethics really does is hold the lines firm so that you can route and audit. You see, all ethics is for, in actual fact, the totality of its operation – it is simply that additional tool necessary to make it possible to get technology in. That's the whole purpose of ethics, is to get technology in. Well, man doesn't have that purpose for his law and justice. He wants to squash people who are giving him trouble. That isn't the case in the handling of ethics. It's an entirely different operation. And you'll find out it's a fabulously successful operation. They'll handle it with too much violence, and they'll handle it with too light, and they'll eventually get it adjusted, and they'll eventually learn this fabulously simple point: that ethics is there to let you get technology in. You see, it's the tourniquet before the doctor arrives. You got the idea? It makes it possible to get technology in.

If an area is too enturbulated and there's too much chitter-chat and yip-yap going on in an area, things are knocked apart and the people in it are being knocked around to such a degree you can't get technical in. All you've got to do is just shut it up long enough and say, "Down, dog!" right up to the point where you can – till the auditor arrives. You get the idea? So, you can just hold that area. Now you straighten it out with ethics and then you get the technology lined up. Now auditors start to audit with *the* process they're *supposed* to audit with, see? Now the cases start to move *through* the HGC the way they are supposed to. Now the student begins to go up through his courses and get the material he's supposed to. We

don't have forgetful little omissions like not giving them any checksheets or anything, see? And this technical goes in, see?

Well, when you've got technical in, why, ethics – that's as far as you carry an ethics action. You carry ethics action to the point where you get technical in. No further.

And it's interesting to me, by certain comparative figures, that the publication of a suppressive as a suppressive person is apparently the equivalent of a public hanging. You get exactly – I'm not speaking jokingly – you get exactly the same responses from the individual.

And there's something interesting about that. Over the years I found out that when you cancel somebody's certificates – bang! – within two or three years he was back, straightened out and doing fine. At the absolute outside, two or three years. But when you didn't cancel his certificates, he wandered off and you never heard of him again and he went to hell. Now, there's an interesting one for you. That's simply an empirical datum.

For instance, the other day – I'm now checking off all mailings that go out from organizations – and the other day I was quite fascinated to see a name as the featured Scientology lecturer at a big open evening that was being advertised every place – a name. missing part 23:44 And five, six years ago, at least that, he went around in one small circle, and he was pounding and screaming and howling and that sort of thing, and he was going to do this, and that, and the other thing, and so forth. So I just told him, "Well, your certificates are cancelled, son. And by the time you see fit" – the way we did it in those days – "to get yourself five hundred hours of auditing at your own expense," I think it was, "why, we'll entertain giving them back to you."

Well, what do you know. At the time we used to do that, they always used to put on, "they didn't care." They didn't care. But it's very interesting how glad they always were to get their certificates back. That was what was remarkable. About two years went by and by George he did get his auditing; he did get straightened out, he's been doing fine ever since. And here he is, I noticed him the other day, and so forth (just checking through literature), why, he's the organization's featured lecturer at an open evening and so forth. In other words, everybody has forgotten about this until I've reminded you. Do you understand?

And when, in other words, you have exerted an orderly disciplinary action in some direction where somebody is wrecking people and trying to smash up the org and trying to push things around, for some reason or other putting a label on them brings them back. And if you don't do anything about them at all, not only does the enturbulation continue, but they go off and get lost and go to hell in a balloon. Isn't that an interesting thing?

So, my data is quite positive in that direction that it is a very unkind thing to do not to try to bring order into a Scientology area. And it's an extremely unkind thing to do not to give somebody a hard knock when he's trying to knock down everybody else around him, and say, "Quiet, fellow. Let's quit it now." See? It's very interesting.

Now, man, of course, has a tremendous reaction to something called justice and what he laughingly calls justice. But of course, man has no understanding with which to back up any of these hangings that he commits himself to. In other words, he doesn't have real justice because it has no end product. Its total end product is punishment. Its total end product is do-

ing something. Now, that it doesn't straighten out the community is manifest because – well, it does some good but – perhaps – but it's manifest in the fact that crime continues to rise across the world. And the crime statistics of the world today are going up much higher and faster than population is increasing. And it's such a worry to law enforcement officers today that those that I have spoken to, just within the last year, were in a very apathetic frame of mind, and they just wanted to lie down and quit. That's a funny frame of mind for the world's best police force to be in, isn't it? Well, that's because there's no end product.

Well, you put somebody in prison. So you put them in prison. So when you let them out of prison they go steal another car and you put them back in prison. Do you see? Worse than that, they are incapable of doing more than worsening an individual with the type of disciplinary action which they employ. So it has no end product but punishment, so it's just old-time, MEST universe "Punish everybody. Down with everybody," don't you see?

Well now, you try to bring in an ethics system across this line, of course you jar a lot of people's banks. And that is quite easy to do, because of course those words are to be found in the reactive mind as end words. So as a result you'll get a considerable reaction. But it's very interesting that much greater proportion of people in Scientology today favor a decent ethic level and favor ethics actions, weirdly enough, than are batting back against it because they see that this will square things up.

Well actually, what it eventually does is get them better training, better processing, a better organization and a better grip on the subject of Scientology and less abuse with it. That's the exact end product of an ethics action.

And ethics is only – people will have to learn this along these lines in Scientology, that the total extent of an ethics action is to get technology in. That's all it's for and not for anything else.

Now, you can't sentence people to technology. That's quite interesting. You can't sentence somebody to getting better. But you sure as hell can sentence him to not getting better. Because after all, what are we doing? We are factually and only there, gratuitously as a matter of fact, helping people to help themselves and to get better. That is our total action.

Now, nobody has got a pistol to *our* heads forcing us to do this, so the only thing that we would do would be the normal thing which we would do anyhow. After a guy has made just so much ruckus, we lose our desire to assist him. And that is really the basic expression of an ethics action. It's simply an expression of this normal reaction of "We don't care to assist you anymore" or "We don't care to assist you for a week or two. Let you think it over." Do you follow?

So, the end product of an ethics action is to get technology in. And that's its total action.

Now, far from blowing up an organization, if you very carefully look over the ethics levels – actions, or the justice actions of organizations and huge governments and empires, and companies and this and that, and compare these things, you find some rather astonishing data falls out in your lap. It's so contrary to what you might believe that you might tend to discount it. But after a while the data itself is too overwhelming.

The taut ship, the harshly run empire, the viciously conducted regiment, normally has a very high esprit and works like mad, can get itself out of most anything and survives practically forever. And the sloppily run ones go by the boards quick.

I first got on the track of this in studying... Some time, by the way, when you haven't anything else to do, read Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. That's quite a thing. I undertook that some years ago because I was having trouble sleeping. But I decided I would read it from one end of that many-volumed volumes to the other – read the whole thing. And it was quite an interesting exercise. I hope I never get so ambitious as to start reading the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* from one end to the other. But, I will say, I am running out of reading matter now that Ian Fleming has picked himself up another body. [laughter, laughs] May have to do it.

But, I was considerably struck in this study by something I didn't understand at all, and I couldn't make any sense out of it all, and it just left me gawp-jawed. Only long periods of progressive rule and recovery from barbarian attacks and internal upsets were periods when the emperor was a nut, just a sadistic boob. It doesn't make any sense at all. Now, a good emperor would come in, and he was going to straighten everything out and get the roads open and do all the progressive things he should have done, and he would be dead from within two to eighteen months. He would have been assassinated and everything would have fallen in. And then another bloke takes over. Tortures everybody in sight. Shoots everybody down in flames. Throws them to the lions and the elephants because just that afternoon he was bored.

Like Caligula: some fellow who was being king of the wood or something down somewhere south of town, so he went down there with some bully boys and killed him just for the hell of it. It was a sort of a shrine; he felt like desecrating shrines that day. He gave knighthood to his horse. He was a chattering maniac. And he went on ruling.

Tiberius, a pervert – years and years and years, and he dies with his boots off quietly in bed, surrounded by his weeping retainers. But the next guy after that that says he's going to defeat the enemy, and he's going to straighten out the empire and rebate taxes and do land reforms and do all the good things that you think a good emperor would do – dead!

And I couldn't believe it. And that datum kept racking around in my belfry, round and around. And every once in a while I'd... Well, it had to be true. Because there it was. It's part and parcel of history. So I looked it over and compared it to my own knowledge of the subject; yeah, that was true. I never tried to run anything like that. Gee, you know, it just didn't make any sense to me at all.

Now, I run an expedition or a ship or something like that, normally all the discipline that would take place on the thing is I'd whistle somebody up on the bridge – without a normal mast or anything that you're supposed to have, you know – I'd just say, "This is just between you and me. You've let the side down, boy. Now what you going to do about it?" And he would tell me what he was going to do about it, and that was the end of that. And I used to have very nice, quiet, orderly ships. I never lost anybody doing anything. It was quite amazing, see? So this other didn't make any sense.

Well, apparently you could, if you were dealing very intimately with a relatively small group, by the dint of personality alone, spread out an area of calm that everything is orderly in. All right.

Now, I'll let you in on a secret. You is about ready to move out into that turbulent area called de general public, and he's nuts! We're no longer just operating here, see? We've had our troubles internally but they're always at the public points of the org. They're where the org is hit by the public in general, see, those are the points you can expect to go. Those are the first lines to go out.

Well, the Registrar-pc line: just getting the pc from – to the Registrar's desk and getting the pc up to the D of P. That is usually the first line to go. Well, of course, that's the Reception-public entrance line, and the lines in that vicinity are always shattering. When I'm in an org I put that line together about every – once every three months. It just completely disappears and goes to pieces.

Well, that's an interesting thing, isn't it? I used to blame us – not very seriously – but I used to think there was something dreadfully wrong with us, that we tried to put a movement of this magnitude and wiseness on Earth and could still be that enturbulated and knocked about, and so on. I eventually got so I could look a little bit outside the organization, and I found out that we weren't being knocked about – that's what's funny. Compared to other things; they're really knocked around. Yeah, but they're held with a brutal discipline to hold them in line at all. They're stood right up there very tight.

But in our length of time of existence we've seen several organizations go to pieces. There are several governments that have gone downhill very markedly. They've become rather disorderly. Crime ratio has gone up. The number of bankruptcies per the number of companies has increased-increased-increased; it's going up higher and higher. The measures being taken by governments are normally aimed at managers. They're trying to sort of put things out of business. The enturbulation there is very great. The police officer has been less and less and less able to hold things. And during that same period of time we've been more and more able to hold things, and we have been getting better and better. And our organization lines are becoming more and more sensible, and we have had more and more duration – that is to say, more and more survival potential. And the technology at the same time was getting better, of course, but it was being better applied. Don't you see? We're running an exact reverse curve.

Well, we could keep this up for a long, long while. We could go on our gradient scale and to some degree individually and otherwise, why, we *will* go on our gradient scale. But if we suddenly start expanding organizations, we are reaching straight out into that raw, tumultuous mass called the public. We're reaching straight out into a society that has never looked so good and was quite so bad.

In other words, we had to have some kind of weapons, some kind of tools, to extend our reach so we could get our job done in time. Now, all we had to do was extend our reach. Now, how does a Scientology executive extend his reach? How does a Scientology staff member extend his reach? How is he able to hold more people still so that they can get processed? How is he able to do this?

Well, I found out another factor. And this is, by the way, the key factor that influences this: I found out that as people moved on up toward OT that a certain disdain occurred. Well, it ceased to be important, any more than you might consider it important to kick over an ant heap. If things got too annoying or something like that, somebody is going to bite. Do you follow me? Somebody is going to bite. So I started to design ethics when I saw that it was going to be necessary that people take orderly bites. You see, we've got to take orderly bites.

For instance, before picking up the Capitol at Washington, and turning it around on its base and setting it down again, you'd damn well better give somebody a Comm Ev. Let's be legal about it. Now, that sounds utterly incredible, doesn't it? And yet you really are looking at something like that. It doesn't matter whether it is within your range of reality or not. Just envision it as a possibility. No matter how fancy this might be – but still consider it as a possibility – that if beings became more and more powerful and they became annoyed about something, and started to straighten something up, they're liable to straighten them up with such thoroughness that hardly anybody'd ever recover. Do you understand?

And – this is the other missing factor – unless they have some orderly method of straightening things up, they will take it upon themselves to straighten them up in their own jolly good way, and it'll make one hell of a mess. Now, there was the entrance point of ethics. And the other side of the entrance point of ethics is as an organization expands... I don't say that an OT should be under justice; no, he must have some orderly, agreed-upon communication line by which he does something.

For instance, I'm in an argument right now with Washington, DC, on one simple fact: Our attorney there is absolutely aghast at the declaration of Lyndon G. Johnson<sup>7</sup> as a suppressive person. [laughter] He says this won't do at all. Well, I don't know, the guy is all over our backs. I think he's suppressive. He hadn't called off the FDA; we're having to do it ourselves. We're having to go over and undo practically half the government to get the FDA undone. You're not kidding, we are. You're doing a beautiful job over in Washington, do beautiful job. Not only do they have a Senate investigation of Health, Education and Welfare and the FDA going – which probably will cost the FDA the bulk of its appropriations and may kick the head out – but as soon as that's over the House is going to investigate the FDA.

They're already using our terms in the courts there when they discuss the matter. The suit is only stated in the exact same terms which you could care to find in the policy letter which I wrote to cover it when it originally occurred. And the terms which occur in those policy letters and so forth are now part of US court pronouncements. So, we can reach.

And, of course, I was just joking. I did suggest, you see, however, that the president of the United States should at least be given an amnesty. And that we do this thing in an orderly fashion. And I really didn't see any reason why you couldn't consider him suppressive if he was trying to wipe out our organization by not calling off his dogs. I thought that was some of his responsibility.

But, our attorney says that this would make the president mad. Now, it's interesting that this is not contested by our attorneys because it is silly. [laughter]

---

<sup>7</sup> Lyndon B. Johnson?

And, our attorneys down in Victoria – we're being less successful in this argument. We're arguing back and forth, but now a rather soft approach is being used on this and we're trying to get it done.

Let me ask you this burning question – let me ask you this burning question: Are you for just shooting somebody down without warning or do you want ethics? See? That's the question. Now, what are you in favor of? The kind of law that just freakishly and like the thunder and lightning all of a sudden strikes down anybody in sight? Or is it the kind of law that you say, "Here is the path. Narrow as it may seem, you try to take Scientology out of the running and that's off the edge of the path. And if you have done that, things are now going to happen. And we do them in a very legal fashion." In other words, we have no illegal hangings. Every one of our hangings is legally done. You get the idea? There's always thirteen turns in that hangman's noose. See, there's always thirteen steps to that gallows. In other words, even a blind man would find out after a while that he was being warned. You get the idea?

Now, this doesn't happen to be for me. I can handle you guys. I can handle a lot more. But what am I supposed to do, stand around here as the only cop?

Now, right now what you've got in essence is a little system of ethics which is being adjusted, in actual use – being adjusted and its procedures are being looked over. And it's working very, very nicely. And of course, it isn't too different than what we've been doing, but it's being done on a scheduled action, and it is effective. And the only reason it's there is to hold things quiet until technology can be gotten in. All right. Very good.

In acting along these particular lines, we of course have it rattling around inside organizations, rattling around Scientologists. I imagine there are two or three people here on staff right now that probably in the last twenty-four hours have seen an ethics report handed in on them of one kind or another. Just some executive handed in an ethics report on them, see?

"Did willfully and knowingly upset the ashtray all over my shoes." They're becoming used to the tools of the thing, and with familiarity they will then be able to use it sensibly.

They're now finding out how much *shock* you can give somebody with Scientology ethics. It is a brutal dose, man, when it's shoved all the way home. And they find out how lightly it has to be used. The lightness of use is fantastic.

For instance, we have had somebody who worked at Saint Hill here as a cleaner for many years, and no amount of talking to her, no amount of persuasion by others, has caused her to find out that there was an organization present or there was any kind of an organization going on. She just works for Mary Sue and myself, and she goes on and she does all this work and so forth, and if anybody else talks to her, why, she goes up in a screaming fit. Well now, you would expect ethics would upset somebody like that, but quite on the contrary. I turned her in the other day for a scarred frame on a door. Obviously some heavy piece of furniture had been slammed against the door like an elephant butting into it – something very undelicate. And I wrote out an ethics chit and of course sent her her copy.

Now, you would have thought she'd have blown, screamed and so forth. She very nicely then answered up on the thing and stated that it had been done by workmen when they were moving furniture up on that floor. And she did identify it, and so forth, and so help me Pete, today turned in a damage report on a broken curtain cord that she had found in the house and forwarded it to – Ethics! [laughter] From a person who a very short time ago just considered that we were all a lot of nuts, that was an awful upgrade of case.

No, if you're going to handle things in your immediate environment, if you're going to handle this mass of public out here, if you're going to handle raw meat and all of its suppressions and potential trouble sources and all the rest of this, and the various ills that we run into when we handle these people, you're going to need weapons with which to do it. You start funneling them into the organization and this guy says, "*Nyah-yah-yah*" and he starts knocking around, "*Wrrh-wrrh-wrrh-wrrh*." Well, if you have any familiarity with this thing called ethics, you'll be able to tap him on the shoulder and he won't "*Yah-yah-yah*." At least, if he does, he'll "*Yah-yah-yah*" someplace else. You understand?

Now, you would be surprised what this does technically, how it backs up your technical. Now, here at Saint Hill – in our new activity which we call an HGC and which we had no public pcs for to amount to anything so we constituted a Qualifications Division here at Saint Hill – we put our Technical Division together and then put our Qualifications Division together. And what's going together right now is the Qualifications Division in full. When we get the Qualifications Division in full again, we'll come back to the Technical Division and put it together again more broadly, don't you see? We'll play it against these two factors. What's getting all the attention right now is the Qualifications Division.

Now, in the handling of these various lines, it is simply putting up channels for people to travel on. Now, if you are going to do your job at all you are going to have to have some way to route and handle without getting into an altercation every time you said "Boo."

Now, in this HGC that we had running and so forth, we had two persons now, so far, that would have just baffled a D of P to the end of time. The D of P just would have gone around holding his head in his hands and wondering what to do, and he would have been sending a cable to Saint Hill or something like this. And he just would have been worried about this, and so forth. He wouldn't have known what to do. Because those were spook cases, those two cases. They ran like a dream, got tone arm action, they went outside and collapsed.

Now, one is collapsing on a highly cyclic basis. He's up on Tuesday and down on Wednesday, see? Three days ago he's telling somebody how bad off he is, but just today there's a despatch in saying how he's just found out his chest and asthma have cleared up. Well, you can absolutely count on the fact that within thirty-six hours it's how bad off he is again. This case is a rolly coaster case.

What is a rolly coaster case? This is your technical advance: Your rolly coaster case is a potential trouble source and just on the other side of him there is a suppressive person invalidating his gains. And that suppressive person was always out of our view before, and we could just hold our heads in our hands saying, "Why does that guy get so good and get so bad? And how does he go up and down? Well, I'll audit him some more." The one thing you

must never do is audit a potential trouble source. He's never going to get any better – not until he's labeled as a potential trouble source and told to disconnect or handle. He's going to go *bzzzz-zzz-zzz*. And actually it's an awful mess because by the fact he's getting better, he then becomes such a threat to the suppressive person that he just gets done in. His environment becomes absolutely unlivable. To the degree that he makes progress, the pressure has got to come back against him, and you're just killing the guy. The better you make him the more he's going to be hit from the other side.

And sometimes you don't – well, you don't even know the identity of this person, see? So you see a case going *bzzzz-bzzzz-blu*. What is this? He was in wonderful shape when he left your auditing room, terrible shape on Tuesday. Then he comes back and you give him a little assist, see? Now he's fine on Wednesday. On Friday you meet a friend of yours and say, "You know that pc of yours. Well, he was threatening to commit suicide last night, and they had to call in the police."

"What in the name of God is going on?" you'd think. See? Big mystery created. You'd blame it on your auditing – what had *you* done? You'd blame it on the technology you were using. Didn't have any relationship to it at all. Just on the other side of this boy and out of the sight of the auditor was a suppressive. Now, how are you going to handle the suppressive? Well, you'd certainly better label him one way or the other. Now, nobody is handling this person, and they're stark, staring mad. What do we do with this guy? How do we handle this bird?

Well, how we handle him is – by George, you better not go on processing that fellow. You better not, because you'll make him worse. No matter what you do about it you'll make him worse. It's not that your technology isn't working. That's the trouble: it is! You're spoiling somebody's total Svengali control here. And the harder you push at it and the better you make him – you could wind him right up, you know, with cyanide pills in the coffee. You understand? You're putting him in grave danger of his life.

So, what's the nice thing to do? He's always had this problem around him, but nobody ever said, "Your problem, fella. *Do* something about it." See, so you give him a little policy letter on the subject of a potential trouble source, and it tells him what he's got to do.

You don't even have to issue an Ethics Order on such an action unless – watch this now – unless technology doesn't go in. See? In other words if we can get technology in, short of shooting somebody, we will. You see? But supposing he starts going, "*Yow-yow-yow*," and so forth, and, "Poor Agnes. She has a perfect right to berate me because I am such a dog." Boy, this guy is caved in, isn't he? Now, he says, "Well, if you won't process me, I guess I will just have to leave Scientology, too, to go off in my own way with Agnes." One Agnes a suppressive person; one pc a – not just a PTS now: he elected himself out.

In other words, the degree of action which you can put against him to straighten out the situation is quite considerable.

Now, the normal action would be to tip somebody off on this, even with an Ethics Order. This is quite a normal action, not the preferred or the ordinary procedure. I'm just saying it's just one that could be done. Cases vary. You would say, "Now, you know, you're going to be labeled a PTS, a potential trouble source here. And if you can just get your wife in *before*

she is labeled a suppressive person, she can be processed. But after that point, why, we couldn't touch her – if it goes this far, and there's a lot of trouble in this. So why don't you get her over here and get her audited." Now, frankly, you wouldn't be able to do this in an organization which was just teaching and processing up to Level I. Because suppressives, let me tell you by experience, are pretty crazy – you understand – their normal run.

Now, if a person isn't very crazy, you hand the label to him, he'll straighten out; he can see the light. But if he's real crazy, man, he can't see anything. He's just got to fight. Well, if you knew what he was fighting you wouldn't feel so sorry for him.

He's back there on the track a few trillion years fighting the Ubugs. He's solving a present time problem which hasn't in actual fact existed for the last many trillennia in most cases, and yet he is taking the actions in present time which solve that problem with the Ubugs.

What the devil is that all about? Well, it's the guy is totally stuck in present time. He's got 99.9999999 percent of his attention units are at some past period of the track – an *exact, precise* past period of the track. And in that *precise, exact instant* he is fighting off something and is trying to handle something by some means, and those are the means and practices which he is using in present time. He does not have any problem with you; you do not have any problem with him at all – none! You aren't back there where he is, and he isn't up where you are. Now, you can *assume* there are problems, but that isn't the problem he's trying to solve.

And that is the whole anatomy of psychosis, and I knew we would find it someday. That's the whole anatomy: this is stuck on the backtrack with 99999 percent... And they're fighting off – they're trying to give the person poison before they can be strangled themselves. So they've got to go around and they've got to give everybody poison, you see? And then they reclassify poison because that is too direct, you see? By cross-association, identification and so forth, why, then they've got to do something to get somebody to do something. And they just see it. And it just adds all up and everything becomes everything, and associative restimulators are all over the place. And they're actually performing this same action. They're performing this same action. So of course, you try to help this person, he misidentifies you at once just like a mad dog does. You extend any help in his direction and he bites you. Of course, he'd bite anybody that came anywhere near him. Why? The guy is stuck on the backtrack and the flying saucer pilots are getting him, don't you see?

Anybody that approaches him or tries to have any effect upon him of any kind whatsoever is immediately and instantly identified as a flying saucer person or something of the sort, and therefore has to be shot down in flames and killed, and so on. He's just defending himself in some mad insanity against things that are no longer there. And it's... so on.

He falls into several categories as he does this, and they're very short and all that material is at Class VII.

But the action here that he is trying to do is mistimed. That is to say, it wasn't successful back then, but he's still trying to do it now. Only he's trying to pull it on you, so your effort to solve his problems do not in actual fact solve the problem he is in, because he's in a problem with somebody that hasn't got anything to do with you.

Now, you could blame yourself and say, "I wonder why I'm having so many problems with this person?" when in actual sober fact you aren't having any problems with this person. You're not even giving that person any problems. Do you see? No, he's just fighting off this chimera.

Now, another thing is, is when he is driven down to the first dynamic to that degree, he of course then will attempt to solve things by knocking off everyone else. That's a perfectly good solution: the way to live is to kill everybody. So if he sees anybody getting any stronger or any better, he goes stark staring mad. This is the one thing which mustn't happen! Nobody must get better because these flying saucer pilots, if they got any stronger they'd be able to get him! So nobody must get any better. That's the one thing which mustn't happen. So Scientology will get it right in the teeth the better we get, you see – and the better known it is that we are actually helping people. You may think – you may think that the saving grace of Scientology is for everybody to know that it works instantly and immediately and just goes fine. Oh, no, no, no. That is the moment when you had better start watching out. We've gotten by so far because it is well known that we're complete frauds. [laughter] It's almost as if I designed it that way.

Well, right now we're about to stick our necks out. We can handle anything that breathes – rapidly and immediately. We can push somebody up to Clear and we can push them up to OT. Here we sit. We've got the technology. We have the organizational technology. And as we start to expand and we start to have a broad, dramatic effect upon the community – already we're within an inch of it. We're receiving a bid, and are in receipt of a bid, that is from a vicinity of the United Nations to train Scientologists for it. Very interesting. International City is being listened to. The only organization I wrote it for was the United Nations. You've never seen me mention it since. I knew sooner or later they'd tangle up with it because they haven't got any other solution. They've tangled. I'm talking about Wednesday night.

Now, organizations start beefing up and getting big and sassy, and their pricing range and amount of service and that sort of thing starts to improve. Now, I'm not trying to run through just public. We've got to retrain psychologists, psychiatrists, doctors. We've got to train them. We got to handle them. Some of those guys are pretty batty. Fortunately for us they're not all crazy, but some of them are *real* crazy.

How do we handle them? Are we going to sit around and argue ourselves deal, dumb and blind about how we are not actually trying to hang them from the local rafter, that our process is an entirely different thing? Do we go on exhausting all of our energies on the more suppressive members of the society or do we – do you expend those same valuable energies upon the broader body of the society? Which do we do? Well, we certainly had better get out of the road the boys who want to stop us, because they're not trying to be convinced, they're just trying to stop you. If you made those flying-saucer pilots any stronger, man, they'd have it. See, they know what's dangerous, and that's people who get any bigger or tougher, because after all they're in this terrible state of having to fight off all these people, and very hard to do being followed by a green alligator.

You haven't had much experience yet on this Level Chart. We haven't actually given you much data about it. But as you start to put that together – and certainly those of you who move into Level VII – you're going to be aghast! You're going to be aghast at how wrong you have been. You have been wrong. You've been wrong right along with me. You've considered the insane portion of the society lower than it was; it's very, very high!

And you start running right down amongst the grass roots on these people, and you find out what they really think and what they really been up to all the time they were walking around wearing their cute little old lady's bonnet – *krdrdrdrd* – and life is going to be to you a much more exposed affair. And people are going to stretch out there, and the sheep and the goats are going to be looking different. And you're going to find out that some of these people that you had a little bit of trouble with and you thought they were just kind of a tough case – if you ever go back and process one of those guys, your hair will stand on end. A tough case? What the hell were you doing in the same room with a gorilla? [laughter]

We've gone through one of these periods of finding out more about man and mankind that, of course, we couldn't crack the back of what's the anatomy of insanity. And we know that now. And you can – if you recall or look over literature and so forth those days, I said the one thing you could understand about insanity is that we didn't know anything about it, and it was incomprehensible, and that was the thing you could understand about insanity. And we left it parked there.

Well, we've gone on to this point, and I can tell you down to a gnat's eyebrow what insanity is, see? Insanity is now comprehensible, totally comprehensible. I've just described it to you. You didn't find that very complicated, did you? Guy is stuck on the time track fighting off the werewolves. Ha-ha. It's not my guess, man, it's not my guess. That's subjected to processing proof that happens right before your eyes at VII – *pow!* There he is – *boom!* And that's the end of that process. You see?

In Dianetics, we were trying to run the track – we were trying to run the whole track and trying to make the track be good and so forth. We've moved so far in fifteen years that what might have taken us thousands and thousands of hours of very good processing can now be done in less than fifty with total positiveness on an insane pc. That's progress.

You hit the society with that, you better damn well have the organization, you better damn well have the training, you better damn well have the ethics to back you up. *Rdrdrdrdr!* Talk about jumping into the tiger's mouth to see if he has halitosis. [laughter]

I don't fancy myself in the role of having to be the only one who can bring any order, the only one who can straighten up something, the only one... You know, that "only one" gets tiresome after a while, you know? Of course, it would at once be a lie to say I didn't do the work, but would also be an imposition to say I was the only one who could then ever do anything. You see, these two points are different. So if I have any trouble at any time handling some suppressive at five or six thousand miles, I'm sure some executive someplace is having trouble handling him on the other side of the desk. So I've tried to give him weapons with which he could handle this situation. And those weapons are fitted well technically.

A potential trouble source *does* behave that way. A suppressed person *is* in that condition. If you label the person you can resolve the situation and get technology in. If you don't

label them and don't call a spade a spade you will never get the technology in. If you don't clear the way for technology and use it to get technology in, it's going to take you many times as long to get the technology in so it speeds it up.

How long does an ethics action last? An ethics action lasts until technology is in. Elementary. How much ethics do you use? You use enough ethics to get technology in. When do you stop an ethics action? Well, you stop it when you've got technology in. This is very elementary and very funny because somewhere along the line you're going to have somebody complaining about all these unfinished cycles of action. Somebody is going to complain about them, but he'd be a fool if he did.

There's been an interrogation madly in progress. There have been interrogatories going out to this or that and the other thing. There is data being amassed. There's stuff being put in folders; there's programs of whole investigation of this and that is going forward. There's paper, paper, paper, paper, piling up here, and there's more work being done. And a Comm Ev has now been formed up, and they're busy choosing interested parties to this Comm Ev, and so forth. And all of a sudden you don't hear anything about it anymore at all. It's just dead vacuum. What happened to all this?

Technology got in. You understand? What was all that doingness? Well, that doingness was going to go all along and mounting up higher and higher and higher until technology finally got in somewhere along the line. You see? It's total planning.

And I'll tell you the awfulest thing you ever saw in your life. Terrible thing has just occurred. Lives are being blasted. Ruin stares many people in the face. In the London area at this exact moment there's a long, long list of interested parties that contain amongst them several very suppressive people, and some who are just there for witness purposes. Oh, it's a very serious affair. It's a Committee of Evidence to obtain data on the spreaders of false and malicious rumors so that they can be sued by the association for redress and damages. And that moved right out into civil law, didn't it? In other words, that's a Committee of Evidence married up with civil law. And it means business, too. If it doesn't settle down, why, it will go on proceeding, don't you see?

But what actually is occurring? Poor little old HCO up there has been just knocked around by suppressives until it doesn't know whether it's coming or going. So I just used this mechanism to say, "Down, dog. Let's have a nice quiet, quiet area while we get HASI London put back together again." Missing part 1:13.34 See, there's no fake about it.

But to show you how bad it is, since HCO has been putting it in up there – putting ethics in – and straightening it up, straightening it up, straightening it up, they've been on a steady increase, and they've been on a sufficiently steady increase that they are now the first org out of an emergency area. Isn't that interesting? And they're going to have the ten, fifteen people that are stark, staring nuts in the London area – out of all of those millions of people in London, you see, there's only this little handful – [laughter] and they're just going to be as quiet as a smothered bird. Going to be real quiet. And during their quietude, technology will get in.

It's all very interesting, because it's all very serious, and yes, it could go right on through to a final conclusion that did blast this, that and the other thing and would blow up

most anything. But, it's a question then of when this technology will get in well in London. That's the only question. It's not a question of where does the ethics proceed. That is not the question at all. It's how long do you have to hold the area down?

Now, maybe, the HCO Sec up in London can breathe. She was being bothered the last couple of days a lot by interested parties calling in and saying they were innocent and hadn't said anything, and nobody was saying anything, and everything was awful quiet *where they were* which I thought was a very healthy sign.

You would be surprised how psychopathic some of these things can be because proceeding from a psychopath, of course, they're psychopathic.

You have no idea some of the rumors that go around – or maybe you do. They're utterly fantastic. It's all the more incredible because how the hell would I have time to do these things? How the hell would anybody have time to do these things? Here I am at work, hammer and tongs, turning out bulletins and plans, handling despatches, and roaring it up, and trying to form up this and straighten up that and so forth – and somebody thinks I've got time for some of these other actions. *Tshuth!* They compliment me. [laughter]

And here's probably the only outfit that ever hit this planet that meant *exactly* what it said, and was doing *exactly* what it was doing, and was doing *exactly* nothing else, and was achieving its targets right straight along the line – *pow! pow! pow!* And this organization is guilty of "*Yack-yack-yack-yack-yack* and *yack-yack-yack-yack-yack*. And the other day, *yek-yek-yek-yoh*." [laughter]

I fortunately have some knowledge of the psychopathic personality and what he will do and imagine, but it's sometimes very peculiar how they can dream it up.

One of them the other day – very interesting up in London – I'll just tell you this little aside and so forth. Boy, he had everybody – oh, these big generalities, you see – he had everybody in East Grinstead was suing Saint Hill because Saint Hill was totally broke, you see, and our accounts were all in bad shape and everything was bad. You see, big great genera... Saint Hill is absolutely paid right up to the notch. The only suits in progress at the present moment are those that we're leveling to collect a little money from some private persons that owe us some dough, not even Scientologists. *Huhh-hh!*

You never saw a happier, more prosperous picture. You never saw a public atmosphere around and about that was calmer, see? But this guy is saying, "And it's all in a jam. And do you know what it's about? And my authority is, my attorneys which are down in East Grinstead and *mur-hur-hur* and *mer-hur-hur-hur-hur*." [laughter] Oh, he's just having a ball, see?

So, the other day they lowered a slight boom on this particular direction and they called a spade a spade, and he was put as part of that Comm Ev up in London. And you know, he came in and told the people that he had told all this to, who had sat and listened to him and taken the notes on it, that he had never said anything like that before in his life; he had never mentioned it.

What people would miss about this: he believes that. He believes that, just as he himself never said it in the first place. It was some circuit. See?

Why, of course, now, he says with perfect truth that he never said it. That's true. How the hell could he say anything? He hadn't been there for seven trillion years. [laughter]

Well, anyway, right now – right now with – when we haven't got things straightened out along on the new org board and a few things like that, you see more of ethics internally in organizations than you might ordinarily see. When you're sitting out along one of these organizational channels one day you'll just thank your stars. You're sitting there maybe as an Examiner and so forth, and some student will come in and fly up in your face, and so forth. And all you told him is he'd better study his E-Meter a little bit harder. And he just takes your head off and practically – so forth. And at that moment it's a choice between restraining yourself from frying his brains and sending a chit to Ethics so it will accumulate in his file. And I think you'll be very happy to send a little chit to Ethics and say, "Doakes. Discourtesy to Examiner. Ethics."

Of course, nothing happens to Doakes. In actual fact nothing will happen to Doakes for days or weeks. But sooner or later somebody will decide that it's too enturbulent right now in that particular course and so they'll go look in the ethics files, and they add them all up, and they find one nice, fat file, and they feel they need a head on a pike so there is Doakes. There's his head on a pike.

Now, we find out that all during this time that it wasn't hit or miss or by chance and so forth; we find out he in actual fact hasn't been making any progress, and it was actually damned lucky for us that we found out about it now, because we can do something about it.

So anyway, you'll find out that the organization will run as long as it has channels, and as long as the particles on those channels don't carom off the sides of the channels and collide with the working parts of the organization. Now, if you can bring that about, then you can have an organization that has a total capability of pouring through it practically the whole human race.

In the absence of holding the sides of the channel, being able to remove the barriers to progress – in the absence of such a tool, why, you just couldn't ever work up to volume. Everything has to be handled on such a tiny, particularized, individual basis, and people are caving in, and you have to replace your Registrar every three months because the public impact wears her out, don't you see? That sort of thing. Well, you don't need that sort of thing as it goes.

So, I'm sure – I'm sure that the boys with the more entheta look at life got it all figured out that we've all gone stark staring mad, you see, with all this justice. No, we're just having a little fun with justice just now, and when we learn about it, why, we'll be able to control a fairly wide sphere of public in such a way that they don't all get destroyed. That's the main danger. The main danger to them is not ethics, it's having their silly heads blown off because they make somebody mad. See – not me. I wouldn't blow their heads off, but I can't guarantee somebody else won't.

So, there is more or less the way that things fit together these days, here's the direction that we're going. As a matter of fact, it's probably with your heads stuck down amongst the textbooks and wrapped around in the environment with various particles flying around and handling all sorts of small problems and that sort of thing, it may sometimes look like you're

not really moving or going anyplace or things are happening which are very poor indeed, and so forth.

Well, you just take a little bit of an overall look at the situation and you find out that it's pretty, pretty darned fantastic. The only thing that's wrong with Scientology these days is the advances are quite unbelievable. Nobody could do this in fifteen years. It's not possible.

You're going to see a Scientology, in size and so forth, which compares to some of your very large industries in the not distant future. You will have amongst you not just Scientologists; you're going to have to fall back on a lot of wog, man. You can't make Scientologists that fast and use them in admin. It wouldn't be possible.

Yeah, well, you could give them a beginning Scientology course and you could do that. Well, here at Saint Hill I've already piloted the operation. I've been working alongside of non-Scientologists on staff for quite a while and it's very easy to do, as long as you have discipline in when they begin. You got to have discipline in when they begin and let them go along with it, and let them know something about it and handle it, and handle it in a disciplined fashion. If you do that you don't get any trouble – into any trouble with a non-Scientologist; he knows where he stands; he knows what the score is. And he'll work – he'll work very nicely, and a Scientologist can work right alongside of him.

As a matter of fact if he happens to be stark staring mad – and I do mean that advisedly – of course you'll have some collision, because you always do. But in actual fact, over a period here of six years, easily 70, 80 percent of the work at Saint Hill has been done by non-Scientologists who didn't know anything about it at all.

So, in your large Central Organizations, you'll find out the Technical and Qualifications Division; your upper executive levels and so forth, will be mainly composed and – they'll be actually totally composed of trained personnel. But then even in those divisions, all of your clerical actions, everything connected with filing and typing and keeping address plates, and putting things together, and all of the types of clerical actions you can shake a stick at, lots of professions that you could name, will be mixed up in that organization. Well, it has to be kept and straightened out, and that organization has to be straightened out, too. That's been one of the little things that has been very hard in putting together the org board. How do you put together an org board that doesn't take a Scientologist to keep it straight. See?

And that's one of the things that's been solved in relationship to this because that takes a considerable amount of discipline. They find out that discipline is much better than the one in the factory which they just left. But if you don't have any discipline at all, they just collapse. They feel they – that you're soft in the head or something, and they don't know what to make you out. They walk around. They haven't got any walls to bump into. They're very used to disciplinary walls, you see? Unless you give them some they feel quite disturbed and quite lost and quite unsafe actually.

So, we've piloted this out. So that's one of the factors of expansion.

And then you're expanding into a public where law and order has actually ceased to exist. Today you could no more get a person arrested for stealing your pocketbook than you

could fly to the moon on a washboard. If the cop did arrest him, he probably wouldn't even bother to take him in front of the magistrate's court. You'd just be very interested if you wanted to talk to the police. This isn't being advertised, of course; it just happens to be deadly true. You're walking out into a society that is losing its grip on order, and it's a pretty poor show.

Now, you've got the additional fact that when you put in a stable datum, enturbulence will blow off. Well, let's not get all the enturbulence in our teeth, let somebody else have it in their teeth, too.

The net result of what we're doing is trying to make an orderly show for the future. Those of you who are aboard at this particular time may not – on course, for instance – may not sometimes feel that you are handled with all the gentleness that you might be handled, that you're maybe *yanked* into this pattern and *yanked* into that pattern and so forth. And I don't come out and hold your hand. It's not that I don't want to talk to you – a long way from it, and so forth. I miss talking to you. As heavily as my schedule is put together, it's almost impossible for me to turn around twice. I have to economize and only turn around once.

The main thing about it is, is I do get individual reports on this, that and the other thing that's going on. I know about where you sit and know just about what the score is, and you'll find at this moment a Sec ED is transferring those students who have been on a slow drag over a considerable period of time into a special completion unit under Review, at no cost to themselves, which pulls them off of the lines, puts them back on the original check-sheets they're on so they can finish that with a cycle of action and get what they came for and also have their cases straightened out and be terminated. That, of course, unmatches the unmatched particle flow. In other words, the student who has lagged behind.

We've had a unit on Emergency and this is more or less the way I'm ending the Emergency. You might say, we're pretty well ending the unit. But what we're doing in actual fact is simply... The machine now, you might say, is geared to take a certain particle flow of students along a certain particular line. Well, those who have been dragging are certainly going to get less attention unless they are given some special attention on this, and those that are overdue up into the next slots and so forth had better be handled. Well, the place to handle that is Qualifications Division because it corrects what's going on, on the assembly line. Don't you see? It takes things that can't run on the assembly line and puts them over and handles these. And that'll probably be taking place here tomorrow morning. The next day there will be a mad scramble on this. But the whole action is I've seen here very plainly that there are certain people who just plainly would never finish up at all unless they're given some specialized attention on the thing. And I don't intend to lose them. We need every auditor we've got.

You see changes like this. Sometimes you don't see the overall picture, and it's a little bit hard to understand, and it sometimes works some privation or upset on you once in a while, something like that. Well, I'm not trying to tell you it's all for the best in this best of all possible worlds, because that would tell you at the same time that I never make any mistakes. No, I don't – I don't work on that formula at all. I just try to be right far more often than I'm wrong, and then I consider if that's that and then we take care of that, then it will somehow or

another work out. It's highly satisfactory in the final analysis. It's not so satisfactory, of course, when you happen to be the one who gets caught in the wrong solution. [laughter]

But there's always, of course, one thing you can count on. I'm the first one to change it when I find out it's wrong.

Well, anyway, I wish you lots of success with you – with this new lineup and with the new unit that you'll be moved over onto. And I'm officially as of this moment ending the Emergency on Unit C without shooting anybody in flames.

It's been a lecture more or less on organization and ethics and how those things compare to each other and what their actual use is. And I hope you can benefit from it to some degree.

Thank you very much.

HUBBARD KOMMUNIKATIONSBÜRO  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 1 OCTOBER 1967

Remimeo

*Admin Know-How*

**USES OF ORGS**

There are two uses (violently opposed to each other) to which Scientology Orgs can be put. They are:

To forward the advance of self and all dynamics toward total survival.

To use the great power and control of an org over others to defend oneself.

When a decent being goes to work in an org he uses 1.

When a suppressive goes to work in an org he uses 2.

When you get in Ethics the decent one raises his necessity level and measures up. The suppressive type blows (leaves).

It is of vital interest to all of us that we have orgs that serve to increase survival on all dynamics. And that we prevent orgs being used as means to oppress others.

The answer, oddly enough, is to **get in ethics** exactly on policy and correctly. And we will advance.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:jp.cden



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 16 OCTOBER 1967

Remimeo

*Ethics*

*Admin Know-How Series 16*

**SUPPRESSIVES AND THE ADMINISTRATOR**  
**HOW TO DETECT SPS AS AN ADMINISTRATOR**

There are three areas of detection which an administrator can utilize in the detection of a suppressive person.

These are

1. No ethics change
2. No case change
3. No admin change.

An SP (suppressive person) is unable to change because he cannot, himself, confront. He is badly "out of valence." Therefore, not being able to look at things directly, he is unable to erase them or even see what they are. Such people often have a curtain of pictures they look at instead of the universe around them. They do not see a building. They see a picture of a building in front of the building. They are not at the point from which they view things.

Thus they are peculiar in that they can't change.

The three principal zones in a Scientology org are

1. Ethics
2. Tech
3. Admin.

We have the natural laws of these subjects, each one.

If you can get in ethics, you can get in Scientology technology. If you can get in Scientology technology, you can get in admin. If you can get all three in, you have an org and have expansion.

If you can't get in tech, ethics is out. If you can't get in admin, both tech and ethics are out.

The sequence that things have to be "gotten in" to make an org is 1<sup>st</sup> ethics, 2<sup>nd</sup> tech, 3<sup>rd</sup> admin.

Where one of these goes out, the org contracts.

We have these three sciences. To really handle things, one has to be a master of all three, even to live a good personal life.

By "get in," we mean get it applied and effective.

We live in a very woggy world at this time. The wog is so out-ethics he is living in what amounts to a criminal society.

When we try to get tech in on the planet, we run into the out-ethics areas and this is the real source of our troubles where we have any. We are getting in tech before we get in ethics. It *can* be done (obviously, since we are doing it). But it is a heavy strain at best.

Just because we do not at once get ethics in on the planet does not mean we can't get any tech in.

By handling small sectors, beginning with self and Scientology groups and orgs, we can continue to repeat the cycles of three – ethics, tech, admin. Gradually we enlarge the numbers we have and gradually our sphere of ethics-tech-admin expands. And we one day have ethics in on the planet, tech in on the planet, admin in on the planet.

The only stumbling block is the SP. This person (about 10 percent of the population) is unable to change. We can process them if we can get them to sit still.

But these are the hidden booby-traps which make one's life, one's family, one's org, one's nation, one's planet a rough-rough proposition.

Ninety percent of the people say, "Ethics great, tech great, admin great." And away we go.

Ten percent say, "Horrible, horrible, horrible." And cannot *either see or change*. They are the true psychotics no matter how "sane" they sound. The people in institutions are generally only their victims.

This 10 percent, one must be able to detect and weed out so they don't contaminate areas we are bringing up in ethics, tech and admin.

Our policy is we don't waste time on them. To cater to them is to betray 90 percent of the population. So we set them aside for another day.

We get them off lines, out of orgs and to one side.

The true character of these people is usually masked in many ways. They are expert only in deception and can take on any guise.

To listen to them one would suppose he was talking to his best friend sometimes. Except the knife in one's back is also driven in by them.

We have much tech to describe them.

But one does not have to be an auditor with a meter to find these people.

An administrator only needs to know the three things about them.

1. No change in ethics

2. No change in case
3. No change in admin.

These people have

1. Thick ethics files
2. Thick (or no) case files
3. Thick full (or no) comm baskets.

If you just dismissed anyone who had all three, you would have gotten rid of an SP.

It works this way. When you start to get in ethics, most people "learn the ropes" fast. They may have a few down conditions and chits or even courts or Comm Evs but you see the frequency dwindles and eventually vanishes or nearly so.

When you start to get in tech on a person, it may be a hard haul for a while and then it begins to level out and get easier.

When you start to get in admin, the confusion around some person may be great but after a while the lines and policies straighten out.

*None* are good little angels. But 90 percent make progress in these 3 fields of ethics, tech and admin.

The SP does **not** make any consistent progress at all and lapses every time.

As only 10 percent of the people then are making nearly all the tough work in ethics, tech and admin, the thing to do then is to get them off the lines rather than betray 90 percent.

And the SP is detectable in **all three areas**. It needs no microscope to find out who on a staff has the seniors working so hard for so little gain.

Their ethics file is huge, their case file either doesn't exist at all or is very fat, their comm lines are jammed, their policy is out and their stats are on the bottom eternally.

So as an administrator you can detect SPs. You better had. **Your own stats will be down to the degree you fail to detect them.**

Just go to your files and look at the desks and sack whoever satisfies all three conditions above and you can't miss and **will** be able to breathe.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH.jp.cden.gm



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 3 MARCH 1966

Remimeo  
Exec Sec Hats

*Exec Div*

**ATTACKS ON SCIENTOLOGY**  
**SEX AND ORGANIZATIONS**

It is interesting that a review of faltering orgs that got into trouble in their areas each one had a bad sex entanglement high on staff.

A Review of actions of orgs and attacks over the last 15 years makes it stand out sharply that an org which is mixed up sexually in the higher echelons will not be effective, will have low statistics and can't defend itself on the public front.

Such are not attacked for loose sexual relations. They are just too decayed to do a good job of defense or follow policy. So they become subject to attack.

The last UK attack was easily rebuffed and so are many attacks. But where an org is caved in by bad sexual messes, it doesn't seem to be able to defend itself on the general front.

We don't often get such situations as a sex-mess org but where we do, they get into severe trouble *on other counts*.

Sex, obsessive and promiscuous, is a blood brother of psychosis. Note the sex stress of Freud, the sex orgies in institutions between patients and attendants and psychiatrists. Note the book (early '50s, U.S.) by Psychiatrist FREDA FROHMM REICHMANN, where she tries to get her fellow psychiatrists to leave their patients alone. It is a text trying to make them ethical in their practices. It reveals a sordid picture.

This is given as an indicator. I know only 4 orgs in all the 16 years before this writing that collapsed or came near collapse at one period in the history of each. And each one was sex crazy. (LA 1950, Melbourne early 60s, Johannesburg 60s, Washington 62 on. Each of these got into severe trouble. LA 50 collapsed, Melbourne collapsed, Johannesburg nearly collapsed, DC is being saved only by strenuous effort.)

So we have an indicator that when an org in the upper strata starts tolerating sexual promiscuity you can expect serious trouble of other kinds just ahead within the next year or two.

This also applies to psychiatry as we will start knocking them out shortly.

I am not talking about an occasional "affaire" or a slip. I am talking about general dedicated sexual misconduct by staff as the ordinary occurrence.

As a speculation it might be the early Christians (who were no fools as they built strong organizations) discovered in the first century or two that a Church which went sexually off-beam didn't last and so banned it. They may have banned it so hard they made even casual Christians madly anti-sex, which is a lot too much. Certain it is they saw sex as an organizational menace and did not see that violent anti-sex was just as crazy, being the other side of the same coin.

Thus Exec Secretaries should be alert for an org going off the beam. Watch in low statistic orgs that don't recover easily for heavy sexual promiscuity and get the sex loops out of it quick, particularly out of its upper executive level. For I promise you that that org will absorb thousands of man-hours of work to rebuild if sexual misconduct is let go on.

The label of sexual promiscuity easily attaches to persons and is not always true. So be very thorough in the investigation and be sure the charges are factual. If so, shoot quick. Don't caution. Experience with such has taught me that no amount of persuasion or orders will (a) bring up their statistics or (b) stop the catastrophe they will walk into. Only prompt removal of the offenders will get the org going up again.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 9 FEBRUARY 1971

Remimeo

## EXECUTIVE MISBEHAVIOUR

In the past executives in three instances have seen fit to associate themselves with persons of the opposite sex who were antipathetic to Scientology and have continued with them a 2D relationship.

The idiocy of such conduct becomes obvious when it is realized that organizations antipathetic to Scientology spend money by the millions and hire people to infiltrate or disrupt organizations.

"Incautious" would be the light word for such behaviour. In each case the org and staff have suffered. In each case the actual condition of the executive could not have been higher than doubt.

Therefore the following policy is laid down:

Executive Misbehaviour Policy No. 1: No Executive who begins or persists in a sexual relationship with a person hostile to or "open minded about" Dianetics and Scientology may be retained on post or in the organization.

Executive Misbehaviour Policy No. 2: Any Executive who engages in activities for which he could be blackmailed may not hold any Executive post.

Executive Misbehaviour Policy No. 3: Any person who places personal interests and situations above the interest of the group may not hold an Executive post.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:mes:sb



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 3 MAY 1972R  
Revised 18 December 1977

Remimeo  
Executive Hats

(Revision in this type style)

*Important*

*Executive Series 12*

## ETHICS AND EXECUTIVES

Any person holding an executive post (head of department or above) is deemed an **Executive**.

Evaluation has revealed that the breakdown in many orgs is a failure on the part of executives to wear their ethics and justice hats.

It has been found that below administrative Whys there is usually an ethics situation as well, which, unhandled, causes the administrative Why not to function or raise stats.

In an area which is downstat, it is the duty of an executive to investigate and find any out-ethics situation and get it corrected.

Ethics is a personal thing in relation to a group. Unethical people are those who do not have ethics in on themselves personally.

It is the responsibility of the executive to see to it that persons under his control and in his area *get their personal ethics in and keep them in*.

Dishonesty, false reports, an out-ethics personal life, should be looked for and, by persuasion, should be corrected.

When an executive sees such things, he or she must do all he can to get the person to get his own ethics in.

When an area is downstat, the executive must at once suspect an out-ethics scene with one or more of the personnel, and must investigate and persuade the person to be more honest and ethical and correct the out-ethics condition found.

If this does not correct, and if the person or area remains downstat, the executive must declare the person or area in Danger and apply HCO PL 9 APR. 72, "CORRECT DANGER CONDITION HANDLING."

The situation, if it does not correct, thereafter becomes a matter of full group justice with Courts and Comm Evs. Persons whose ethics have remained out must be replaced.

The seniors of an executive are bound to enforce this policy and to use it on any executives whose personal ethics are out and who fail to apply it. It will be found that those who do not apply this policy letter have themselves certain dishonesties or out-ethics situations.

**It is vital to any organization, to be strong an effective, to be ethical.**

**The most important zone of ethical conduct in an organization is at or near the top.**

Ethical failure, at the top or just below it, can destroy an organization and make it downstat.

Historical examples are many.

**Therefore, it is policy that an executive must keep ethics in on himself and those below him, or be disciplined or commoved and removed from any post of authority, and someone found who is himself ethical and keep ethics in on those under his authority.**

The charge in any such case for a staff member or executive is **failure to uphold or set an example of high ethical standards.**

Such offenses are composed of

1. **Dishonesty.**
2. Use of false statements to cover up a situation.
3. Representing a scene to be different than it actually is to cover up crimes and escape discipline.
4. Irregular 2D connections and practices.
5. Drug or alcoholic addiction.
6. Encouraging out-ethics.
7. Condoning or failing to effectively handle an out-ethics situation in self or others as an in-charge, officer or executive.

## **TECHNICAL**

People with out-ethics withholds cannot see. This is proven by the brilliant return of perception of the environment in people audited effectively and at length on such processes.

Such people also seek to place a false environment there and actually see a false environment.

People whose ethics are low will enturbulate and upset a group as they are seeking to justify their harmful acts against the group. And this leads to more harmful acts.

Out-ethics people go rapidly into Treason against the group.

A person whose ethics have been out over a long period goes "out of valence." They are "not themselves."

Happiness is only attained by those who are **honest** with themselves and others.

A group prospers only when each member in it has his own personal ethics in.

Even in a PTS (potential trouble source) person, there must have been out-ethics conduct toward the suppressive personality he or she is connected with for the person to have become PTS in the first place.

People who are physically ill are PTS *and are out-ethics* toward the person or thing they are PTS to!

---

Thus a group to be happy and well, and for the group to prosper and endure, its individual members must have their own ethics in.

It is up to the executive or officer to see that this is the case and to **do** the actions necessary to make it come about, and the group an ethical group.

---

### EXEC OR OFFICER'S STEPS FOR GETTING IN ETHICS ON A STAFF MEMBER

#### STEP I

Inform the person personally he is in Danger condition by reason of acts or omissions, down stats, false reports or absence or 2D or whatever the circumstances are.

He is in fact **in** Danger because somebody is going to act sooner or later to hit him.

He may be involved already in some other assignment of condition.

But this is between you and him.

**He is in danger because you are having to bypass him to get his ethics in, a thing he should do himself.**

If he cooperates and completes this rundown and it comes out all right, you will help him.

If he doesn't cooperate, you will have to use group justice procedures.

This is his chance to get ethics in on himself with your help before he really crashes.

When he accepts this fact, Step I is done. Go to Step 2.

#### STEP 2

Ethics is gotten in by definition on the person.

**Get the definitions fully understood.**

The following words must be Method 4 word cleared on all the words and the words in their definitions on the person being handled.

**"Ethics:** The study of the general nature of morals (morals [plural] [noun]: *The principles of right and wrong conduct*) and of the specific moral choices to be made by the individual in his relationship with others."

"The rules or standards governing the conduct of the members of a profession."

**"Justice:** 1. Moral rightness; equity. 2. Honor, fairness. 3. Good reason. 4. Fair handling: due reward or treatment. 5. *The administration and procedure of the law.*"

**"False:** Contrary to fact or truth; without grounds; incorrect. Without meaning or sincerity; deceiving. Not keeping faith. Treacherous. Resembling and being identified as a similar or related entity."

**"Dishonest:** Disposed to lie, cheat, defraud or deceive."

**"Pretense:** A false reason or excuse. A mere show without reality."

**"Betray:** To be disloyal or faithless to."

**"Out-Ethics:** An action or situation in which an individual is involved contrary to the ideals and best interests of his group. An act or situation or relationship contrary to the ethics standards, codes, or ideals of the group or other members of the group. An act of omission or commission by an individual that could or has reduced the general effectiveness of a group or its other members. An individual act of omission or commission which impedes the general well-being of a group or impedes it in achieving its goals."

Do not go to Step 3 of this until all the above words are cleared by Method 4 Word Clearing.

### STEP 3

Ask the person what out-ethics situation he or she is involved in.

It may take the person some time to think of it, or he may suppress it and be afraid to say it for fear of consequences. Reassure him that you are only trying to help him.

He may have brought it up in a session but did not apply it as out-ethics. Coax him through this.

If his conduct and actions are poor or downstat, he for sure will be able to come up with an out-ethics personal scene.

Sometimes the person is secretly PTS and is connected to a suppressive or antagonistic person or group or thing. In such an instance he will roller-coaster as a case or on post or have accidents or be ill frequently. (See PTS tech for material on this and for future handling. Checksheet BPL 31 May 1971RG, Issue IV, "PTS and SP detection, Routing and handling checksheet", but go on handling with these steps.)

Sometimes the person just uses PR (brags it up and won't come clean). In this case, an auditing session is required.

If the person gets involved in self-listing, get him audited on HCOB 20 Apr. 72, C/S Series 78, which gives the auditing session procedure. A person can become very upset over a wrong item. It is easily repaired, but it *must* be repaired if this happens.

By your own 2WC or whatever means or repair get this Step 3 to a clear-cut out-ethics situation, clearly stated. Do not forget to go on with this eventually if there is a delay in completing it. GIs will be in if correct.

### STEP 4

Have the person work out how the out-ethics situation in which he or she is involved would be a betrayal of the group or make them false to the group or its ideals.

Do not make the person guilty. Just get them to see it themselves.

When they have seen this clearly and have cognited on it completely, go to next step.

### STEP 5

The person is now ready to apply the **first dynamic danger formula** to himself.

Give him this formula and explain it to him.

#### First dynamic formula

The formula is converted for the 1<sup>st</sup> dynamic to

- 1<sup>st</sup> 1. Bypass habits or normal routines.
- 1<sup>st</sup> 2. Handle the situation and any danger in it.
- 1<sup>st</sup> 3. Assign self a Danger condition.
- 1<sup>st</sup> 4. Get in your own *personal ethics* by finding what you are doing that is out-ethics and use self-discipline to correct it and get honest and straight.
- 1<sup>st</sup> 5. Reorganize your life so that the dangerous situation is not continually happening to you.
- 1<sup>st</sup> 6. Formulate and adopt firm policy that will hereafter detect and prevent the same situation from continuing to occur.

Now usually the person is already involved in another *group* situation of down stats or overt products or bad appearance or low conditions, Courts, Comm Evs, for something.

It does not matter what other condition he was in. From you he is in *Danger*.

So 1<sup>st</sup> 1. and 1<sup>st</sup> 2. above apply to the *group* situation he finds himself in.

He has to assign *himself* a Danger condition as he recognizes now he has been in danger from himself.

1<sup>st</sup> 4. has been begun by this rundown.

It is up to him or her to finish off 1<sup>st</sup> 4. by applying the material in Steps 2 and 3. He or she has to use self-discipline to correct his own out-ethics scene and get it honest and straight, with himself and the group.

1<sup>st</sup> 5. is obvious. If he doesn't, he will just crash again.

1<sup>st</sup> 6. In formulating and adopting firm policy, he must be sure it aligns with the group endeavor.

When he has worked all this out **and demonstrated it in life**, he has completed the personal Danger Rundown.

He can then assign himself Emergency and follow the Emergency Formula (HCO PL 23 September 67, pg. 189-190, Vol 0 OEC, "Emergency").

### STEP 6

Review the person and his stats and appearance and personal life.

Satisfy yourself that the steps above and the out-ethics found were all of it. That no wrong item has been found. That the person is not PTS.

Handle what you find. But if you find that the person did not improve and gave it all a brush-off, you must now take the group's point of view and administer group justice.

Your protection of the person is at end because he had his chance and is apparently one of those people who depend on others to keep his ethics in for him and can't keep them in himself. So use group justice procedures thereafter.

If the person made it and didn't fall on his head and is moving on up now **as shown by honest stats and condition of his post**, you have had a nice win and things will go much better.

And that's a win for everybody.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

Revision assisted by  
Pat Brice  
LRH Compilations Unit I/C

LRH:PB:dr.gm

L. RON HUBBARD

# EXECUTIVE DIRECTIVE

LRH ED 241R INT

22 July 1974  
Revised & Reissued  
26 September 1977

220703R

To: ALL STAFFS, GO, A/Gs,  
HAS, EOs, Ds of P  
From: RON

## POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE

Ref:	HCOB 10 Aug 73	"PTS Handling"
	BPL 5 Apr 72RA Issue I	"PTS Type A Handling"
	PTS Cassette	"Can we ever be friends"

**As the actual tech of PTS is not well understood or used:**

- 1. No staff member may be dismissed for being PTS. Any staff member previously dismissed as PTS must be restored to staff.**
- 2. A comm ev or condition may be ordered on any staff member refusing or failing to handle per above references.**
- 3. No HGC pc may be routed off lines as PTS but must be handled by the auditor using above refs.**
- 4. Only when the org has a Flag or Folo trained graduate of the PTS and SP detection routing and handling course or has been trained by a Flag or Folo graduate of the PTS and Sp detection routing and handling course, 3 may above be relaxed and only then when PTS'es are actually being handled by him.**

**PTSness is actually a PTP and causes roller coaster as it is difficult to audit over a PTP or work either. But it isn't all that horrible. And it can be handled, usually easily.**

Love, Ron

LRH:JG:nt:pat

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

Revision assisted by A/CS-4



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead. Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 12 MAY 1972

- Remimeo
- GO for Enforcement

*ETHICS*

*Executive Series 13*

*Finance Series 12*

*Personnel Series 25*

**PTS PERSONNEL AND FINANCE**

PTS means Potential Trouble Source. This is a person who is connected to a suppressive person, group or thing. (For full information on PTS see HCO P/L 31 May 197 1, Issue IV, Revised 5 May 72, a checksheet.)

N.C.G. means No Case Gain despite good and sufficient auditing.

A chronically ill person, whether the person is known to be connected to a Suppressive or not, is always found to have been so connected and PTS.

**It is unshakable policy hereafter that no person who is PTS or chronically ill or who gets no case gain may be on finance or registrar lines or in top command posts or as has or Ethics Officer or MAA.**

**TECHNICAL FACT**

A person who is connected to a suppressive person, group or thing will dramatize a "can't have" or an "enforced overt have" on an org or staff members.

A "can't have" means just that-a depriving of substance or action or things.

An "enforced overt have" means forcing upon another a substance, action or thing not wanted or refused by the other.

The technical fact is that a PTS person got that way because the suppressive was suppressive by depriving the other or enforcing unwanted things upon the person.

The PTS person will dramatize this characteristic in reaction to the suppression.

Therefore a PTS person as an ED, C/O, Product Officer, Org Officer, Treasury Sec, Cashier or Body Reg will run a can't have on the org and its staff by

- (a) Refusing income
- (b) Wasting income made
- (c) Accepting wrong customers (like psychos) and forcing them on the org
- (d) Fail to provide staff or service
- (e) Advocate overt products.

## HISTORICAL

When staffs went on proportionate pay in the late 1950s, so long as I ran the orgs directly the staffs made more money than before.

When I moved off these lines directly the staffs began to receive less money personally.

At that time it seemed to me that proportionate pay served as an excuse to some in an org to run a can't have on the staff.

We knew that some registrars could take money in easily and others never seemed to be able to.

The technical reason for this has just emerged in another line of research entirely.

In completing materials and search on Expanded Dianetics I was working on the mechanism of how a PTS person remained ill.

I found suppressives became so to the person by running a "can't have" and "enforced overt have". This pinned the PTS person to the suppressive.

Working further I found that a PTS person was a robot to the suppressive. (See HCO B 10 May 1972, "Robotism".)

This research was in the direction of making people well.

Suddenly it was apparent that a PTS person, as a robot to SPs, will run "can't haves" and "enforced overt haves" on others.

Checking rapidly it was found that where finance lines were very sour a PTS person was on those lines.

## RECOVERY

PTS tech, objective processes, PTS rundowns, money processes and Expanded Dianetics will handle the condition.

However one cannot be sure that it has been handled expertly in orgs where a money "can't have" has been run as its tech quality will be low due to an already existing lack of finance.

Only stats would tell if the situation has been handled fully.

Thus the policy stands. Handled or not handled, no person who is PTS or who has no case gain will be permitted in top command or any lines that influence finance.

Any org which has consistently low income should be at once suspect of having PTS or N.C.G. persons on the key finance posts and an immediate action should be taken to discover the PTS or N.C.G. condition and replace such persons with those who are not connected to suppressives or who do get case gain.

Nothing in this policy letter permits any PTS person to be in an org or cancels any policy with regard to PTS.

This policy letter *requires* direct check, close investigation and handling of PTS or SP situations on these posts that may go undetected otherwise.

**Nothing in this policy letter permits any key org post to remain empty.**

## NATIONAL

As a comment on something that may impinge on orgs and might affect them, the **foremost** reason for a failing national prosperity and inflation is a personal Income Tax agency. This runs a vicious can't have on every citizen and makes them PTS to the government. Individuals even begin to run a can't have on themselves and do not produce. This IS the cause of a failing national economy. It can be a factor in an org and must be handled on the individuals so affected.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

- LRH:nt.sb.rd.ts



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 21 JANUARY 1966

49.

50. Remimeo

51.

**SEARCH AND DISCOVERY**  
**(ETHICS TYPE CASES, PTS'S)**

**S&D ERRORS**

**(HANDLING PTS'S WITH S&D)**

When you have a failed Search and Discovery, the following are incorrect or have been omitted:

1. Incorrect item (errors in listing or assessment, over or under listing, bad metering, poor question).
2. Person has not actually been made to disconnect from the SP by declaration in writing.
3. It was really an ARC Break, not an SP and ARC Breaks should have been looked for instead of SPs.
4. The SP found was refused by the Auditor or Ethics.

The golden rule of S & D also applies – if it isn't the correct person or group that was "found" the good indicators won't come in.

*So any* incorrectly done S&D (as above) will not result in a pc bright-eyed and bushy tailed. All S&Ds correctly done on a pc that is PTS result in remarkable recoveries magical to see. So don't blame S&D if it "fails". Blame the lack of skill in using it and the person who ordered it or did it should be retrained.

L. RON HUBBARD

52. LRH:ml.cden



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 10 JUNE 1966  
Issue II

Remimeo  
Tech Div Hats  
HGC Auditors  
Qual Div Staff

## S & D – THE MISSED ITEM

There are four points I want to get across to you.

1. **Illness = only PTS**
2. **Only PTS = Illness**
3. **Only a PTS condition can make a grade V (or any grade) sick**
4. **A bad S & D makes a person sick**

Get it? **Good!!**

Now, if a person who has had an S & D gets sick, what do you know? You know that:

- (a) They are a PTS
- (b) The S & D was not properly done
- (c) An item was missed

**Note:** The missed item may be on a list that was made 2 or 3 years ago.

On the HCO B 5TH FEBRUARY 1966 "S & D WARNING", I *clearly* stated that "It is the action of *nearly* finding the right one that may make the pc ill". One has restimulated the charge of the **right** item, but, has found and okayed the **wrong** item.

A bad S&D is **deadly**.

A bad S & D can cause a dangerous physical condition. A bad S & D can land a pc in hospital (I know of two such cases where it did).

So please! **Please!!** get this, it is so very important. Always, repeat, **always** look for the **missed** item on a priorly done list when the pc gets sick.

Know your S & D bulletins, know your listing and nulling bulletin – **thoroughly** – and you won't go wrong.

Let's fix up roller coasters, not help keep them roller coasting.

**It's very easy.**

LRH:lb-r.cden

L. RON HUBBARD



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 20 JULY 1966

- 53.
- 54. Remimeo
- 55. Required for  
Level IV Students
- 56. To Review Audi-  
tors
- 57. To Ethics Officers
- 58.

**THE TYPE TWO PTS**

It has been revealed at Saint Hill that HGC auditors and Review auditors are permitting their preclears to be sent through to Ethics for writing disconnection letters to any person or group which the preclear thinks to have been suppressive of him and then continuing the Search and Discovery to find the SP on the list.

This is improper. The auditor should continue the proper auditing of an S&D until the proper item on the list is found.

An Ethics Officer should only accept from a Type Two PTS, the proper SP found upon the completion of an S& D properly listed and nulled to one SP.

L. RON HUBBARD

- 59. LRH:lb-r.rd



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 5 APRIL 1972  
ISSUE I

Remimeo  
HCO Sec Hat  
Dir Insp & Rpts Hat  
Ethics Officer Hat

## **PTS TYPE A HANDLING**

### **DEFINITION**

Per HCO Policy Letter of October 27, 1964, a PTS (meaning a Potential Trouble Source) type A is a person "intimately connected with persons (such as marital or familial ties) of known antagonism to mental or spiritual treatment or Scientology. In practice PTS persons, even when they approach Scientology in a friendly fashion, have such pressure continually brought to bear upon them by persons with undue influence over them that they make very poor gains in processing and their interest is solely devoted to proving the antagonistic element wrong."

### **A SOURCE OF TROUBLE**

Such persons with antagonistic family members are a source of trouble to Scientology because their family members are not inactive. In fact from direct experience with Inquiry after Inquiry into Scientology, it has been found that those who have created the conditions which brought about the Inquiry in the first place and those who testified before same have been the wives, husbands, mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, or grandparents of some Scientologist. Their testimony has been full of such statements as, "My son completely changed after he went into Scientology – he no longer was respectful to me." "My daughter gave up a wonderful career as a hairdresser to go into Scientology." "My sister got these funny staring eyes the way all Scientologists have."

Their testimony was illogical and their descriptions of what occurred were untrue, but the point of the matter is that such persons **did** cause Scientology, Scientology Orgs and fellow Scientologists a great deal of trouble and difficulty.

## DON'T CREATE ANTAGONISM

Many Scientologists in their misunderstanding and misapplication of Scientology create the conditions that bring about the antagonism in the first place. A few illustrations of how this is done are as follows:

Scientologist to mother: "I now know where you are on the Tone Scale – 1.1. Boy are you sneaky!" (Evaluation and invalidation.)

Father to Scientologist: "Now I don't want you to borrow the car again without my permission. I have told you time and time..." Scientologist to father: "OKAY! FINE! OKAY! GOOD! THANK YOU! I GOT THAT!" (Not an acknowledgement, but an effort to shut up the father.)

Scientologist to older brother: "You murdered me in a past life, you dirty dog!" (Evaluation and invalidation.)

Mother to Scientologist: "Whatever are you doing?" Scientologist to mother: "I'm trying to confront your dreadful bank." (Invalidation.)

There are so many ways to misuse tech and to invalidate and evaluate for others in a destructive fashion to bring about bypassed charge, ARC Breaks and upset that they can not all be possibly listed. The idea is **not** to do so. Why create trouble for yourself and for your fellow Scientologists as nothing will have been gained but ill-will?

## THE WHY

Per HCO Policy Letter of March 7, 1965, it is a CRIME to be or become a PTS without reporting it or taking action, or to receive processing while PTS. Further as per HCO Policy letter of October 27, 1964, a PTS may not be trained.

This means that a person who is PTS may not receive processing or training while PTS and it also means that they had better do something to handle their condition. As per older, now cancelled policy; the PTS individual was required to handle or disconnect from the antagonistic family member before he or she could continue with their training or processing. Many took the easy course and merely disconnected as such disconnection was only temporary for the time of their training or processing and so they did not in actual fact handle the condition in their life which was upsetting to them as Scientologists.

Scientology executives have had to promise the New Zealand government that the policy of disconnection from families would be cancelled. This was done. But since that time we have had more PTS trouble than before.

Therefore what is needed is a legal and more sensible way to handle.

Using recent technology contained in the Data Series Policy Letters, a new procedure is possible. Each PTS individual should report to Ethics and with the assistance of Ethics find a **Why** as to their familial antagonism and then set about actually handling the situation. The **Why** could be that his parents wanted him to be a lawyer and so blame Scientology that he is

not one, rather than the fact that he flunked out of law school and couldn't stand the thought of being a lawyer!

Or perhaps the **Why** is that the Scientologist keeps writing her parents for money or the **Why** could be that the mother has just read an entheta newspaper article.

In any case the **Why** should be found and the PTS individual should then do whatever is necessary to handle.

See the Data Series P/Ls (must be word cleared on the user) to find out how to find a Why.

### HANDLING

The person who is PTS should be declared as such by Ethics and should not receive Scientology training or processing until the situation has been handled.

The handling could be as simple as writing to one's father and saying, "I do not complain that you are a janitor, please do not complain that I am a Scientologist. The important thing is that I am your son and that I love and respect you. I know you love me, but please learn to respect me as an adult individual who knows what he wants in life." Or it could be as follows, "I am writing to you, Daddy, because mother keeps sending me these dreadful newspaper clippings and they are upsetting to me because I know they are not true. You do not do this and so it is easier for me to write to you."

Again there are as many ways of handling as there are Why's found. Each case is individual. Remember, too, there is always the possibility of a **no** situation. And if the person thinks he's a PTS and isn't he can get sick. Or if he insists he isn't and is, he can also get upset. So find if there **is** a situation first.

It is the purpose of Ethics to ensure that the situation is handled.

CS-G  
for

L RON HUBBARD  
FOUNDER

LRH:MSH:nt.lm.tda



## BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN

11 NOVEMBER 1977

Reissued 10 December 1977

Remimeo  
PTS/SP Detection Routing  
and Handling Course  
Snr CI IV

### HANDLING PTS SITUATIONS

The majority of the Technology on how to handle PTSes is already covered in the PTS and SP Detection, Routing and Handling Course. The following LRH tips on handling PTS Type A situations have been excerpted from an LRH lecture as additional data for your use.

"I coached a pc one time as to how to talk to his parents. I coached him very, very carefully. This is a sort of an MAA job, not a C/S job. I made him repeat everything after me, very carefully. 'And when your mother says to you so and so and so and so what are you going to say?' It was just good roads and good weather. I forced on him at pain of being squashed, to follow this exact patter with his parents. 'Hello Mama, how are you? How's Papa?' etc., simply good roads and good weather. And she says 'Yeow yeow yeow yeow yeow yeow' and you '...wha wha wha wha wha'. Why just say 'well alright, alright', and don't answer back and don't engage in any argument of any kind whatsoever. Give it an acknowledgement. I told him 'You are calling them up just because you're passing through and you were interested in how they are, and that is your whole story.' And he did, and that was the end of the whole situation. The pc came back to battery. Relationships with the parents went totally normal. In other words, he was keeping it going by his worry, his upset, his letters, trying to answer their questions, his conversation with them. Whereas I cut it all into just the pattern of something on the order of about a Tone 3.5 straight across the boards. That was the end of the PTS condition.

"A PTS condition also has outside handling steps. But you as an auditor, or you as a C/S are possibly limited by the fact that you don't have an MAA, or you do not have somebody who is sufficiently skilled in order to do this job for you, and it winds up blowing everybody's head off. In such an instance, just get hold of the guy, coach him in exactly what he's going to say. 'Oh but no she'd never listen, she won't. She hasn't talked to me for seven years. She won't talk to me in any way shape or form.' 'Well alright, alright, alright, that's fine, good.' Then you get a little bit inventive and you say 'Well, when is her birthday? ', or something like that, and the pc says 'Well as a matter of fact, it was a month or two ago,' and you say 'Well alright, why don't you send her a birthday card, Remember to tell her it's a belated day card, and that you remembered her birthday and always had kind thoughts of her?' Now the incoming comm may blow his head off, and you just cool him off. Don't engage in any corner of this. This is not the game you're playing. You simply acknowledge any nice part that you can find. 'Papa went hunting, and you're a dirty dog, and I've never seen the like of you, and you're an ungrateful brat and so on, and why don't you be like your Great Uncle

Oscar who is now doing time in Sing Sing and will be executed next week?' And so forth, and you say 'I hope Daddy had a fine hunting trip.' It's the only part of it you answer. You coach him into a two-way comm that is well above 2.0 on the tone scale. That mostly consists of acknowledgments and mild interest in what's going on. You will find out these conditions will evaporate, if you can prevent the backflash from being responded to by the PTS person. In other words there are ways to handle this in real life.

"You will find a great many people who are 'PTS', are antagonizing the people. They're antagonizing them beyond belief, and they're telling them what's wrong with them, and they're telling them this and they're telling them that and so on, and the person eventually gets very resentful. Well even that can be patched up. You are not doing anything at the other end of the line. You cool off the PT scene sufficiently, one way or the other, so that the person can sit in the auditing chair." LRH (Compiled from LRH Taped Lecture 7511C20)

Julie Gillespie A/CS-4

Approved by LRH Pers Comm

Authorized by AVU

for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the  
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:AH:KU:JG:pat

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 24 APRIL 1972  
Issue I

Remimeo  
DofP  
Auditors  
Ethics Officers

*C/S Series 79*

*Expanded Dianetics Series 5*

**PTS INTERVIEWS**

(Reference HCO B 17 April 72, C/S Series 76)

Interviews to discover a PTS condition are done on a meter with all reads marked.

The Interview asks (a) about persons who are hostile or antagonistic to the pc, (b) about groups that are anti-Scientology, (c) about people who have harmed the pc, (d) about things that the pc thinks are suppressive to the pc, (e) about locations that are suppressive to the pc and about past life things and beings suppressive to the pc.

In doing the Interview the Interviewer must realize that a sick person is PTS. There are no sick people who are not PTS to someone or a group or something somewhere.

A somewhat suppressive pc will find the good hats suppressive. This does not relieve his condition. He is PTS to SP people, groups, things or locations, no matter how SP he is.

He can have been audited by someone he knew in an earlier life and who goofed the session. A few auditors have since been declared. Not because they goofed but because they were SP.

However, some PTS pc will make trouble for good people because that is what PTS means (Potential Trouble Source). So do not buy all the good people he is PTS to.

Further, when you do get the person or group or thing or location the PTS person will F/N VGI and begin to get well.

The PTS condition is actually a problem and a mystery and a withdrawal so it is sometimes hard to find and has to be specially processed (3 S&Ds) to locate it. Usually it is quite visible.

Don't have a sick, rollercoaster pc appear for Interview and then say "not PTS". It's a false report. It only means the Interviewer did not find it.

The pc sometimes begins to list in such an Interview and such an Interview where a wrong item is found has to be audited to complete the list or find the right item. (See C/S Series 78, HCO B 20 Apr 72, Issue II.)

So Interview worksheets are **vital**.

The Interview should end on an F/N.

The Interview is followed by the Ethics action of HCO PL 5 April 72 or other Ethics actions such as handling or disconnection and posting as called for in policy. An Interviewer has to use good TRs and operate his meter properly and know 2-way comm and PTS tech.

Some Interviewers are extremely successful.

Such Interviews and handling count as auditing hours.

When properly done, plus good auditing on the PTS RD, well people result.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:mes.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 10 AUGUST 1973

Remimeo  
HCO Secs  
E/Os  
MAAs  
Tech Secs  
Ds of P  
PTS Pack

## PTS HANDLING

(PTS = Potential Trouble Source)

There are two stable data which anyone has to have, understand and **know are true** in order to obtain results in handling the person connected to suppressives.

These data are:

1. That all illness in greater or lesser degree and all foul-ups stem directly and only from a PTS condition.
2. That getting rid of the condition requires three basic actions: A. Discover. B. Handle or disconnect.

Persons called upon to handle PTS people can do so very easily, far more easily than they believe. Their basic stumbling block is thinking that there are exceptions or that there is other tech or that the two above data have modifiers or are not sweeping. The moment a person who is trying to handle PTSs gets persuaded there are other conditions or reasons or tech, he is at once lost and will lose the game and not obtain results. And this is very too bad because it is not difficult and the results are there to be obtained.

To turn someone who may be PTS over to an auditor just to have him mechanically audited may not be enough. In the first place this person may not have a clue what is meant by PTS and may be missing all manner of technical data on life and may be so overwhelmed by a suppressive person or group that he is quite incoherent. Thus just mechanically doing a process may miss the whole show as it misses the person's understanding of why it is being done.

A PTS person is rarely psychotic. But all psychotics are PTS if only to themselves. A PTS person may be in a state of deficiency or pathology which prevents a ready recovery, but at the same time he will not fully recover unless the PTS condition is also handled. For he became prone to deficiency or pathological illness because he was PTS. And unless the condition is relieved, no matter what medication or nutrition he may be given, he might not recover and certainly will not recover permanently. This seems to indicate that there are "other illnesses or reasons for illness besides being PTS". To be sure there are deficiencies and illnesses just as there are accidents and injuries. But strangely enough the person himself precipitates them because being PTS predisposes him to them. In a more garbled way, the medicos and nutritionists are always talking about "stress" causing illness. Lacking full tech they yet have an inkling that this is so because they see it is somehow true. They cannot handle it.

Yet they recognize it, and they state that it is a senior situation to various illnesses and accidents. Well, we have the tech of this in more ways than one.

What is this thing called "stress"? It is more than the medico defines it – he usually says it comes from operational or physical shock and in this he has too limited a view.

A person under stress is actually under a suppression on one or more dynamics.

If that suppression is located and the person handles or disconnects, the condition diminishes. If he also has all the engrams and ARC Breaks, problems, overts and withholds audited out triple flow and if **all** such areas of suppression are thus handled, the person would recover from anything caused by "stress".

Usually the person has insufficient understanding of life or any dynamic to grasp his own situation. He is confused. He believes all his illnesses are true because they occur in such heavy books!

At some time he was predisposed to illness or accidents. When a serious suppression then occurred he suffered a precipitation or occurrence of the accident or illness, and then with repeated similar suppressions on the same chain, the illness or tendency to accidents became prolonged or chronic.

To say then that a person is PTS to his current environment would be very limited as a diagnosis. If he continues to do or be something to which the suppressive person or group objected he may become or continue to be ill or have accidents.

Actually the problem of PTS is not very complicated. Once you have grasped the two data first given, the rest of it becomes simply an analysis of how they apply to this particular person. A PTS person can be markedly helped in three ways: (a) gaining an understanding of the tech of the condition (b) discovering to what or to whom he is PTS (c) handling or disconnecting.

Someone with the wish or duty to find and handle PTSs has an additional prior step: He must know how to recognize a PTS and how to handle them when recognized. Thus it is rather a waste of time to engage in this hunt unless one has been checked out on all the material on suppressives and PTSs and grasps it without misunderstands. In other words the first step of the person is to get a grasp of the subject and its tech. This is not difficult to do; it may be a bit more difficult to learn to run an E-Meter and considerably more difficult to learn how to list for items, but there again this is possible and is much easier than trying to grope around guessing.

With this step done, a person has no real trouble recognizing PTS people and can have success in handling them which is very gratifying and rewarding. Let us consider the easiest level of approach:

- I) Give the person the simpler HCO Bs on the subject and let him study them so that he knows the elements like "PTS" and "Suppressive". He may just cognite right there and be much better. It has happened.
- II) Have him discuss the illness or accident or condition, without much prodding or probing, that he thinks now may be the result of suppression. He will usually tell you it is

right here and now or was a short time ago and will be all set to explain it (without any relief) as stemming from his current environment or a recent one. If you let it go at that he would simply be a bit unhappy and not get well as he is discussing usually a late lock that has a lot of earlier material below it.

- III) Ask when he recalls first having that illness or having such accidents. He will at once begin to roll this back and realize that it has happened before. You don't have to be auditing him as he is all too willing to talk about this in a most informal manner. He will get back to some early this-lifetime point usually.
- VI) Now ask him who it was. He will usually tell you promptly. And, as you are not really auditing him and he isn't going backtrace and you are not trying to do more than key him out, you don't probe any further.
- V) You will usually find that he has named a person to whom he is still connected! So you ask him whether he wants to handle or disconnect. Now as the sparks will really fly in his life if he dramatically disconnects and if he can't see how he can, you persuade him to begin to handle on a gradient scale. This may consist of imposing some slight discipline on him such as requiring him to actually answer his mail or write the person a pleasant good roads good weather note or to realistically look at how he estranged them. In short what is required in the handling is a low gradient. All you are trying to do is **move the PTS person from effect over to slight gentle cause**.
- VI) Check with the person again, if he is handling, and coach him along, always at a gentle good roads and good weather level and no H E and R (Human Emotion and Reaction) if you please.

That is a simple handling. You can get complexities such as a person being PTS to an unknown person in his immediate vicinity that he may have to find before he can handle or disconnect. You can find people who can't remember more than a few years back. You can find anything you can find in a case. But simple handling ends when it looks pretty complex. And that's when you call in the auditor.

But this simple handling will get you quite a few stars in your crown. You will be amazed to find that while some of them don't instantly recover, medication, vitamins, minerals will now work when before they wouldn't. You may also get some instant recovers but realize that if they don't you have not failed.

The auditor can do "3 S&Ds" after this with much more effect as he isn't working with a completely uninformed person.

"3 S&Ds" only fail because of wrong items or because the auditor did not then put in triple rudiments on the items and then audit them out as engrams triple flow.

A being is rather complex. He may have a lot of sources of suppression. And it may take a lot of very light auditing to get him up to where he can do work on suppressives since these were, after all, the source of his overwhelm. And what he did to **them** might be more important than what they did to **him** but unless you unburden **him** he may not get around to realizing that.

You can run into a person who can only be handled by Expanded Dianetics.

But you have made an entrance and you have stirred things up and gotten him more aware and just that way you will find he is more at cause.

His illness or proneness to accidents may not be slight. You may succeed only to the point where he now has a chance, by nutrition, vitamins, minerals, medication, treatment, and above all, auditing, of getting well. Unless you jogged this condition, he had no chance at all: for becoming PTS is the first thing that happened to him on the subject of illness or accidents.

Further, if the person has had a lot of auditing and yet isn't progressing too well, your simple handling may all of a sudden cause him to line up his case.

So do not underestimate what you or an auditor can do for a PTS. And don't sell PTS tech short or neglect it. And don't continue to transfer or push off or even worse tolerate PTS conditions in people.

You **can** do something about it.

And so can they.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 15 DECEMBER 1973

Remimeo  
All Levels  
Add Level II Checksheet  
Ethics Officers  
Masters at Arms  
C/Ses

**THE CONTINUOUS MISSED W/H  
AND CONTINUOUS OVERT  
WITH DATA ON DEGRADED BEINGS  
AND FALSE PTS CONDITIONS**

Reference: (1) Tape List and HCOB List of Level II,  
Page 4 HCO PL 26.1.72, Issue VI, concerning Withholds and Overts.  
(2) "Admin Know-How – Alter-Is and Degraded Beings", HCO B 22 Mar 67.

There are two *special* cases of withholds and overts. They do not occur in all cases by a long ways. But they do occur on a few cases. These are **Continuous Missed Withholds and Continuous Overts**.

This is not quite the same as "The Continuing Overt Act" HCO B 29 September 65. In that type the person is repeating overt acts against something usually named.

**THE CONTINUOUS MISSED W/H**

A Continuous Missed Withhold occurs when a person feels some way and anyone who sees him misses it.

Example: A doctor feels very unconfident of his skill. Every patient who sees him misses the fact that he is not confident. This reacts as a missed withhold.

It is of course based upon some bad incident that destroyed his confidence (usually of an engramic intensity).

But as the person actively withholds this, then those seeing him miss the withhold.

This could work in thousands of variations. A woman feels continuous disdain for her child but withholds it. The child therefore continuously misses a withhold. All the phenomena of the missed w/h would continuously react against the child.

Probably all dishonest social conduct brings about a Continuous Missed Withhold. The politician who hates people, the minister who no longer believes in God, the mechanic who privately believes he is a jinx on machinery, these all then set up the phenomena of missed withholds on themselves and can dramatize it in their conduct.

## **THE CONTINUOUS OVERT**

A person who believes he is harmful to others may also believe that many of his common ordinary actions are harmful.

He may feel he is committing a Continuous Overt on others.

Example: A clothing model believes she is committing a fraud on older women by displaying clothing to them in which they will look poorly. In her estimation this is a Continuous Overt Act. Of course all older women miss it on her.

Appearance, just being alive, can be considered by some as an overt.

Missed withhold phenomena will result.

## **DEGRADED BEINGS**

The Continuous Withhold and Continuous Overt are probably a basis of feeling degraded.

Degraded Beings, as described in "Admin Know-How – Alter-Is and Degraded Beings", HCO B 22 Mar 67, are that way at least in part because they have some Continuous Missed Withhold or a fancied Continuous Overt Act.

This makes them feel degraded and act that way.

## **HANDLING**

One can add to any program a check for a Continuous Missed Withhold or Continuous Overt as an additional version of rudiments.

A master question, which could be broken down into three lists which would have to be done by the laws of L&N, would be, "When anyone looks at you what feeling (action, attitude) of yours do they miss?" Then, "When was it missed?" "Who missed it?" and "What did he do that made you believe it had been missed?"

Another approach, less dangerous in that lists aren't made, would be:

For Continuous Missed Withhold the question could be, "Is there some way you feel that others don't realize?" And with 2WC uncover it. Then ask, "Who misses this?" with answer, followed by, "When has someone missed it?" with E/S to an earlier time. Followed by,

"What did he (or she) do that made you think he (or she) knew?" This will key it out and can change behavior.

For Continuous Overt Act it would be, "Is there something you do that others do not know about?" With 2WC to cover it and get what it is. Then ask, "Who has not found out about it?" with an answer. And then, "When did someone almost find out?" "What did he (or she) do that made you think he (or she) knew?"

Each of the above questions should be F/Ned.

## MOTION

People who have Continuous Withholds or Overts tend to be very slow, flubby and impositive. They have to be very careful. And they make mistakes. Slowness or robotness are keys to the presence of Continuous Missed Withholds or Overts.

## PTS

Quite often a case is **falsely labeled PTS** when in fact it is really a matter of Continuous Missed Withholds and Continuous Overts.

When a "PTS" person does not respond to PTS handling easily then you know you are dealing with Continuous Missed Withholds and/or Continuous Overts.

## SUMMARY

These conditions are not present in all cases. When they are you have a Degraded Being. When a "PTS" person does not respond to PTS handling, try Continuous Missed Withholds and Continuous Overts. You can prevent blows, handle much HE and R and change character in this way.

LRH:nt.rd

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 20 APRIL 1972  
Issue II

Remimeo

*C/S Series 78*

**PRODUCT PURPOSE AND WHY AND  
WC ERROR CORRECTION**

Where untrained Auditors are finding Whys for a Danger Formula, or post purposes or post products as called for in the Est O System you will get a certain amount of error and case disturbance. Such upsets also come from word clearing by incompetent persons.

The C/S should look for these especially when such campaigns are in progress. He should suspect them as a possibility when a case bogs.

A C/S must be sure all such papers and worksheets get into pc's folders.

A common repair action is to

1. Do an assessment for type of charge.
2. Handle the charge found by the assessment done.
3. Fly all the reading items found on such assessments by 2WC or direct handling.
4. Suspect **listing errors** on any Why or purpose or product found even though no list exists and reconstruct the list and L4B and handle it.
5. Handle word clearing of *any* type in or out of session with a Word Clear Correction List done in session by an Auditor.
6. When word clearing is too heavy on the pc or doesn't clean up suspect he has been thrown into implants which are mostly words or the words in some engram. As Implants are actually just engrams, handle it with an L3B.

**LISTING**

Any item found out of session or by a non-auditor is suspect of being a Listing and Nulling (L&N) error even though no list was made.

**Today a correct L&N item must BD and F/N.**

So treat such items as you would list errors and try to reconstruct the list and either confirm the item or locate the real item (may have been invalidated and suppressed) or extend the list and get the real item.

The real item will BD F/N.

One can establish what the situation is with a post purpose, a Why or a product or any other such item by doing an L4B.

## SELF AUDITING

The commonest reason for self auditing is a wrong or unfound L&N item.

People can go around and self list or self audit trying to get at the right Why or product or purpose after an error has been made.

## REACTION

**Nothing produces as much case upset as a wrong list item or a wrong list.**

Even, rarely, a **Dianetic List** can produce wrong list reactions. Ask the pc for his somatics and he blows up or goes into apathy. Or blows. Or attacks the auditor.

**All** of the more violent or bad reactions on the part of the pc come from out lists.

Nothing else produces such a sharp deterioration in a case or even illness.

## OUT LISTS

Therefore when one gets a sharp change in a case (like lowered tone, violence, blows, "determination to go on in spite of the supervisor", long notes from pcs, self C/Sing, etc, etc, the C/S **suspects an out list**.

This outness can occur in regular sessions even when the item was said to BD F/N.

It can occur in "Coffee shop" (out of session auditing of someone), or by Est Os or poorly trained or untrained staff members or even in life.

## PTS

When such actions as finding items by non-auditors are done on PTS people the situation can be bad, so one also suspects the person to be PTS to *someone* or *something*.

"PTS" does not communicate well in an assessment question so one says, "Someone or something is hostile to you" and "You are connected to someone or something that doesn't agree with Dianetics or Scientology."

## REPAIRS

The main things to know when doing such repairs are (a) that such situations as wrong lists or upset people can occur in an org where untrained people are also using meters and (b) **that it is up to the C/S to suspect detect and get them handled in regular session.**

Do not ignore the possible bad influence.

As the good outweighs the bad in such cases, it is not a correct answer to forbid such actions.

It is a correct answer to require all such actions and worksheets become part of the folder.

One can also persuade the D of T or Qual to gen in the people doing such actions. And do not ignore the effect such actions can have on cases and do not neglect to include them in C/Ses before going on with the regular program.

They can all be repaired.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:nt.rd



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 17 MARCH 1974

Remimeo

## TWC CHECKSHEETS

### TWC, USING WRONG QUESTIONS

Two Way Comm is not an art. It is a science which has exact rules.

Foremost in the rules is:

**Don't use a Listing Question in Two Way Comm.**

By a "listing question" is meant any question which directly or indirectly calls for items in the pc's answer.

Use of "who", "what", "which" instantly turns a TWC into a listing question.

Listing questions are governed by the rules of Listing and Nulling.

If you use a listing question accidentally in TWC you can get the same bad reactions from a pc that you would get on a wrongly done list.

The reason for pc upsets in TWC is hidden as it is not apparently a listing process, rarely gets the correction a bad list would get.

Asking "who" or "what" or "which" during a TWC after the main question can also turn it into a Listing and Nulling process.

TWC questions **must** be limited to feelings, reactions, significances. They must **never** ask for terminals or locations.

**Example:** "Who upset you?" in TWC causes the pc to give items. This is a **List**. "What are you upset about?" does the same thing. "Which town were you happiest in?" is also a **Listing** question **not** a TWC question. Any of these results in the pc giving items. They are not then nulled or correctly indicated. The pc can get **very** upset just as he would with a wrong list. Yet the session is not a "listing session" so never gets corrected.

**Example:** "How are you doing lately?" is an example of a correct TWC question. It gets off charge and gets no list items. "Are you better these days than you used to be?" "How have you been since the last session?"

"What happened" is different than "What illness", "What person", "What town" which are listing questions.

## **REPAIR**

When other things fail to locate the upset of a pc look into TWC processes in the folder and treat them as L&N processes where the pc has answered with items. The relief is magical.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:ntm.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 17 APRIL 1972

Remimeo

*C/S Series 76*

**C/Sing A PTS RUNDOWN**

Ref:	HCO B 9 Dec 71	PTS Rundown
	HCO B 20 Jan 72	PTS Rundown Addition
	HCO B 13 Feb 72 II	PTS RD Additional LRH Data
	HCO PL 5 Apr 72	PTS Type A Handling
	HCO B 16 Apr 72	PTS Correction List
	HCO B 17 Apr 72	C/Sing a PTS RD (this HCO B)

Any subsequent issues.

The whole point of a PTS Rundown is to make a person *not PTS any longer*.

The point is not to just run some processes. It is to have a person all right now.

To really understand this rundown, one would have to know what PTS is in the first place and why one was doing the rundown.

This would apply to the auditor as well as the C/S.

PTS means **Potential Trouble Source**. It means someone connected to a person or group opposed to Scientology.

It is a **technical** thing.

It results in illness and rollercoaster and **is** the **cause** of illness and rollercoaster.

When you do a PTS RD on a pc **correctly** he or she should no longer be ill or rollercoaster.

**But this includes the person handling his PTS condition in the real universe not in just his bank.**

An auditor and C/S must see that the person is:

- (a) Handled properly in HCO or by the DofP if HCO isn't there so that the person handles the PTS **connection** itself. (SEE HCO PL 5 APRIL 72, "PTS TYPE A HANDLING".)
- (b) Do the RD correctly (see reference HCO Bs above).
- (c) DofP Interview the person **after** the RD is "complete" to be sure the person is now all right (not PTS).

- (d) Watch the person's folder for any new signs of illness and rollercoaster and if these occur find out what was missed by assessing PTS RD CORRECTION LIST. (See HCO B 16 April 72.)
- (e) Handling the PTS RD CORR LIST.
- (f) Re-interviewing to be sure the person is all right now.

## DATA

Anyone handling or auditing or C/Sing PTS cases should have done the **Pack "PTS, SP TECH"** Pack 1 & Pack 2 which are based on HCO PL 31 May 71 which is the **checksheet** for available tech and policy on this subject.

To this checksheet (HCO PL 31 May 71) must be added these issues:

HCO B 9 Dec 71	PTS Rundown
HCO B 20 Jan 72	PTS Rundown Addition
HCO B 13 Feb 72 II	PTS RD Additional LRH Data
HCO PL 5 Apr 72	PTS Type A Handling
HCO B 16 Apr 72	PTS Correction List
HCO B 17 Apr 72	C/SING A PTS RD (this HCO B)
Any subsequent issues.	

## PTS SITUATIONS

The hardest thing to get across about a PTS situation is that it **is** the reason for continued illness and rollercoaster (loss of gains).

The condition *does* exist. It is in fact common.

We *do* have the auditing tech to handle now.

The material has to be applied correctly just like any other material.

The reason we do the rundown is not to do some sessions or sell some auditing or just explain why the person is like that. We do the rundown so the person will no longer be PTS.

*The (EP) End Phenomenon of the PTS RD is attained when the person is well and stable.*

As a C/S you **must** put a **yellow tab** marked PTS on a PTS PC Folder that stays on until the person is **no longer PTS**.

If you do **not** do this there will be about 25% of your pcs or more that **you will be in continual trouble with!** Because you will be C/Sing auditing for a person who is PTS, will be ill, will rollercoaster because the person has NOT been handled to EP on being PTS.

These people, by the way, will tell you, "Oh, I'm not PTS." "But your father is suing the org." "Oh yes, I know, but it doesn't bother me. Besides my illness is from something I ate

last year. And I rollercoaster because I don't like the Examiner. But I'm not PTS." The mystery is solved when you find they haven't a clue what the letters mean or what the condition is, so give them a copy of HCO PL 5 Apr 72 and let them read it. If they still want to know more give them HCO PL 23 Dec 65. (Remembering it has to be Word Cleared Method 4 or he won't have a clue even if he reads it.)

We are on no campaign to rid the world of suppressives when we are handling a PTS pc. But facts are facts and tech is tech.

In handling a PTS person as a C/S you are on a borderline of policy violation unless you make the person do what it says in HCO PL 5 April 72 first. That handles the situation itself. Then you can handle the person with the PTS Rundown.

It is a great rundown. Like any other it has a standard way of going about it.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:mes.rd



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 20 JANUARY 1972R  
Revised 8 December 1978

(Revisions in this type style)  
(Ellipsis indicates deletion)

Remimeo  
Class IV Grad Checksheet  
Class VI Checksheet  
C/Ses  
Class IV Grad and  
above Auditors  
Ethics Officers

## PTS RD ADDITION

(Refers to: HCOB 9 DEC 71R PTS RUNDOWN, AUDITED)

The only reasons a PTS RD does not work are:

- |                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| C/S error:           | 1. Not doing one at all.   |
| C/S error:           | 2. Doing one in the middle of another RD.  |
| C/S error:           | 3. Doing one without set-up, including a complete PTS C/S-1.   |
| C/S error:           | 4. The person was not PTS – which is to say was not chronically ill or roller-coaster and the items or flows didn't read.                |
| Auditor error:       | 5. The RD was badly run auditor-wise. R3R was bad, metering poor, ruds not correctly or fully done.                                      |
| Auditor & C/S error: | 6. The RD was quickie, only doing step (a) and brushing it off.  |
| C/S error:           | 7. Even though the whole RD was done fully, there remained on the case an undetected additional person or thing to which the pc was PTS. |

The rules of PTS are

**A person who roller-coasters is always PTS.**

**A person who is chronically ill always is PTS.**

**A Pts rundown that does not work has not been done as per 1 to 7 above.**

The remedies to the above are

1. Do it.
2. Pgm it in correct sequence.

3. Set the case up properly so it is running well and past errors handled.
  4. Establish how well the person holds his gains before pgming one. If any Q at all, do the RD.
  5. Cram the auditor on TRs, metering, R3RA drills and ruds. Do L4BRA,... L3RF on the pc and handle accordingly.
  6. Complete the rundown.
  7. 2WC "What is your attention on?" to F/N. On PTS Rundown fly all ruds single; L&N "On the PTS Rundown what being or thing was missed?"; R3RA Triple or Quad on it; fly all ruds and overts on it Triple or Quad; run "Can't Have/Enforce Have" Triple or Quad. If all not very okay now L&N "What other subject or people might have been overlooked on the PTS Rundown?" and handle the item on each step of the rundown per HCOB 9 Dec 71RC, Rev. 8 Dec 78 PTS RUNDOWN.
- 

A PTS RD *always* works. If it works with a relapse there is an error in it as in the numbered paras above.

**This is vital tech to the pc. It makes the most difficult cases fly if it is done right.**

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:mes.bh.jk

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 16 APRIL 1972

Remimeo

**PTS RD CORRECTION LIST**

(Reference HCO B 17 Apr 72  
"C/Sing the PTS Rundown"  
C/S Series 76)

This Correction List is assessed and handled after a PTS Rundown has been done on the pc.

It also serves as a checklist of expected actions with the Rundown.

The handlings are given below the assessing statements in each instance.

The list is Always Done Method 5 (All assessed then handled).

1. You have been physically ill after auditing. \_\_\_\_\_  
(If this happened after a PTS RD the RD is not complete.  
2WC to F/N then find what was incomplete.)
2. You lost the gains achieved in auditing. \_\_\_\_\_  
(Same as 1 above.)
3. You are still in communication with a person or group that does  
not like Scientology. \_\_\_\_\_  
(Have HCO handle per P/L 5 Apr 72 or if HCO does not act handle  
with D of P or Tech Sec.)
4. You know someone who disagrees with what you are doing. \_\_\_\_\_  
(See 3 above.)
5. You handled the whole situation completely. \_\_\_\_\_  
(If reads, 2WC to F/N.)
6. You only said it was handled. \_\_\_\_\_  
(2WC to F/N, give pc P/L 23 Dec 65 and P/L 5 Apr 72 and  
Method 4 WC them and report it to the D of P for further handling.)
7. You don't understand the situation. \_\_\_\_\_  
(See 6 above.)
8. You don't believe there is a situation. \_\_\_\_\_  
(2WC to F/N and probably handling as 6 above. It could be there  
is no situation now.)
9. You didn't want to handle it and protested. \_\_\_\_\_  
(2WC to F/N. See 6 above.)

10. It can't be handled anyway.  
(2WC to F/N and see 6 above.) \_\_\_\_\_
11. There was something wrong with the auditing or auditor.  
(Find what and do L1C, L3B or L4B as indicated.) \_\_\_\_\_
12. There was earlier bad auditing.  
(Wasn't set up. Repair Pgm.) \_\_\_\_\_
13. You were given the PTS Rundown in the middle of another  
incomplete rundown.  
(2WC to F/N. Complete the incomplete RD then verify the PTS RD.) \_\_\_\_\_
14. You weren't PTS in the first place.  
(Find out if the pc was connected to SPs or an SP group in actual  
fact. Possibly still is but misinterpreting "PTS". If so do 6.) \_\_\_\_\_
15. The feelings about the people you were audited on are still there.  
(2WC to F/N. L1C, L4B, L3B as indicated. Complete the RD.) \_\_\_\_\_
16. The PTS Rundown was not complete.  
(2WC to F/N. Sort out Case on PTS RD Addition HCO B 20 Jan 72.) \_\_\_\_\_
17. You still feel PTS.  
(See 16.) \_\_\_\_\_
18. You still can't hold onto your auditing gains.  
(See 16.) \_\_\_\_\_
19. You were ill after the RD.  
(See 16.) \_\_\_\_\_
20. You feel more upset than ever.  
(See 16.) \_\_\_\_\_
21. There is still an additional person that wasn't detected.  
(See 16.) \_\_\_\_\_
22. You were told to attest but were still PTS.  
(See 16.) \_\_\_\_\_
23. You decided you were PTS when you weren't.  
(2WC to F/N. Handle as indicated by Data pc gives.) \_\_\_\_\_
24. You said a person was suppressive who really wasn't.  
(See 23.) \_\_\_\_\_
25. There is a situation that has not been disclosed.  
(2WC to F/N. Get full data. C/S accordingly.) \_\_\_\_\_
26. There were lies told.  
(See 25.) \_\_\_\_\_
27. You don't agree about all this.  
(See 25.) \_\_\_\_\_
28. Your condition was really caused by something else.  
(See 25.) \_\_\_\_\_

29. There were misunderstood words.  
(See 25.) \_\_\_\_\_
30. Everything was all right in the first place.  
(See 25.) \_\_\_\_\_
31. There were list errors.  
(L4B.) \_\_\_\_\_
32. There were engram errors.  
(L3B.) \_\_\_\_\_
33. There were auditor errors.  
(L1C.) \_\_\_\_\_
34. You now feel okay.  
(2WC to F/N.) \_\_\_\_\_

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH: mes.rd



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 27 JULY 1976

Remimeo  
**All Auditors**

**PTS RUNDOWN AND VITAL INFO RD  
POSITION CORRECTED**

It has just come to my attention that HCOB 9 December 1971RA and HCOB 6 October 1974, which were written by then CS-4, restricted,. PTS handling and Vital Info RD to Expanded Dianetics which is a false position.

The PTS Checksheet is Board Policy Letter 31 May 1971RB. That checksheet **must** be studied and passed by **all** staff concerned with PTS handling whether in HCO or in Div 4 or Div 5. In short, **that** is the actual position on the grade chart or in classes of the PTS Run-down.

When listing has to be done to handle a PTS person or to find a why or who, on PTS RDs or anything else, it is dangerous for anyone but a Class IV who has been interned to do it. **that** is a matter of who can do listing. It is **not** a matter of where the pc is on the grade chart.

**You have to handle those who are PTS as PTSes before you can audit them successfully.**

**Anyone handling PTS people must have passed and been certified on the PTS Checksheet, BPL 31 May 1971RB.**

The errors put in these two HCOBs have caused orgs and the field to fill up with PTSes which went unhandled. You cannot audit a PTS person on anything but what handles PTSness.

The HCOBs are being reissued as HCOB 9 December 1971RB and HCOB 6 October 1974R to correct the error of placing PTS RD in Expanded Dianetics where it does not belong and placing the Vital Info RD in Expanded Dianetics.

A mission that worked more than a year correcting HCOBs that were marked as written by me but weren't and reissuing as Board Technical Bulletins missed these. They otherwise did well. The person who wrote the originals found them and called it to attention as an error.

**Please correct this in all packs.**

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:nt



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 31 DECEMBER 1978  
Issue III

Class III and above  
Auditors  
Word Clearers  
HCO  
Tech/Qual  
C/Ses  
PTS/SP Detection,  
Routing and Handling  
Course  
Ethics Officers  
Class IV Grad Check-  
sheet

**EDUCATING THE POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE,  
THE FIRST STEP TOWARD HANDLING: PTS C/S-1**

Ref:	BPL 5 Apr 72RC I	PTS TYPE A HANDLING
	BTB 11 Nov 77	HANDLING PTS SITUATIONS
	HCOB 24 Apr 72 I	PTS INTERVIEWS
	HCOB 10 Aug 73	PTS HANDLING
	HCOB 27 Sep 66	THE ANTI-SOCIAL PERSONALITY THE ANTI-SCIENTOLOGIST
	HCOB 28 Nov 70	PSYCHOSIS
	HCOB 24 Nov 65	SEARCH AND DISCOVERY
	HCOB 12 Mar 68	MISTAKES, ANATOMY OF
	HCOB 9 Nov 67	REVISION OF REMEDY A. REMEDY B AND S AND Ds
	HCOB 5 Feb 66 III	S AND D WARNING
	HCOB 9 Dec 71RC	PTS RUNDOWN, AUDITED
	HCOB 20 Jan 72R	PTS RUNDOWN ADDITION
	HCOB 3 Jun 72RA	PTS RUNDOWN, FINAL STEP
	HCOB 29 Dec 78	THE SUPPRESSED PERSON RUNDOWN
	HCOB 30 Dec 78	SUPPRESSED PERSON RUNDOWN – PROBLEMS PROCESSES
	HCOB 31 Dec 78 II	OUTLINE OF PTS HANDLING

When you find you have a potential trouble source on your hands the very first thing you must do is educate him on the fundamentals of PTS/SP tech.

*Do not* begin any other PTS handling on any PTS person until he has completed the basic education steps of the PTS C/S-1 given in this HCOB.

In the absence of education into the basics of PTS tech you will have PTS students and pcs asserting they're not PTS, you will have upsets. protest, recurrences of "once handled" PTSness. PTSes will not cognite, will not take action to handle the antagonistic terminal, will

not recover. Failure to educate simply doesn't work. So a very thorough job must be done at this point to guarantee the success of any PTS handlings which follow.

Now people and circumstances and PTS sits vary, and you may wish to carry the education steps of the PTS person beyond what is given here before you begin any other handling on him. I will leave that to your educated judgment. However, the steps of the PTS C/S-1 given in this HCOB must be done on all PTS students and pcs *before any sort of PTS Interview or 10 August handling or any PTS auditing is undertaken.*

The person should, of course, study the complete PTS/SP Detection, Routing and Handling Course so that he understands the full mechanics that had been upsetting his life, but the PTS C/S-1 will give sufficient data and understanding so that he or she can begin handling the PTS scene.

### PTS C/S-1

The following PTS C/S-1 is not a long action and can and should be accomplished speedily. Its purpose is to give to any PTS student or pc the necessary data and R-Factor on the basics of PTS/SP tech so that he understands and is able and willing to successfully handle his PTS situation. It can be done by an auditor, in session, or in the course room under the supervision of the Word Clearer and Course Supervisor.

Note: Some pcs and students who have been trained or who have in the past received PTS handling may protest that they know the terms and issues. If this happens acknowledge with excellent TRs and without invalidation or evaluation and tell them that this action is intended to make PTS handling effective for all and is a required step of the handling. If the auditor or Word Clearer uses excellent TRs and a good R-Factor, no ARC breaks will occur and the person will have tremendous wins.

The auditor or Word Clearer should be fully familiar with this issue as well as all issues in the PTS/SP Course pack. He will need to take a very thorough look at what has to be covered with the pc in this C/S-1 and know his materials very well and have them ready for reference and clearing any misunderstands or questions the pc may have.

The following will be needed:

- Technical Dictionary
- Admin Dictionary
- A good English Dictionary
- A good dictionary in the pc or student's native language, and for a foreign language case a dual dictionary (English-to-foreign language and foreign language itself).
- PTS and SP Definitions Sheet – Attachment No. I of this issue
- Demo kit

A. Have the pc define each term, using the reference. (Note: you don't ask: "Do you know what this word means?" You ask: "What is the definition of?"

When the pc has told you the definition, have him give you a sentence or two using the term correctly. Where it applies, have him give you examples, using his experiences or those of others. Have him demo with a demo kit. Cover by exact definition all terms used and take each term defined to an F/N.

- B. Check for any questions (or misunderstandings) as you go along and ensure any such get handled so the pc or student winds up with a clear understanding of the word.

Don't settle for glibness that does not show understanding, but on the other hand, don't overrun or put duress on the pc or student, either.

Ensure each word cleared is taken to F/N.

### PTS C/S-1 PROCEDURE

1. Give the R-Factor that you are going to clear the basic words and concepts concerning PTSness.
2. Clear the word **Affinity**. Have the pc or student demo its meaning.
3. Clear the word **Reality**. Have the pc or student give you sentences and examples showing his understanding.
4. Clear the word **Communication**. Have the pc or student demo its meaning.
5. Clear **ARC Break**. Have the pc or student demo what an ARC break is.
6. Clear **Problem**. Have the pc or student demo a problem.
7. Clear **Withhold**. Have the pc or student give you an example of a withhold.
8. Clear **Missed Withhold**. Have the pc or student demo a missed withhold.
9. Clear **Postulate**. Ask the pc or student if he's ever postulated anything. Have him tell you about it.
10. Clear **Counter** (the prefix).
11. Have the pc or student demo several examples of a postulate and a counter-postulate.
12. Clear **hostile. Antagonism**.
13. Clear **Suppress**. Have the pc Or student demo several different examples of how someone or something could be suppressed.
14. Clear **Suppression**. Have the pc or student give you examples of suppression from movies he's seen or books he's read or suppression he's seen or experienced.
15. Clear **Suppressive Person**. Have the pc or student demo the definitions.
16. Clear **Suppressive Groups**.
17. Clear **Roller-Coaster**. Have the pc or student demo roller-coaster. Ask him if he's ever been around anyone who roller-coastered. Let him tell you about it briefly if he wishes.

18. Clear **Potential Trouble Source** (PTS). Have the pc or student demo this well. (If this step is being done by a Word Clearer in the course room, end off at this point and send the pc or student to the Examiner. Then, get him started on the Study Section. If being done in session, the auditor may continue with the Study Section. )

### STUDY SECTION

19. The following issues are to be read by the PTS student or pc, word cleared Method 4 and starrated. This may be done in a course room, under the super-vision of the Course Supervisor or in session with an auditor.

HCOB 27 Sep 66	THE ANTI-SOCIAL PERSONALITY THE ANTI-SCIENTOLOGIST
HCOB 28 Nov 70	PSYCHOSIS
HCOB 24 Nov 65	SEARCH AND DISCOVERY
HCOB 12 Mar 68	MISTAKES, ANATOMY OF
BPL 5 Apr 72RC I	PTS TYPE A HANDLING
BTB 11 Nov 77	HANDLING PTS SITUATIONS
HCOB 24 Apr 72 I	PTS INTERVIEWS
HCOB 10 Aug 73	PTS HANDLING

20. End off and send the pc or student to the Examiner. Route the pc's folder with all worksheets to the C/S who will examine them for thoroughness and completeness and then order the person's next step.

---

Educating a PTS person is the key to putting him at cause over the PTS sit. Do this PTS C/S-1 thoroughly and well. It is not to be considered a substitute for the full PTS/SP Detection, Routing and Handling Course, but will set up the PTS student or pc for a highly successful PTS handling. These you get him signed up for the course.

PTS tech is highly effective and powerful. Get the most out of it by applying it properly, with **education** as the first step.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:jk

## PTS C/S-1 DEFINITIONS SHEET

### ***AFFINITY***

Degree of liking or affection or lack of it. Affinity is a tolerance of distance. A great affinity would be a tolerance of or liking of close proximity. A lack of affinity would be an intolerance of or dislike of close proximity. Affinity is one of the components of understanding; the other components being reality and communication. (Dianetics Today, Glossary)

### ***REALITY***

The degree of agreement reached by two ends of a communication line. In essence, it is the degree of duplication achieved between cause and effect. That which is real is real simply because it is agreed upon, and for no other reason. (Tech Dict)

### ***COMMUNICATION***

"The interchange of ideas or objects between two people or terminals. More precisely the definition of communication is the consideration and action of impelling an impulse or particle from source point across a distance to receipt point, with the intention of bringing into being at the receipt point a duplication and understanding of that which emanated from the source point." "The formula of communication is: Cause, Distance, Effect, with Intention, Attention and Duplication with Understanding." "Communication by definition does not need to be two-way. Communication is one of the component parts of understanding." (Tech Dict; HCOB 5 Apr 73 Reiss. 19 Sep 74 AXIOM 28 AMENDED; Dianetics Today, Glossary)

### ***ARC BREAK***

A sudden drop or cutting of one's affinity, reality, or communication with someone or something. Upsets with people or things come about because of a lessening or sundering of affinity, reality, or communication or understanding. It's called an ARC break instead of an upset, because, if one discovers which of the three points of understanding have been cut, one can bring about a rapid recovery in the person's state of mind. It is pronounced by its letters A-R-C break. (Tech Dict)

### ***PROBLEM***

Anything which has opposing sides of equal force; especially postulate-counter-postulate, intention-counter-intention or idea-counter-idea; and intention-counter-intention that worries the preclear (Dianetics Today Glossary)

### ***OVERT***

1. ... An aggressive or destructive act by the individual against one or more of the eight dynamics (self, family, group, mankind, animals or plants, mest, life or the infinite). (Dianetics Today, Glossary)

2. That thing which you do which you aren't willing to have happen to you. (Tech Dict)

### ***WITHHOLD***

An undisclosed harmful (contra-survival) act. (Dianetics Today, Glossary)

### ***MISSED WITHHOLD***

An undisclosed contra-survival act which has been restimulated by another but not disclosed. This is a withhold which another person nearly found out about, leaving the person with the withhold in a state of wondering whether his hidden deed is known or not. (Dianetics Today, Glossary)

### ***POSTULATE***

1. To conclude, decide or resolve a problem or to set a pattern for the future or to nullify a pattern of the past. (Tech Dict)

2. That self-determined thought which starts, stops or changes past, present or future efforts. (Tech Dict)

3. In Scientology the word postulate means to cause a thinkingness or consideration. It is a specially applied word and is defined as causative thinkingness. (Tech Dict)

### ***COUNTER***

1. Opposition, as in direction or purpose; for example countermarch, counteract. (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language)

### ***HOSTILE***

1. Of or pertaining to an enemy. (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language)

2. Feeling or showing enmity; antagonistic. (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language)

### ***ANTAGONISM***

1. Mutual resistance; opposition; hostility. (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language.)

2. The condition of being an opposing principle, force or factor. (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language)

### ***SUPPRESS***

1. To squash, to sit on, to make smaller, to refuse to let reach, to make uncertain about his reaching, to render or lessen in any way possible by any means possible, to the harm of the individual and for the fancied protection of a suppressor. (Tech Dict)

### ***SUPPRESSION***

1. Suppression is "a harmful intention or action against which one cannot fight back." Thus when one can do anything about it, it is less suppressive. (Tech Dict)

### ***SUPPRESSIVE PERSON***

1. A person with certain behavior characteristics and who suppresses other people in his vicinity and those other people when he suppresses them become PTS or potential trouble sources. (Tech Dict)

2. A person who has had a counter-postulate to the pc you are handling. (Tech Dict)

3. Is one that actively seeks to suppress or damage Scientology or a Scientologist by suppressive acts. (Tech Dict)

### ***SUPPRESSIVE GROUPS***

1. Are defined as those which seek to destroy Scientology or which specialize in injuring or killing persons or damaging their cases or which advocate suppression of mankind. (Tech Dict)

### ***ROLLER-COASTER***

1. A case that betters and worsens. A roller-coaster is always connected to a suppressive person and will not get steady gains until the suppressive is found on the case or the basic suppressive person earlier. Because the case doesn't get well he or she is a potential trouble source to us, to others and to himself. (Tech Dict)

2. Gets better, gets worse, gets better, gets worse. (Tech Dict)

### ***POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE***

1. Somebody who is connected with an SP who is invalidating him, his beingness, his processing, his life. (Tech Dict)

2. It means someone connected to a person or a group opposed to Scientology. It is a technical thing. It results in illness and roller-coaster and is the cause of illness and roller-coaster. (Tech Dict)

3. The PTS guy is fairly obvious. He's here, he's way up today and he's way down tomorrow and he gets a beautiful session and then he gets terribly ill. That's the history of his life. (Modern Management Technology Defined)

4. The mechanism of PTS is environmental menace that keeps something continually keyed-in. This can be a constant recurring somatic or continual, recurring pressure or a mass. The menace in the environment is not imaginary in such extreme cases. The action can be taken to key it out. But if the environmental menace is actual and persists it will just key-in again. This gives recurring pressure unrelieved by usual processing. (Modern Management Technology Defined)

### ***SEARCH AND DISCOVERY***

1. Search and discovery of suppression is called an "S and D." It locates the suppressive on the case. (HCOB 9 Nov 67, REVISION OF REMEDY A, REMEDY B AND S AND Ds)

"Remember that the real suppressive person (SP) was the one that wove a dangerous environment around the pc. To find that person is to open up the pc's present time perception or space. It's like pulling a wrapping of wool off the pc.

"The SP persuaded or caused the pc to believe the environment was dangerous and that it was always dangerous and so made the pc pull in and occupy less space and reach less.

"When the SP is really located and indicated the pc feels this impulse not to reach diminish and so his space opens up.

"The difference between a safe environment and a dangerous environment is only that a person is willing to reach and expand in a safe environment and reaches less and contracts in a dangerous environment.

"An SP wants the other person to reach less. Sometimes this is done by forcing the person to reach into danger and get hurt so that the person will thereafter reach less.

"The SP wants smaller, less powerful beings. The SP thinks that if another became powerful that one would attack the SP.

"The SP is totally insecure and is battling constantly in covert ways to make others less powerful and less able." (HCOB 5 Feb 66 S AND D WARNING)

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 7 MAY 1969  
ISSUE VI

Remimeo  
CI VIII  
Dianetic Course

(Revision of HCOB 1 September 1968)

**SUMMARY OF HOW TO WRITE AN AUDITOR'S REPORT,  
WORKSHEETS AND SUMMARY REPORT, WITH SOME  
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**AUDITOR'S REPORT**

An Auditor's Report should contain:

Date  
Name of Auditor  
Name of Pc  
Condition of Pc  
Length of Session  
Time Session started and ended  
TA at beginning and end of Session  
Rudiments  
What Process was run – **listing the exact commands** (often forgotten by most auditors)  
Time of Start and End of Process  
Whether Process is flat or not  
Any F/Ns.

**WORK SHEETS**

A Work Sheet is supposed to be the complete running record of the session from beginning to end. The Auditor should not be skipping from one page to another but should just be writing page after page as the session goes along.

A Work Sheet is always foolscap, 8 x 13 inches, written on both sides and each page is numbered. Pc's name is written on each separate sheet.

A Work Sheet may be in 2 columns depending on how big the writing is of the Auditor.

When the session is completed, the Work Sheets are put in proper sequence and stapled with the Auditor's Report Form on top from beginning to end of session.

TA and time notations should be made at *regular* intervals throughout the session.

When making a list on a Pc:

1. Always mark a read as it reads – F. LF. BD.
2. Always circle the reading item. Mark if indicated to the Pc with *IND*.
3. Always when extending a list put in a line from where it has been extended, e.g.

Joe

Shoes

Socks

\_\_\_\_\_ extended

Sky

Wax

Pigs, etc., etc.

NOTE: When you repair an old auditing session you *always* write on the old auditing report and W/sheets in a *different coloured pen* with the date of the-report.

When running various processes in a session, mark each F/N clearly noting time and TA.

## SUMMARY REPORT

A Summary Report is written exactly as per HCOB 17 March 1969, "Summary Report".

Two gross goofs I have noticed since case supervising folders on the RSM is that Auditors have not been turning in Ethics cases to the MAA. In one instance, a Pc was audited by 2 auditors in 2 different sessions, got a R/S on crimes against Scientologists and M/W/Hs and neither auditor turned the Pc in to Ethics. This is not the only instance. The second thing is that Auditors are very evaluative of the Pc's case as indicated by their comments on the Summary Report. This is incorrect; this report is used simply as an exact record of what happened during the session. It is not up to the auditor to evaluate the Pc's Case, this is the Case Supervisor's job. The auditor may suggest what is to be run, at which time the Case Supervisor will review the session, what was run, how the Pc went in relation to what was being run and then give his directions.

Auditor Report Forms or W/sheets are never recopied. The Auditor should always read over his W/sheets before turning in folder to the Case Supervisor and, if any words or letters are missing or cannot be read, they should be written in with a different coloured pen.

If these rules are followed it will make the Case Supervisor's job much much easier and auditors' reports more valuable.

To add the obvious, it is a **crime** to give any session or assist without making an Auditor's Report or to copy the original actual report after the session and submit a copy instead of the real report. Assist reports that use only contact or touch assists may be written after a session and sent to Qual.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:jp.an.cs.ei.cden



BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN  
6 NOVEMBER 1972R  
Issue V

Revised & Reissued 28 July 1974 as BTB  
(Revision in this type sty/e)

Remimeo

CANCELS  
HCO BULLETIN OF 6 NOVEMBER 1972  
Issue V, SAME TITLE

(Attach to this *BTB* – *BTB* 20 June 70,  
"Summary Report".)

*Auditor Admin Series 12R*

## THE SUMMARY REPORT FORM

The Summary Report Form is a report used simply as an exact record of what happened and what was observed during the session.

The form BTB 20 June 70, "SUMMARY REPORT" is used and the Auditor fills in the appropriate data.

### USE OF SUMMARY REPORTS

With the introduction of C/S Series THE FANTASTIC NEW HGC LINE, Summary Report Forms were omitted from the admin procedure at Flag.

However, the use of Summary Report Forms is left entirely to the discretion of the C/S of an Org.

They *are* used extensively in training.

**Every student auditor on courses and co-audit must write a summary report form after each session.**

It is a tool for increasing an Auditor's obnosis of what goes on in a session. It teaches Auditors how to quickly and concisely analyze and report on a case.

### FILLING IN THE REPORT

The Summary Report Form is filled in as follows:

1. The date.
2. The pc's name and the Auditor's name, in BLOCK letters.

3. The process run, the total tone arm action for the session and the length of the session in hours and minutes.
  4. Goals are no longer set at the beginning of session but if the pc in passing mentions any goals he has attained, or more likely gains he has had in the session, these are noted at this point.
  5. Aspects of running process – each of the questions 1 to 22 of the form are answered. Here write down briefly what the preclear was doing in the session. Do not write opinions with regard to what was happening or how the preclear was running the process. Here we are interested in the aspects of the case in relationship to the process or processes being run.
  6. Ethics Report
  7. Suggest
- } These are written on the Auditor's C/S Sheet per C/S Series 25.

The Summary should be done for the session given the preclear for the day. It is not stapled to the worksheets but is paper-clipped on top of the Auditor's Report Form and beneath the Exam Report.

Two sessions in one day calls for only one Summary Report with the TA and data of each session.

It should be **legible** and **readable**. If an Auditor's handwriting is poor, it should be printed out by the Auditor.

Writing the reports should only take the Auditor 15 minutes to do at the most. Having just audited the preclear you should quite easily fill the report out.

<i>References:</i>	HCO B 14 June 65	"Summary Report"
	HCO B 7 May 69	"Summary of How to Write an Auditor's Report"
	HCO B 5 Mar 71	"C/S Series 25, The Fantastic New HGC Line"
	BTB 20 June 70	"Summary Report"

Compiled by  
Training & Services Bur

Revised & Reissued as BTB  
by Flag Mission 1234  
I/C: CPO Andrea Lewis  
2nd: Molly Harlow

Authorized by AVU  
for the  
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS  
of the  
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:HE:AL:MH:MM:mh.rd.jh

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN  
6 NOVEMBER 1972R  
Issue VII

Remimeo

Revised & Reissued 25 July 1974 as BTB

Cancels  
HCO Bulletin of 6 November 1972  
Issue VII, Same Title

(The only revision is under *Content Of Worksheet*:  
"G. Reads" was added.)

***Auditor Admin Series 14R***

**THE WORKSHEETS**

The Worksheets are the sheets on which the Auditor writes a complete running record of the session from beginning to end, page after page, as the session goes along.

A Worksheet is always foolscap, 8 x 13 inches, written on both sides and each page is numbered, back and front, top center of page.

This is so an Auditor can say, "Now the R/S occurred on page 25," which saves a lot of time. Further it gives the proper number of pages the session went.

The Worksheet is written in two columns. The Auditor writes down the left-hand column and then down the right-hand column.

**CONTENT OF WORKSHEET**

The most important parts of the session to be noted are:

- A. When the TA goes up (on what?)
- B. When the TA goes down (on what?)
- C. When an F/N occurs (on what – any cog?)
- D. When VGIs occur (on what?)
- E. When BIs occur (on what?)
- F. How the process ran (what commands are being run?)
- G. Reads

TA and time notations should be made at regular intervals throughout the session.

When a process reaches EP – write in the pc's cognition, circle the F/N and whether or not it was indicated, note the pc's indicators, the time and TA.

When Two-Way Comming a subject it is essential that all items (terminals, statements, etc) that read are so marked on the worksheets – LF, LFBD. All reading items are circled in green after the session.

R/S items, Ethics situations, Ser Facs and Evil Purps are marked, after the session, by ringing them on the W/S with a red pen.

## SHORTHANDING

Auditors usually develop a system of shorthand the session actions being done, so that session speed is not hampered by Admin.

For example, the repetitive process:

Recall a change Recall a no-change Recall a failed change is run as a bracket (the pc is given the first command, then the second and then the third and then the first and then the second, etc.).

The first command can be abbreviated to 1, the second to 2, and the third to 3.

The W/S therefore would look like:

12 <sup>32</sup>	2.8	
a ✓		
failed ✓		
change ✓		
no-change ✓		
recall ✓	F/N	
1.		
cleared		
2.		
cleared		
3.		
cleared		

(note that each word of the command is cleared before clearing the command as a whole)

12<sup>49</sup>

2.6

1. Mother went on holiday

2. at school

3. didn't sell bike

1. moved to new house

2. etc.

After the session when the commands are written out in full on the Auditor's Report Form, the numbers are again noted so that the C/S can refer to them.

**Whatever system of abbreviation is used by the auditor, the worksheet must communicate to the c/s what actions were taken during the session.**

### LEGIBILITY

Worksheets should be written legibly. They are never recopied.

The Auditor should always read over his W/sheets before turning in the folder to the Case Supervisor and if any words or letters are missing or cannot be read, they should be put in in block print, in red.

Example:

TOTALLY ← (red)

want to get TΘΣΔΛΛΨ well



(illegible word)

This can be overdone, to the extent that it is almost sarcasm. At the most it should just run into one or two corrections to a page. If the Auditor is having to correct the page more than that he should learn how to write rapidly and legibly. See HCOB 3 Nov 71, C/S Series 66, "Auditor's Worksheets", which also appears as Auditor Admin Series 15 and comes next in this series.

## NECESSITY OF WORKSHEETS

It is a **crime** to give any session without making an Auditor's Report (i.e. actual W/S taken at that time) or to copy the original W/sheets after the session and submit a copy instead of the real reports.

Assist Reports that use only Contact or Touch Assist are written after the session and sent to HGC Admin to be filed in the pc folder. The pc is sent to the Examiner after an assist.

References:	HCO P/L	19 Nov 65	"Auditing Reports"
	HCO B	7 May 69	"Summary of How to Write an Auditor's Report"
	Tape	12 June 71	"Welcome to the Flag Intern Course"
	HCO B	3 Nov 71	C/S Series 66, "Auditor's Worksheets"
	Tape	7 April 72	Exp Dn Tape 3, "Auditor Administration"

Compiled by Training & Services Bur

Revised & Reissued as BTB by  
Flag Mission 1234  
I/C: CPO Andrea Lewis 2nd: Molly Harlow

Authorized by AVU for the  
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS  
of the  
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:HE:AL:MH:MM:mh.rd.jh

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 3 NOVEMBER 1971

Remimeo

*Re-issued 6 November 1972 as*

***Auditor Admin Series 15***

***C/S Series 66***

## **AUDITOR'S WORKSHEETS**

A very fast way for a C/S to do himself in is to fail to insist on **good legible handwriting**.

When a C/S has auditors who can't write well and rapidly, he gets misunderstood words when he tries to read the worksheets.

One temporary solution is to make the auditor block print the word in red above each hard to read word. Some auditors go to an extreme of block printing the whole W/S.

The more permanent solution is to have Auditors in Cramming practice writing **well** and **clearly** no matter how slowly and then, maintaining the same clarity, speed it up. The auditor after many such practice sessions winds up writing clearly and fast. This can be increased until an auditor can write clearly as fast as people talk.

The occasional headaches a C/S might get are not from the restim of the case he's studying but are from the words on W/Ses he can't make out.

If a C/S does not insist on both block print clarification and auditor writing practice, he will wind up not reading worksheets and may even get foggy about certain cases.

A remedy is to go back to the first folders not understood and get the words clarified and then keep this C/S Series HCO B **in**.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

PS: In the 19<sup>th</sup> Century secretaries wrote beautiful copperplate longhand faster than a man could talk. So don't say it can't be done.

LRH:nt.kjm.rd



BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN  
6 NOVEMBER 1972R  
ISSUE III

Remimeo

Revised & Reissued 27 July 1974 as BTB  
(Revision in this type style)

Cancels  
HCO Bulletin of 6 November 1972  
Issue III, Same Title

- *Auditor Admin Series 10R*

**THE AUDITOR'S C/S**

The Auditor's C/S is a sheet on which the Auditor writes the C/S instructions for the next session.

This is per C/S Series 25:

Full blank page.

Pc's Name (red)  
Auditor's Name (red)

Date  
Class of Auditor  
required next session

(Session Grade) left blank

Auditor's comment (red) or think about the case if he wishes.

The next C/S

1. \_\_\_\_\_ Blue
2. \_\_\_\_\_ Blue
3. \_\_\_\_\_ Blue
4. \_\_\_\_\_ Blue

(red) Auditor Signature

---

The Auditor does not grade his *own* session. He leaves this blank.

### POSITION IN FOLDER

The C/S Instructions for the session go *under* that session, so you get C/S 4.6.68, Auditing Session 4.6.68, C/S 5.6.68, Auditing Session 5.6.68, C/S 7.6.68, etc, etc.

### ETHICS SITUATION

Under Auditor's comments would be noted any Ethics Situation that came to light in the session.

*References:* HCO B 25 June 70 C/S Series 11  
HCO B 5 Mar 71 C/S Series 25 "THE FANTASTIC NEW HGC LINE"  
TAPE 7 Apr 72 Exp Dn Tape 3 "AUDITOR ADMINISTRATION"

Compiled by Training & Services Bur

Revised & Reissued as BTB  
by Flag Mission 1234  
I/C: CPO Andrea Lewis  
2nd: Molly Harlow

Authorized by AVU for the  
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the  
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:MD:AL:MH:BL:MM:mh.rd