

# EO INSTANT HAT

Colour, Screen, read only (unsuitable for print) (CS, Colour, Screen  
Compiled 20. October 2024



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

1.	70-06-15	KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING.....	1
2.	65-02-14	SAFEGUARDING TECHNOLOGY .....	9
3.	70-06-17	TECHNICAL DEGRADES.....	11
4.	65-04-05	SCIENTOLOGY MAKES A SAFE ENVIRONMENT.....	13
5.	75-09-22	THE HCO ETHICS CODES .....	15
6.	65-03-17	ADMINISTERING JUSTICE.....	17
7.	68-06-18	ETHICS.....	19
8.	69-12-07	ETHICS, THE DESIGN OF .....	21
9.	69-12-07	THE ETHICS OFFICER, HIS CHARACTER.....	25
10.	65-05-11	ETHICS OFFICER HAT .....	31
11.	65-04-29	ETHICS REVIEW.....	35
12.	70-10-26	OBNOXIOUS AND THE TONE SCALE .....	41
13.	54-11-26	THE CODE OF HONOUR.....	45
14.	60-02-08	HONEST PEOPLE HAVE RIGHTS, TOO.....	47
15.	59-12-23	RESPONSIBILITY.....	49
16.	59-12-31	BLOW-OFFS.....	51
17.	65-09-29	THE CONTINUING OVERT ACT.....	55
18.	60-02-25	SCIENTOLOGY CAN HAVE A GROUP WIN .....	59
19.	68-10-14	THE AUDITOR'S CODE .....	61
20.	72-01-29	PC HAT.....	63
21.	66-03-03	ATTACKS ON SCIENTOLOGY SEX AND ORGANIZATIONS.....	67
22.	65-03-17	RIGHTS OF A STAFF MEMBER, STUDENTS AND PRECLEARS TO JUSTICE.....	69
23.	71-11-16	CONDITIONS: AWARDS AND PENANCES.....	73
24.	65-09-01	ETHICS PROTECTION .....	75
25.	60-05-27	LETTER TO A SCIENTOLOGIST.....	77
26.	60-06-10	WHAT WE EXPECT OF A SCIENTOLOGIST .....	79
27.	74-02-09	CONDITION BELOW TREASON CONFUSION FORMULA AND EXPANDED CONFUSION FORMULA.....	83
28.	66-01-16	DANGER CONDITION.....	87
29.	72-05-03	ETHICS AND EXECUTIVES.....	91
30.	72-04-04	ETHICS.....	97
31.	65-04-29	ETHICS REVIEW.....	103
32.	68-12-26	THE THIRD PARTY LAW .....	109
33.	69-02-24	JUSTICE .....	113
34.	69-03-15	THIRD PARTY HOW TO FIND ONE .....	117
35.	69-08-25	THIRD PARTY INVESTIGATIONS .....	119
36.	65-05-01	STAFF MEMBER REPORTS.....	123
37.	68-10-04	ETHICS PRESENCE .....	127
38.	65-08-07	SUPPRESSIVE PERSONS, MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF.....	129

39.	65-04-05	HANDLING THE SUPPRESSIVE PERSON THE BASIS OF INSANITY .....	133
40.	64-10-27	POLICIES ON PHYSICAL HEALING, INSANITY AND "TROUBLESOME SOURCES" .....	145
41.	69-05-07	POLICIES ON "SOURCES OF TROUBLE" .....	151
42.	72-04-05	PTS TYPE A HANDLING.....	155
43.	77-11-11	HANDLING PTS SITUATIONS .....	159
44.	70-04-21	FIELD ETHICS.....	161

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

1.	54-11-26	THE CODE OF HONOUR.....	45
2.	59-12-23	RESPONSIBILITY.....	49
3.	59-12-31	BLOW-OFFS.....	51
4.	60-02-08	HONEST PEOPLE HAVE RIGHTS, TOO.....	47
5.	60-02-25	SCIENTOLOGY CAN HAVE A GROUP WIN .....	59
6.	60-05-27	LETTER TO A SCIENTOLOGIST .....	77
7.	60-06-10	WHAT WE EXPECT OF A SCIENTOLOGIST .....	79
8.	64-10-27	POLICIES ON PHYSICAL HEALING, INSANITY AND "TROUBLESOME SOURCES" .....	145
9.	65-02-14	SAFEGUARDING TECHNOLOGY .....	9
10.	65-03-17	ADMINISTERING JUSTICE.....	17
11.	65-03-17	RIGHTS OF A STAFF MEMBER, STUDENTS AND PRECLEARS TO JUSTICE.....	69
12.	65-04-05	HANDLING THE SUPPRESSIVE PERSON THE BASIS OF INSANITY.....	133
13.	65-04-05	SCIENTOLOGY MAKES A SAFE ENVIRONMENT.....	13
14.	65-04-29	ETHICS REVIEW.....	103
15.	65-04-29	ETHICS REVIEW.....	35
16.	65-05-01	STAFF MEMBER REPORTS.....	123
17.	65-05-11	ETHICS OFFICER HAT .....	31
18.	65-08-07	SUPPRESSIVE PERSONS, MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF.....	129
19.	65-09-01	ETHICS PROTECTION .....	75
20.	65-09-29	THE CONTINUING OVERT ACT.....	55
21.	66-01-16	DANGER CONDITION.....	87
22.	66-03-03	ATTACKS ON SCIENTOLOGY SEX AND ORGANIZATIONS .....	67
23.	68-06-18	ETHICS.....	19
24.	68-10-04	ETHICS PRESENCE .....	127
25.	68-10-14	THE AUDITOR'S CODE .....	61
26.	68-12-26	THE THIRD PARTY LAW .....	109
27.	69-02-24	JUSTICE .....	113
28.	69-03-15	THIRD PARTY HOW TO FIND ONE .....	117
29.	69-05-07	POLICIES ON "SOURCES OF TROUBLE" .....	151
30.	69-08-25	THIRD PARTY INVESTIGATIONS .....	119
31.	69-12-07	ETHICS, THE DESIGN OF .....	21
32.	69-12-07	THE ETHICS OFFICER, HIS CHARACTER.....	25
33.	70-04-21	FIELD ETHICS.....	161
34.	70-06-15	KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING.....	1
35.	70-06-17	TECHNICAL DEGRADES.....	11
36.	70-10-26	OBNOSIS AND THE TONE SCALE .....	41
37.	71-11-16	CONDITIONS: AWARDS AND PENANCES.....	73
38.	72-01-29	PC HAT .....	63
39.	72-04-04	ETHICS.....	97

40.	72-04-05	PTS TYPE A HANDLING.....	155
41.	72-05-03	ETHICS AND EXECUTIVES.....	91
42.	74-02-09	CONDITION BELOW TREASON CONFUSION FORMULA AND EXPANDED CONFUSION FORMULA.....	83
43.	75-09-22	THE HCO ETHICS CODES.....	15
44.	77-11-11	HANDLING PTS SITUATIONS.....	159

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

1.	65-03-17	ADMINISTERING JUSTICE.....	17
2.	66-03-03	ATTACKS ON SCIENTOLOGY SEX AND ORGANIZATIONS .....	67
3.	59-12-31	BLOW-OFFS.....	51
4.	74-02-09	CONDITION BELOW TREASON CONFUSION FORMULA AND EXPANDED CONFUSION FORMULA .....	83
5.	71-11-16	CONDITIONS: AWARDS AND PENANCES.....	73
6.	66-01-16	DANGER CONDITION.....	87
7.	72-05-03	ETHICS AND EXECUTIVES.....	91
8.	65-05-11	ETHICS OFFICER HAT .....	31
9.	68-10-04	ETHICS PRESENCE .....	127
10.	65-09-01	ETHICS PROTECTION .....	75
11.	65-04-29	ETHICS REVIEW.....	103
12.	65-04-29	ETHICS REVIEW.....	35
13.	68-06-18	ETHICS.....	19
14.	72-04-04	ETHICS.....	97
15.	69-12-07	ETHICS, THE DESIGN OF .....	21
16.	70-04-21	FIELD ETHICS.....	161
17.	77-11-11	HANDLING PTS SITUATIONS .....	159
18.	65-04-05	HANDLING THE SUPPRESSIVE PERSON THE BASIS OF INSANITY .....	133
19.	60-02-08	HONEST PEOPLE HAVE RIGHTS, TOO.....	47
20.	69-02-24	JUSTICE .....	113
21.	70-06-15	KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING.....	1
22.	60-05-27	LETTER TO A SCIENTOLOGIST .....	77
23.	70-10-26	OBNOSIS AND THE TONE SCALE .....	41
24.	72-01-29	PC HAT .....	63
25.	69-05-07	POLICIES ON "SOURCES OF TROUBLE" .....	151
26.	64-10-27	POLICIES ON PHYSICAL HEALING, INSANITY AND "TROUBLESOME SOURCES" .....	145
27.	72-04-05	PTS TYPE A HANDLING .....	155
28.	59-12-23	RESPONSIBILITY.....	49
29.	65-03-17	RIGHTS OF A STAFF MEMBER, STUDENTS AND PRECLEARS TO JUSTICE.....	69
30.	65-02-14	SAFEGUARDING TECHNOLOGY .....	9
31.	60-02-25	SCIENTOLOGY CAN HAVE A GROUP WIN .....	59
32.	65-04-05	SCIENTOLOGY MAKES A SAFE ENVIRONMENT.....	13
33.	65-05-01	STAFF MEMBER REPORTS.....	123
34.	65-08-07	SUPPRESSIVE PERSONS, MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF.....	129
35.	70-06-17	TECHNICAL DEGRADES.....	11
36.	68-10-14	THE AUDITOR'S CODE .....	61
37.	54-11-26	THE CODE OF HONOUR.....	45
38.	65-09-29	THE CONTINUING OVERT ACT .....	55

39.	69-12-07	THE ETHICS OFFICER, HIS CHARACTER .....	25
40.	75-09-22	THE HCO ETHICS CODES .....	15
41.	68-12-26	THE THIRD PARTY LAW .....	109
42.	69-03-15	THIRD PARTY HOW TO FIND ONE .....	117
43.	69-08-25	THIRD PARTY INVESTIGATIONS .....	119
44.	60-06-10	WHAT WE EXPECT OF A SCIENTOLOGIST .....	79



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  
HCO 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<sup>1</sup>. 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note by the editor: Mathematcally, these figures should be vice versa.

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 slugs 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 prenatales, 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 COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 5 APRIL 1965

Issue III

Gen Non-Remimeo  
BPI  
Mag Article

## SCIENTOLOGY MAKES A SAFE ENVIRONMENT

We're working to provide a safe environment for Scientology and Scientologists in Orgs everywhere.

The dangerous environment of the wog world, of injustice, sudden dismissals, war, atomic bombs, will only persist and trouble us if we fail to spread our safe environment across the world.

It starts with our own orgs. They must be safe environments.

Only good tech and justice can make the Org environment safe. Like an auditing room, we must be able to work undisturbed by the madness at our doors.

We can make every org a safe island then by expanding and joining those orgs, bring peace and a safe environment to all the world.

It not only can be done. It is happening this moment. Push it along. Support policy, good tech and justice.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:mb.cden



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 22 SEPTEMBER 1975  
Issue II

Remimeo

## THE HCO ETHICS CODES

Ten years ago I issued this HCO Executive Letter when the new HCO Ethics Codes were first introduced. (They were called "Justice Codes" for a short while.)

Since that time our continued expansion has been made possible by the application of the Ethics Codes over the world by the staffs of Scientology Orgs, assisted in no small way by the Guardian Office.

This HCO Executive Letter is reissued here in this Policy Letter so that all staff members may have a copy to add to their Staff Hats.

---

### HCO EXECUTIVE LETTER OF MARCH 18, 1965

To: ALL STAFF  
From: RON  
Subject: JUSTICE

#### **Protect your job, your position, your reputation, your org and Scientology with HCO Ethics Codes.**

End insecurity and fear. The HCO Ethics Codes end these.

Be free of capricious punishment, dismissal by rumor and constant post changes. The HCO Ethics Codes let you know when you're right or wrong.

You are entitled recourse from injustice. The HCO Ethics Codes give it to you.

Standardize discipline in our organizations so a Scientologist knows where he or she stands.

There is freedom in knowing what is thought right, what is thought wrong. There is only slavery when nobody knows and the rules are all "off the cuff."

The turbulence of our organizations has been entirely the product of the society into which we are moving. Today, government by riot and intimidation finds a rising crime rate and sinking freedom. Ours is superior knowledge. We will grow to the degree we can mani-

fest superior order. Our organizations and posts have been upset for 15 years, not by our own actions but by the decreasing ability of the society to handle people. We cannot look today for justice at the hands of what passes for civilization.

If we manifest in ourselves and our organizations a higher degree of order than that of the society into which we are expanding, *by that alone*, the society will move under us.

If in our groups there is better justice, easier recourse from injustice and a higher sense of order, people will move under us, finding in us a greater security and certainty than they do in the madhouse which passes for the "outside world" today.

That world will come our way as fast as and to the degree that we attain a superior culture.

All we have to do, each one of us, is insist upon our rights under and the uniform enforcement of the HCO Ethics Codes and we will achieve expansion and achieve as well dominion in the society.

It isn't hard to do. And we get paid for it. Under the Ethics Codes, whether we do our jobs well is analyzed wholly by statistics, never by rumor or opinion.

Under the Ethics Codes nobody can be demoted, transferred or dismissed without cause and must be reinstated if wrongly treated. Under the Ethics Codes no senior can "balance the budget" by wholesale dismissals-instead they must provide new work and find new income.

Under the Ethics Codes those who reduce your unit pay are located by statistics and educated better into their jobs or coached until they can do them. Only complete refusal to improve can bring them before their fellow staff members to explain why.

**The totality of power is orderly progress.**

Our organizations are being streamlined now to handle anything we meet. Our technology of organization comes from Level VII. A part of that technology consists of bringing order and making for us in Scientology groups a safe environment in which we can work. Just as nobody can audit in a constantly invaded room, so nobody can work without the protection of ourselves from the enturbulence of the society around us and its lack of order.

The Ethics Codes are part of our expansion programing.

Your maximum personal protection lies in knowing and understanding the Ethics Codes and getting only Ethics Codes used in all such matters. Your advancement as a staff member and an org depends on them.

Make them work.

Best, Ron

---

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:nt



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 17 MARCH 1965  
Issue III

Gen Non-Remimeo

*HCO (Division 1)*

*Justice Hat*

**ADMINISTERING JUSTICE**

There are some things to firmly keep in mind when you have to use HCO's Justice function:

1. Only the criminally inclined desire a society in which the criminal is free to do as he pleases.
2. Only the criminally inclined are frightened enough of Justice to protest and complain that it exists.
3. Without order nothing can grow or expand.
4. Justice is one of the guards that keeps the channel of progress a channel and not a stopped flow.
5. All reactive minds can exert pain and discomfort on a being. They demand the suppression of the good and the production of the bad. Therefore, in administering Justice, restrain just a trifle more than a bank can compel a bad action. The external threat need be just enough to make the internal pressure to do wrong the lesser of two discomforts. Judgment lies in how much external restraint to apply.
6. Decent people are in favor of Justice. Don't confuse the opinion of the majority who wish it with the snarls of the few who fear it.
7. A person who is dramatizing his criminal intent can become very angry if he is not prevented from hurting others.
8. A thetan is good. He invented a bank to keep others good. That mechanism went wrong. And that's why we're here.
9. In a session you would keep a burglar from bursting in the room and disturbing the preclear. In Scientology you keep offenders out so we can get on with our session with society.
10. Look up the person who rails against Justice most and you will have the one you have been looking for.
11. The only overt in handling Justice is not to work for the greatest good of the greatest number.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml.bp.cden



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 18 JUNE 1968

Remimeo  
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

LRH:js.cden



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 DECEMBER 1969

Remimeo  
All Exec Hats  
HCO Area Hat  
I & R Hat

## ETHICS, THE DESIGN OF

It is very easy for a staff member and even an Ethics Officer to completely misunderstand Ethics and its functions. In a society run by SPs and controlled by incompetent police the citizen almost engrammatically identifies any justice action or symbol with oppression.

Yet in the absence of true Ethics no one can live with others and stats go down inevitably. So a justice function must exist to protect producers and decent people.

To give you an example, when a little boy this life, the neighborhood a block around and the road from home to school were unusable. A bully about five years older than I named Leon Brown exerted a very bad influence over other children. With extortion by violence and blackmail and with corruption he made the area very dangerous. The road to school was blocked by the 5 O'Connell kids, ranging from 7 to 15 who stopped and beat up any smaller child. One couldn't go to school safely and was hounded by the truant officer, a hulking brute complete with star, if *one didn't* go to school.

When I was about six I got very tired of a bloody nose and spankings because my clothes were torn and avidly learned "lumberjack fighting" a crude form of judo from my grandfather.

With this "superior tech" under my belt I searched out and found alone the youngest O'Connell kid, a year older than I, and pulverized him. Then I found alone and took on the next in size and pulverized *him*. After that the O'Connell kids, all 5, fled each time I showed up and the road to school was open and I convoyed other little kids so it was safe.

Then one day I got up on a 9 foot high board fence and waited until the 12 year old bully passed by and leaped off on him boots and all and after the dust settled that neighbourhood was safe for every kid in it.

So I learned about justice. Kids would come from blocks away to get help in their neighbourhood. Finally for a mile around it was a safe environment for kids.

From this I learned two lessons:

1. Strength is nothing without skill and tech and reversely, without skill and tech the strength of brutes is a matter of contempt.

2. Strength has two sides, one for good and one for evil. It is the intention that makes the difference.

---

On further living I found that only those who sought only peace were ever butchered. The thousands of years of Jewish passivity earned them nothing but slaughter.

So, things do not run right because one is holy or good. Things run right because one makes them run right.

Justice is a necessary action to any successful society. Without it the brute attacks the weak, the decent and the productive.

There are people who suppress. They are few. They often rise up to being in charge and then all things decay. They are essentially psychopathic personalities. Such want position in order to kill. Such as Ghenghiz Khan, Hitler, psychiatrists, psychopathic criminals, want power only to destroy. Covertly or overtly they pay only with death. They arrived where they arrived, in charge of things, because nobody when they were on their way up said "No". They are monuments to the cowards, the reasonable people who didn't put period to them while they were still only small bullies and still vulnerable.

Ethics has to get there before tech can occur. So when it doesn't exist or goes out then tech doesn't occur and suppression sets in and death follows.

So if someone doesn't hold the line, all become victims of oppression.

## TWO SECTIONS

The Ethics Section is in Department 3. This department is called Inspection and Reports.

In small orgs there is only one person in that department.

Primarily his duties consist of Inspecting and Reporting to his divisional head and the Executive Council.

That is the first section's function.

**When** inspection reveals outness and reports (such as graphs or direct info to the EC) do not result in correction **then** it is a matter for the second section.

The second section of Department 3 is Ethics.

Now it is an Ethics matter. If correctly reported outnesses that threaten the org are **not** corrected then one assumes that suppression exists.

Because he has files of damage reports and chits and because he can see and investigate, the Ethics Officer locates **who** is causing outnesses and suppressing the org. By condition assignments, publication and Comm Evs he gets in Ethics.

It occasionally happens that it is someone high up in the org. It sometimes happens his seniors or the EC scold him for daring to report on things or to them. Then he knows the suppression is high up and he is delinquent in duty if he does not report it to the next highest org and if no action there right on up to the Sea Org. Anyone removing him for daring to report the factual results of his inspections can be severely handled by upper organizations. The Ethics Officer can only be in trouble if he fails to do his job and keep in Ethics.

Hitting people with conditions is such a small part of Ethics that it is almost an abandonment of post. Letting people be hit with wrong conditions is a Comm Ev offense.

Letting an SP collapse stats or an org is a shooting offense.

An Ethics Officer uses Ethics to protect Ethics upstats and keep the stats up and to smoke out crimes that push people and stats down. It is a simple function.

The basic duties of Dept 3 are what it says. Inspection and Reports. These alone usually work. When they don't and stats fall or people fall off the org board, one goes into Ethics actions.

You don't let incompetent and suppressive people on staff in the first place and you crowd Ethics in on them if they're found to be there.

You **don't** confuse an executive's effort to get the stats up with suppression.

The E/O is making the environment safe so that production can occur and service can be given. He is making it unsafe for those who by neglect or continual errors or suppression push stats down and get good staff members to leave.

If none of this is well understood and yet someone is making it impossible to work, find a 9 foot high board fence...

The E/O must know his Ethics policy. He must understand why he is there.

And the rest of the people in the org should understand it too.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:rs.ldm.rd





HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 DECEMBER 1969  
Issue II

Remimeo  
HCO ES Hat  
HCO Hats  
DirI&RHat  
Ethics Hat

## THE ETHICS OFFICER, HIS CHARACTER

If a staff has no confidence in their Ethics Officer, their morale is difficult to sustain.

A staff member has his head down, doing his job. Suddenly he finds out that nobody has mailed any letters or magazines for a month. This is a shock, an ARC Break. He was doing his job, so he natters a bit and resolves to keep his eye open after this. He may even do some investigation on his own. In other words he's distracted from his post and duties. The environment is not safe.

**Where** was the E/O? Who didn't notice there was nothing going out?

A few weeks later the staff member hears that the address plates are full of duplicates, wrong addresses and half missing. This is a shock. It means the magazine never reached anyone really despite all the work. The staff member says to hell with it. There couldn't be an Ethics Officer worth anything and the org must be full of SPs. So the staff member goes out and has a cigarette and sneers.

So do I.

A safe environment is a productive environment. An unsafe environment is an empty hall.

## ETHICS FUNCTIONS

Now this would appear that the E/O runs the org. Or that he gets in everyone's way. Or that he is a whip that forces people to work. Or any other silly idea borrowed from a wog world where the police make things about as safe as a snake pit full of assorted reptiles.

The **Tech** fact is the data we have about SPs. There are very few of these in proportion to decent people. That one fact is something this society's police don't know. According to extant social tech **all** people are basically bad and are only made "good" through punishment. So everyone everywhere has to be threatened. That's extant wog tech. It doesn't work. The crime rate soars so obviously the know-how isn't to be found out "there". People are all ani-

mals, "they" say and must be herded. Well that's the "modern social scientist's" nutty idea. Society does not know that all they'd have to do is round up their few SPs and they'd have no crime. Instead whenever they arrest criminals they prove to these that society is brutal and crime justified and just let them loose again. They don't straighten SPs up because the "social scientist", the psychologist and psychiatrist are at this writing at least mainly SPs themselves and haven't any tech but the club.

So the E/O must understand at once that he is dealing with a new highly precise tech. It is the tech of Ethics. A meter, a case folder, a course study record, a knowledge of the HCOBs on SPs and case types and PTS phenomena and you can identify an SP promptly. He makes things go wrong, hurts people, oppresses. Around him all the right actions vanish and the wrong actions appear.

Now because he or she can make others go PTS, then **they** make mistakes.

So you get a whole group making things go wrong.

The E/O, knowing his Ethics Tech, can sort out the group, find the real SP, remove him or depower him and zingo<sup>2</sup> the group will rebound and do great.

If an E/O finds himself having to assign lots of conditions, finds as he inspects the org that the HCO Pol Ltr on promotions of the org or the old org rudiments list when checked against the org demonstrates too many outnesses, he knows that he is dealing with one or more SPs in the org or around its area.

Careful investigation by the E/O (and he has very exact procedures all to be found in the OEC Ethics pack) discloses the source or sources of the trouble. He verifies all against the person's stats, study and case record and his meter and then he acts.

If he is right the org straightens right out. If the E/O is wrong in his investigation and action things will get worse – i.e., stats will go down. So he can do it all over again, exhume the body he incorrectly shot, apologize and now find the real SP!

So Ethics has its own tech, very superior tech indeed.

Ethics could clean up a whole nation and make it boom, using its tech correctly.

As Ethics is a powerful tech, an uninformed E/O who thinks he is a sort of KGB – Local cop – FBI – Scotland Yard sure has missed the point. They are (or are at this writing) total failures as witness the condemnation of crime stats in their areas. They are simply oppressive terror symbols. They take psychiatric advice and get psychiatric results. The end product is mutiny and revolution by the population.

When you threaten the whole population you get riot and civil commotion. When you have riot and civil commotion the police are threatening (because of lack of Ethics tech) the whole population whereas less than 10%, even as little as 1%, are bad hats.

---

<sup>2</sup> Zingo: Interjection: A one word sentence used to express approval or positive enthusiasm in a commentative manner. Used as a stand-alone sentence.

## SUPPRESSIVE REASONABLENESS

The greatest enemy of the E/O is the reasonable person. There are no good reasons for any outness except

- (a) Natural catastrophes (such as earthquakes, lightning, etc)
- (b) Suppressive persons
- (c) Persons who are PTS to suppressive persons.

When an exec starts to explain the "reasons" for low stats instead of working to get high stats he is being reasonable.

When Joe Blow has just smashed his 5<sup>th</sup> typewriter and the Dissem Sec starts to explain how he's just a good boy gone a bit ARC Breaky she is being "reasonable". He's either an SP or he's PTS to someone.

The explanation is the answer to the E/O's **who**, not the Dissem Sec's why.

The ECs of 3 orgs are at violent war with each other. Somebody explains how reasonable this is. Their E/Os had better meet quietly and find out **who** is an SP and **who** is PTS in that battle royal and **act**.

Reasonableness is suppressive since it lets oppression continue without action being taken.

Suppressive reasonableness is a common trait. It comes from **the inability to confront evil**.

Evil takes a bit of confronting.

People who want desperately to "have no trouble" often won't confront and handle trouble.

Murder is murder. It occurs. A murder is not a frightened wish it had not occurred. It occurred. Somebody did it. There's the body.

Psychiatrists, for instance, have two major types in their ranks, both psychopathic. One is a theetie weetie who thinks all criminals are poor abused things and the other is himself a criminal psychopath who turns criminals loose on the society just to get even with people for his own fancied wrongs. Tracing several major crimes it can be found that the violent criminal was in the hands of a psychiatrist earlier and told him his intentions yet was let loose on society.

Such a criminal – a rapist, a murderer – can't be helped by psychiatry. But that isn't the point. Decent people died and some died horribly. That doesn't make a very safe environment does it?

It is true that we could straighten this criminal out if we could keep him out of circulation for a while. It is true the criminal is in trouble, **but it is also true that he commits crimes**.

So an E/O doesn't want somebody in circulation in a group or a society who commits crimes.

The job of the E/O is to disconnect and de-power the criminal and so protect the group.

The criminal, the SP (same thing) is **trying to get even with people**. That's his common denominator. He does it by covert omissions or overt violence. It all amounts to the same thing.

The E/O works for from 90% to 99% of the group, not for the 1%.

When the E/O has done his duty to the group he can then take up the individual. I always handle things in that order:

1. Safeguard the group.
2. Rehab the individual.

You will have a mess if you only do one or the other or try to rehab the individual criminal without safeguarding the group.

In actual practice you safeguard the group by removing or isolating the individual. Then you see what can be done for the individual to rehab him without endangering the group in any way.

An E/O can be used by an SP (with false reports or stupid orders) to needle and hurt a group. The duty of the E/O is plain. Follow policy.

An E/O can be paralyzed when seniors will not let him do his job either because they don't understand it or because they are suppressive. The stats tell which one.

But the E/O has an action in this case.

I recall that the first two E/Os ever appointed, did their job, tried to clean up the org where two criminals and a spy were in full bloom and were clobbered by the OES (then Assoc Sec) and removed. The same executive carried the org over Niagara Falls within a year. He was having homosexual relations with the spy! The fault here was a lack of investigation or investigatory skill and Ethics tech not yet developed fully. If these two E/Os had found that they couldn't work and couldn't function despite crashing org stats they should have located who was blocking any action by simple investigation and they would have found the crime, and with that in hand they could have said, "See here".

## E/O CONDUCT

An E/O should never discuss staff members who are merely under investigation or act in a way to 3<sup>rd</sup> party people. An E/O gets the facts and then acts.

An E/O should himself be an Ethics upstat. E/Os who aren't don't last long.

An E/O should act like a shepherd not a wolf. When the facts are in plain view he or she should act like a panther with one straight pounce.

An E/O who is an efficient E/O is very popular with a staff. If he or she knows his business and carries it out effectively the E/O easily becomes a local hero.

An E/O shouldn't permit a staff to be nagged, threatened or given floods of conditions. When he sees these things occurring he knows it's time to investigate for **who** has got people PTS and handle without other orders.

An E/O's rehab actions should be limited to re-investigation on request, correcting actions based on false reports and seeing that Qual does any case handling that comes up.

When an E/O sees big efforts being spent on trying to get ex-wolves back into the fold he investigates for the source of the effort and having found it finds out **who** and **why**. One E/O never could get an org going but sure worked to get ex-wolves painted white. One head of an org had a staff in virtual mutiny but worked continuously to get reinstated to grace three people who over the years had done nothing (on clear evidence) but shoot upstate for outside pay – yet the E/O of that org didn't even try to find out why the head of that org was so constantly PTS as to worry only about rehabbing and reinstating SPs. And to this day (the situation is current) the E/O of that org has sent no report or appeal to a higher org.

An E/O can get so irresponsible as to assign his whole function to just Ethics conditions assignments. Never enforced, no sort out of staff ever attempted, no real confront at all, just a weary round of conditions and threats of conditions. Been removed of course. Lots of threats and conditions mean only somebody is SP and a lot of others are PTS.

An E/O trying to handle a long org history of down stats and trouble should look first only at those who have been in the org throughout the trouble period. One or more will be SP or PTS but good.

An E/O who has had an area all calm but suddenly sees it roughed up should look only at those who came into it since it went bad.

An E/O is only trying to make a safe environment in which staff members can work happily and good service is being given to the public.

An E/O in the final analysis is answerable to me that all is well and secure with his area.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:rs.ei.cden



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 11 MAY 1965

Remimeo  
Ethics Officer Hat  
HCO Exec Sec Hat  
HCO Sec Hat  
Dir Insp. & Rpts Hat  
Ethics Section  
Personnel Hat

*HCO Division*

Star Check out by Director of Exams  
on hats listed (Effective at once)

**ETHICS OFFICER HAT**

This is a quick outline of the activities of the Ethics Officer.

The purpose of the Ethics Officer is "To help Ron clear orgs and the public if need be of entheta and enturbulation so that Scientology can be done."

The activities of the Ethics Officer consist of isolating individuals who are stopping proper flows by pulling withholds with Ethics technology and by removing as necessary potential trouble sources and suppressive individuals off org comm lines and by generally enforcing Ethics Codes.

The technology of how this is done is quite precise.

In a nutshell, (a) one finds an imperfect functioning of some portion of the org and then (b) finds something that one doesn't understand about it and then (c) interrogates by despatch the individuals in that portion connected with the imperfect functioning.

Just those three steps done over and over are usually quite enough to keep an org running quite smoothly.

On first taking over post in an enturbulated org, or in viewing a portion of the org in an enturbulated condition the actions of the Ethics Officer consist of:

(1) Run back entheta by asking for names of who said it to the person who is now saying it,

(2) locate those persons and find out who told them and then

(3) look amongst those names for no-case-change or for potential trouble sources. Bill voices a rumour (usually with a "they" say ...). The Ethics Officer asks Bill what "they's" name is, Bill thinks and finally says it was Pete. The Ethics Officer locates Pete and asks Pete who told him, and when Pete says "they" the Ethics Officer finds out what "they's" name is. Pete says it was Agnes. Ethics Officer locates Agnes. Agnes maintains it is true and can't say who said it. Ethics Officer looks up Agnes' case folder or puts Agnes on a meter and sees by

high or very low TA that he has a Suppressive. Or he finds Agnes has a suppressive husband and that she is a Potential Trouble Source.

The Ethics Officer then handles it as per Ethics Policy Ltrs.

In short, rumour comes from somewhere. The somewhere is a Potential Trouble Source or a Suppressive. One runs it down and applies the remedies contained in Ethics HCO Policy Letters to that person.

An Ethics Officer's first job is usually cleaning up the org of its potential trouble sources and requesting a Comm Ev for the Suppressives. That gets things in focus quickly and smooths an org down so it will function.

Then one looks for down statistics in the OIC Charts. These aren't understandable, of course, so one interrogates by sending Interrogatives to the people concerned. In their answers there will be something that doesn't make sense at all to the Ethics Officer – Example "We can't pay the bills because Josie has been on course." The Ethics Officer is only looking for something he himself can't reconcile. So he sends Interrogatives to the person who wrote it and to Josie. Sooner or later some wild withhold or even a crime shows up when one does this.

The trick of this "Org Auditing" is to find a piece of string sticking out – something one can't understand, and, by Interrogatives, pull on it. A small cat shows up. Pull with some more Interrogatives. A baby gorilla shows up. Pull some more. A tiger appears. Pull again and Wow! You've got a General Sherman tank!

It isn't reasonable for people to be lazy or stupid. At the bottom you find the real cause of no action in a portion of an org or continuous upset.

When you have your General Sherman, call a Court of Ethics on it. Or take action. But in actual fact you have probably already fixed it up.

There's always a reason behind a bad statistic. Send out Interrogatives until you have the real reason in view. It will never be "Agnes isn't bright." It is more likely, Agnes is on a typing post but never knew how to type. Or worse – the D of P audits org pcs for his own profit. Or the D of T simply never comes to work.

The real explanation of a down statistic is always a very easily understood thing. If you Interrogate enough you'll get the real explanation and then you can act.

Never use conduct for anything but an indicator of what you should interrogate.

Never buy rumours as generalities. Somebody said them and that somebody has a name. Get the name.

## **FILING**

Filing is the real trick of Ethics work. The files do all the work, really.

Executive Ethics reports patiently filed in folders, one for each staff member, eventually makes one file fat. There's your boy.



Call up a Court of Ethics on him and his area gets smooth.

Whatever report you get, file it with a name. Don't file by departments or Divisions. File by names.

The files do 90% of the work. When one file gets fat, call the person up for Ethics action.

### **TIME MACHINE**

Run a Time Machine and let it accumulate data for you.

The orders that fall off of it that weren't complied with should be reported to the senior issuing them.

But file those non-compliances. Soon, a file gets fat and we know why the org isn't running in one of its portions.

### **POLICY**

All Ethics policy applies to the actions of an Ethics Officer.

But the above is his workaday world, auditor to the org, filing his replies, watching for the fat file and then calling a Court on it.

That way an org soon begins to run like a well greased river, doing its job in a happy atmosphere.

Be as sudden and swift and unreasonable as you like. You aren't there to win a popularity contest.

Make Executives report all those Ethics items they should. Make them write their orders and send you a copy. Make your Comm Centre give you the responses for pairing with the copies. File carefully and call the lightning down on the person who gets a fat Ethics file.

It's an easy job. Mostly admin. But so is all Intelligence work. The files do the job if you make people report and if you file well yourself.

And when you feel exasperated and balked and feel like taking it out on somebody, do so by all means.

Whoever heard of a tame Ethics Officer?

The sanity of the planet is all that is at stake.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:mh.cden



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 29 APRIL 1965  
Issue III

Remimeo

**ETHICS  
REVIEW**

(Correction to HCO Pol Ltr 24 April 1965  
and additional Ethics data)

As per HCO Pol Ltr of 28 April 1965, and others of later date, orders to auditing or training may not be made as a sentence or used in an ethics court or by a Comm Ev or any other reason. Auditing and training are awards.

A student who is disruptive of discipline and acts contrary to the ethics codes may not be ordered to review by the D of P, D of T or ethics personnel or other persons in an org.

**ORDERING STUDENTS & PCS**

Tech and Qualifications personnel, particularly the Tech Sec and Qual Sec and D of Estimations, the D of P and D of T, D of Exams and D of Review and D of Certs may order students or pcs to review or to course or to HGC or anywhere in and around these two Divisions without any ethics action being implied. It is just normal, done to get students and pcs on the road to higher levels.

Ethics actions may only suspend training or deny auditing.

Therefore, a student ordered to ethics for discipline who does not then give adequate promise and example of good behaviour and compliance must be thoroughly investigated even to his or her own area and in the meanwhile may not be trained or processed.

The student, however, may not be dismissed or expelled unless full ethics actions and procedures have been undertaken.

All sentences carrying a denial of training or processing must carry a means of the right to be trained or processed being restored in a specified time or under specified conditions.

## STUDENTS AND PCS & ETHICS

The routine action of ethics is to request a reappraisal of behaviour and a signed promise of good behaviour for a specified time. If the student or pc refuses to so promise, then the next action of ethics is an investigation of the student's course or pc's processing behaviour. When then confronted with the data, if the student still refuses to promise, ethics undertakes a full investigation in the student's or pc's own area. If the student or pc still refuses to cooperate, the student goes before a court of ethics which may pass sentence.

## RECOURSE

*Only* after sentence has been passed by a legal body such as a court of ethics or committee of evidence or after an illegal disciplinary action may a student or pc ask for a *recourse*.

Normally before asking for recourse a student or pc *petitions* the office of L. Ron Hubbard if unwilling to accept the discipline but this must be done at once.

If the petition is unfavorably acted upon, the student or pc may ask for recourse.

Recourse must be requested of the convening authority that had local jurisdiction over the student or pc and may not be requested of higher authority. A request to higher authority than the ethics activity that passed sentence is a petition, not recourse.

## COMM EV

A committee of evidence is considered the most severe form of ethics action.

One must not be idly threatened or requested.

Only a Comm Ev can recommend suspension or remove certificates or awards or memberships or recommend dismissal.

The office of LRH passes on all Comm Ev findings before they can go into effect.

A staff member may not be suspended or demoted or transferred illegally out of his division or dismissed without a committee of evidence.

Only after that action, (or wrongful demotion, transfer or dismissal) as above, may recourse be requested.

Students or pcs, however, may be transferred, demoted in level or grade by a court of ethics. And the action of sending the student or pc to a court of ethics is of course a type of suspension which may be prolonged in the face of non-cooperation.

A student or a pc is not a staff member in the ethics sense of the word by simple enrollment on a course or in an HGC or review.

A staff member who is temporarily a student or pc in the Academy or Review or the HGC is not covered as a student or pc by his staff member status. He may be transferred about or demoted as a student or pc by Tech and Qual personnel or suspended as a student or pc by ethics. This however may not affect his staff member status as a staff member. Because he or she is transferred or demoted or suspended by Tech personnel or ethics when a student or pc does not mean he or she may be transferred, demoted or dismissed from his or her regular staff post unless the person's staff status permits it.

### **POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES**

Staff members found to be potential trouble sources are handled like any other potential trouble source – but unless provisional or temporary, may not be affected by this in their staff post. They are of course denied auditing or training until they handle or disconnect but this may not also suspend, transfer or dismiss them (unless of provisional or temporary status).

This ethics action (the potential trouble source) is in lieu of any discipline and disciplinary actions that go beyond temporary suspension of training or processing until the matter is settled, must be undertaken by a court of ethics or a Comm Ev.

### **ARC BROKEN STUDENTS OR PCS**

An ARC break is not an extenuating circumstance in ethics or disciplinary matters and is only taken into account on the person of the auditor who made the ARC break and didn't repair it.

The plea of "ARC broken" is inadmissible in any ethics matter as a defence or justification of misdemeanours, crimes or high crimes.

### **LIGHT TOUCH**

Scientology ethics are so powerful in effect, as determined by observation of it in use, that a little goes a very long ways.

Try to use the lightest form first.

Students are quite caved in by it when it is applied, by actual observation.

Our lines are too powerful and direct and what we mean to a person's future, even while he or she is nattering, is so well understood down deep that ethics action is a far worse threat than mere wog law.

The being who is guilty knows with certainty that he is offending against the future of all, no matter what his surface manifestations or conduct. Further, while wog law at the worst can only cause him or her some pain and a body by execution or one lifetime's loss of liberty, we threaten his eternity. Even while he screams at us he knows this down deep.

My first instance of this was a very dangerous psychotic who was largely responsible for a great deal of the public commotion in 1950. This person desisted and caved in the moment the thought was suggested to her by a non-Dianetic friend that she was threatening all Mankind. She suddenly saw it as truth and instantly gave up all attacks and utterances.

Even the fellow who could push the button on atomic war knows, really, it's only one lifetime per person he is blowing up, only one phase in earth's existence he or she is destroying. That we exist here could actually restrain him. The mere destruction of a planet might not as it's temporary.

Our discipline is quite capable of driving a person around the bend because of what he or she is attacking,

Therefore we can all too easily make a person feel guilty by just a whisper.

I've now seen a student, simply asked a question by ethics, promptly give up and ask for his Comm Ev and expulsion. He hadn't done more than a poor auditing job. Nobody was talking about a Comm Ev or expulsion and he had not a bit of defiance in it. He just caved right in.

You are threatening somebody with oblivion for eternity by expulsion from Scientology. Therefore realize that an ethics action need not be very heavy to produce the most startling results.

Down deep they know this even when they are screaming at us.

One suppressive person who had committed a high crime of some magnitude, went quite insane after departing Scientology and then realizing what he had done.

Therefore, use ethics lightly. It is chain lightning.

### **LEVELS OF ETHICS ACTIONS**

Ethics actions in degree of severity are as follows:

1. Noticing something non-optimum without mentioning it but only inspecting it silently.
2. Noticing something non-optimum and commenting on it to the person.
3. Requesting information by ethics personnel.
4. Requesting information and inferring there is a disciplinary potential in the situation.
5. Talking to somebody about another derogatorily.
6. Talking to the person derogatorily.
7. Investigating in person by ethics.
8. Reporting on a post condition to ethics.

9. Reporting on a person to ethics.
10. Investigating a person by interrogating others about him.
11. Asking others for evidence about a person.
12. Publishing an interrogatory about a person that points out omissions or commissions of ethics offenses.
13. Assigning a lowered condition by limited publication.
14. Assigning a lowered condition by broad publication.
15. Investigating a person thoroughly in his or her own area.
16. Interrogation stated to be leading to a court of ethics.
17. Interrogation in a court of ethics.
18. Sentencing in a court of ethics.
19. Suspending a court of ethics sentence.
20. Carrying out a court of ethics discipline.
21. Suspension or loss of time.
22. A committee of evidence ordered.
23. A committee of evidence publicly ordered.
24. Holding a committee of evidence.
25. Findings by a committee of evidence
26. Submitting findings of a committee of evidence for approval.
27. Waiting for the findings to be passed on or carried into effect.
28. Suspending findings for a period for review.
29. Modifying findings.
30. Carrying findings into effect.
31. Publishing findings.
32. Demotion.
33. Loss of certificates or awards.

34. Denial of auditing or training by a Comm Ev for a considerable period of time.
35. Dismissal.
36. Expulsion from Scientology.

The above is a rough guide to the severity of discipline.

Note that none of it carries any physical punishment or detention.

Short suspension of training or processing up to ninety days is considered under 18. above and is not to be compared with 34. where the time is measured in years.

Just issuing the ethics codes is itself a sort of discipline but it is more broadly welcomed than protested as it means greater peace and faster accomplishment.

L RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.cden

[Note: (Quoting LRH ED 70 INT 16 December 1968) "AN OPERATING STANDARD RULE – No matter how stiff the ethics action is you have to apply to keep the show on the road, remember this: YOU MUST KEEP THE DOOR OPEN – IF IT'S ONLY A CRACK".]



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



P.A.B. No. 40  
PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN  
From L. RON HUBBARD  
Via Hubbard Communications Office  
163 Holland Park Avenue, London W.11

---

26 November 1954

## **THE CODE OF HONOUR**

A Basic Course in Scientology – Part 6

1. Never desert a comrade in need, in danger or in trouble.
2. Never withdraw allegiance once granted.
3. Never desert a group to which you owe your support.
4. Never disparage yourself or minimize your strength or power.
5. Never need praise, approval or sympathy.
6. Never compromise with your own reality.
7. Never permit your affinity to be alloyed.
8. Do not give or receive communication unless you yourself desire it.
9. Your self-determinism and your honour are more important than your immediate life.
10. Your integrity to yourself is more important than your body.
11. Never regret yesterday. Life is in you today, and you make your tomorrow.
12. Never fear to hurt another in a just cause.
13. Don't desire to be liked or admired.
14. Be your own adviser, keep your own counsel and select your own decisions.
15. Be true to your own goals.

Scientology is itself the microcosm of a civilization. It contains two moral codes: one is the moral code of practice which is the Auditor's Code of 1954, the other is the Code of a Scientologist, which will be given at greater length in the next PAB. It also contains an ethical code, and that is its Code of Honour.

The difference between ethics and morals is very clearly known in Scientology, if not in a modern dictionary. This mergence of morals and ethics has occurred in recent times, and is symptomatic of a general decline. An ethic is practiced on an entirely self-determined basis. An ethical code is not enforceable, is not to be enforced, but is a luxury of conduct. A person conducts himself according to an ethical code because he wants to or because he feels he is proud enough or decent enough, or civilized enough to so conduct himself. An ethical code,

of course, is a code of certain restrictions indulged in to better the manner of conduct of life. If one Scientologist started to punish or berate some other Scientologist and called for an enforcement on the grounds that the Code of Honour had been disregarded, the punitive act itself would involve and violate the Code of Honour. The Code of Honour is a Code of Honour as long as it is not enforced. If a person is big enough, or strong enough or sane enough, then he can indulge himself in the luxury of holding upon himself freely and of his own decision the Code of Honour. When such an ethical code begins to be enforced it becomes then a moral code.

A moral code is enforceable. Mores are those things which make a society possible. They are the heavily agreed-upon, policed codes of conduct of the society. If an auditor were to flagrantly and continually violate the Auditor's Code or the Code of a Scientologist, then other auditors would have a perfect right to demand, and through the HASI effect, the suspension or revocation of certificates or memberships, or both. However, no such action is possible with the Code of Honour. A person could continually and flagrantly flaunt the Code of Honour and experience no more than perhaps the slight contempt or pity of his fellows.

The Code of Honour clearly states conditions of acceptable comradeship amongst those fighting on one side against something which they conceive should be remedied. While anyone practicing "the only one" believes that it is possible to have a fight or contest only so long as one remains "the only one" and confronts as that single identity all of existence, it is not very workable to live without friends or comrades in arms. Amongst those friends and comrades in arms one's acceptability and measure is established fairly well by his adherence to such a thing as the Code of Honour. Anyone practicing the Code of Honour would maintain a good opinion of his fellows, a much more important thing than having one's fellows maintain a good opinion of one.

If you believed Man was worthy enough to be granted by you sufficient stature so as to permit you to exercise gladly the Code of Honour, I can guarantee that you would be a happy person. And if you found an occasional miscreant falling away from the best standards you have developed, you yet did not turn away from the rest of Man, and if you discovered yourself betrayed by those you were seeking to defend and yet did not then experience a complete reversal of opinion about all your fellow men, there would be no dwindling spiral for you.

Indicative of this is a process which is rather easy to work and which has some workability. Sit down in a public place where many people are passing by and simply postulate into them, above them, around them, Perfection – no matter what you see. Do this person after person as they walk by you or around you, doing it quietly and to yourself. It may or may not occur that you would bring changes in their lives, but it would certainly occur that you would bring about a change in yourself. This is not an advised process – it is simply a demonstration of a fact that he who lives believing wrong of all his fellow men lives, himself, in Hell. The only difference between Paradise on earth and Hell on earth is whether or not you believe your fellow man worthy of receiving from you the friendship and devotion called for in this Code of Honour.

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 8 FEBRUARY 1960

MA  
Sthil  
Assn Secs  
HCO Secs  
Fran Holders

## HONEST PEOPLE HAVE RIGHTS, TOO

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

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

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

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

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

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

Uneasy lies the head that wears a guilty conscience.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Who would punish when he could salvage?

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

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

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

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

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

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

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd



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 31 DECEMBER AD 9

Fran Hldrs  
HCO Secs  
Assn Secs  
HASI  
Dept Heads

## **BLOW-OFFS**

Scientology Technology recently has been extended to include the factual explanation of departures, sudden and relatively unexplained, from sessions, posts, jobs, locations and areas.

This is one of the things man thought he knew all about and therefore never bothered to investigate, yet, this amongst all other things gave him the most trouble. Man had it all explained to his own satisfaction and yet his explanation did not cut down the amount of trouble which came from the feeling of "having to leave".

For instance man has been frantic about the high divorce rate, about the high job turnover in plants, about labour unrest and many other items all stemming from the same source – sudden departures or gradual departures.

We have the view of a person who has a good job, who probably won't get a better one, suddenly deciding to leave and going. We have the view of a wife with a perfectly good husband and family up and leaving it all. We see a husband with a pretty and attractive wife breaking up the affinity and departing.

In Scientology we have the phenomenon of preclears in session or students on courses deciding to leave and never coming back. And that gives us more trouble than most other things all combined.

Man explained this to himself by saying that things were done to him which he would not tolerate and therefore he had to leave. But if this were the explanation all man would have to do would be to make working conditions, marital relationships, jobs, courses and sessions all very excellent and the problem would be solved. But on the contrary, a close examination of working conditions and marital relationships demonstrates that improvement of conditions often worsens the amount of blow-off, as one could call this phenomenon. Probably the finest working conditions in the world were achieved by Mr. Hershey of Chocolate Bar fame for his plant workers. Yet they revolted and even shot at him. This in its turn led to an industrial philosophy that the worse workers were treated the more willing they were to stay which in itself is as untrue as the better they are treated the faster they blow off.

One can treat people so well that they grow ashamed of themselves, knowing they don't deserve it, that a blow-off is precipitated, and certainly one can treat people so badly that they have no choice but to leave, but these are extreme conditions and in between these we have the majority of departures: the auditor is doing his best for the preclear and yet the preclear gets meaner and meaner and blows the session. The wife is doing her best to make a marriage and the husband wanders off on the trail of a tart. The manager is trying to keep things going and the worker leaves. These, the unexplained, disrupt organizations and lives and it's time we understood them.

*People leave because of their own overts and withholds.* That is the factual fact and the hardbound rule. A man with a clean heart can't be hurt. The man or woman who must must become a victim and depart is departing because of his or her own overts and withholds. It doesn't matter whether the person is departing from a town or a job or a session. The cause is the same.

Almost anyone, no matter his position, can remedy a situation no matter what's wrong if he or she really wants to. When the person no longer wants to remedy it his own overt acts and withholds against the others involved in the situation have lowered his own ability to be responsible for it. Therefore he or she does not remedy the situation. Departure is the only answer. To justify the departure the person blowing off dreams up things done to him, in an effort to minimize the overt by degrading those it was done to. The mechanics involved are quite simple.

It is amazing what trivial overts will cause a person to blow. I caught a staff member one time just before he blew and traced down the original overt act against the Organization to his failure to defend the Organization when a criminal was speaking viciously about it. This failure to defend accumulated to itself more and more overts and withholds such as failing to relay messages, failure to complete an assignment, until it finally utterly degraded the person into stealing something of no value. This theft caused the person to believe he had better leave.

It is a rather noble commentary on man that *when a person finds himself, as he believes, incapable of restraining himself from injuring a benefactor he will defend the benefactor by leaving.* This is the real source of the blow-off. If we were to better a person's working conditions in this light we would see that we have simply magnified his overt acts and made it a certain fact that he would leave. If we punish we can bring the value of the benefactor down a bit and thus lessen the value of the overt. But improvement and punishment are neither one answers. The answer lies in Scientology and processing the person up to a high enough responsibility to take a job or a position and carry it out without all this weird hocus-pocus of "I've got to say you are doing things to me so I can leave and protect you from all the bad things I am doing to you." That's the way it is and it doesn't make sense not to do something about it now that we know.

A recent Secretarial Executive Director to all Central Organizations states that before a person may draw his last pay cheque from an Organization he is leaving of his own volition he must write down all his overts and withholds against the Organization and its related personnel and have these checked out by the HCO Secretary on an E-Meter.

To do less than this is cruelty itself. The person is blowing himself off with his own overts and withholds. If these are not removed then anything the Organization or its people does to him goes in like a javelin and leaves him with a dark area in his life and a rotten taste in his mouth. Further he goes around spouting lies about the Organization and its related personnel and every lie he utters makes him just that much sicker. By permitting a blow-off without clearing it we are degrading people, for I assure you, and with some sorrow, people have not often recovered from overts against Scientology, its Organizations and related persons. They don't recover because they know in their hearts even while they lie that they are wronging people who have done and are doing enormous amounts of good in the world and who definitely do not deserve libel and slander. Literally, it kills them and if you don't believe it I can show you the long death list.

The only evil thing we are doing is to be good, if that makes sense to you. For by being good, things done to us out of carelessness or viciousness are all out of proportion to the evil done to others. This often applies to people who are not Scientologists. Just this year I had an electrician who robbed HCO of money with false bills and bad workmanship. One day he woke up to the fact that the Organization he was robbing was helping people everywhere far beyond his ability to ever help anyone. Within a few weeks he contracted TB and is now dying in a London hospital. Nobody took off the overts and withholds when he left. And it's actually killing him – a fact which is no fancy on my part. There is something a little terrifying in this sometimes. I once told a bill collector what and who we were and that he had wronged a good person and a half hour later he threw a hundred grains of Veronal down his throat and was lugged off to hospital, a suicide.

This campaign is aimed straightly at cases and getting people cleared. It is aimed at preserving staffs and the lives of persons who believe they have failed us.

Uneasy lies the head that has a bad conscience. Clean it up and run responsibility on it and you have another better person, and if anybody feels like leaving just examine the record and sit down and list everything done to and withheld from me; and the Organization and send it along. We'll save a lot of people that way.

And on our parts we'll go along being as good a manager, as good an Organization and as good a field as we can be and we'll get rid of all our overts and withholds too.

Think it will make an interesting new view?

Well, Scientology specializes in those.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.cden



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 overts the auditor doesn't see.

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

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

It is enough for me to know:

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

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

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

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

So we all win.

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

Look down in our Sthil files. There are actually thousands upon thousands of Scientologists there who each one comment on how wonderful it is and how good they feel. There are a few dozen or so who howl they haven't been helped! What a ratio! Yet I believe some on staff think we have a *lot* of dissatisfied people. These no-gain characters strew so much 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 25 FEBRUARY 1960

MA  
BPI

## SCIENTOLOGY CAN HAVE A GROUP WIN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The building unit of a great society is the individual.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH js.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 14 OCTOBER 1968R  
Revised 1 January 1976

Remimeo  
*Auditor 43*  
Class VIII  
All Auditors

## THE AUDITOR'S CODE

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

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

1. I promise not to evaluate for the preclear or tell him what he should think about his case in session.
2. I promise not to invalidate the preclear's case or gains in or out of session.
3. I promise to administer only Standard Tech to a preclear in the standard way.
4. I promise to keep all auditing appointments once made.
5. I promise not to process a preclear who has not had sufficient rest and who is physically tired.
6. I promise not to process a preclear who is improperly fed or hungry.
7. I promise not to permit a frequent change of Auditors.
8. I promise not to sympathize with a preclear but to be effective.
9. I promise not to let the preclear end session on his own determinism but to finish off those cycles I have begun.
10. I promise never to walk off from a preclear in session.
11. I promise never to get angry with a preclear in session.
12. I promise to run every major case action to a floating needle.
13. I promise never to run any one action beyond its floating needle.
14. I promise to grant beingness to the preclear in session.
15. I promise not to mix the processes of Scientology with other practices except when the preclear is physically ill and only medical means will serve.
16. I promise to maintain communication with the preclear and not to cut his comm or permit him to overrun in session.
17. I promise not to enter comments, expressions or enturbulence into a session that distract a preclear from his case.

18. I promise to continue to give the preclear the process or auditing command when needed in the session.
19. I promise not to let a preclear run a wrongly understood command.
20. I promise not to explain, justify or make excuses in session for any Auditor mistakes whether real or imagined.
21. I promise to estimate the current case state of a preclear only by Standard Case Supervision data and not to diverge because of some imagined difference in the case.
22. I promise never to use the secrets of a preclear divulged in session for punishment or personal gain.
23. I promise to see that any fee received for processing is refunded following the policies of the Claims Verification Board, if the preclear is dissatisfied and demands it within three months after the processing, the only condition being that he may not again be processed or trained.
24. I promise not to advocate Scientology only to cure illness or only to treat the insane, knowing well it was intended for spiritual gain.
25. I promise to cooperate fully with the legal organizations of Dianetics and Scientology as developed by L. Ron Hubbard in safeguarding the ethical use and practice of the subject according to the basics of Standard Tech.
26. I promise to refuse to permit any being to be physically injured, violently damaged, operated on or killed in the name of "mental treatment".
27. I promise not to permit sexual liberties or violation of the mentally unsound.
28. I promise to refuse to admit to the ranks of practitioners any being who is insane.

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

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Witness: \_\_\_\_\_

Place: \_\_\_\_\_

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 29 JANUARY 1972

Remimeo  
Pcs/PreOTs  
DofP  
Tech & Qual

### **PC HAT**

This is the "pc hat" for an org Pc/PreOT.

The DofP must have a supply of these on hand for giving to the pc before he starts an auditing intensive. The pc reads and understands it. Any questions the pc has are answered by the DofP. Any misunderstood words can be clarified by the DofP but if extensive by Dept 13.

These are the terminals you will be dealing with as a Pc/PreOT and are the regulations concerning Pcs and PreOTs at the HGC for service.

### **CHAPLAIN**

The *Chaplain* exists in the Qualifications Division to expedite and speed Pcs/PreOTs and students through their services.

Refer to the Chaplain if you have any slow progress, stops, hindrances or if you are not progressing satisfactorily with your auditing. If there is any arbitrary or barrier preventing you from completing your auditing etc, see the Chaplain.

### **DIRECTOR OF PROCESSING**

The Director of Processing (DofP) will interview you on matters concerning your auditing progress and the scheduling of your auditing.

You may see the DofP at any time regarding your auditing. He is there to see you receive the service and help you.

### **TECH SERVICES**

Tech Services or the Tech Services page will contact you when you are scheduled for a session.

## **DEPT OF PERSONAL ENHANCEMENT**

This department, in the Qual Division, takes care of word clearing. One may be sent to it via the DofP.

### **WHEN TO SEE THE EXAMINER**

(The Examiner is open from 9:00 am to 10:00 pm excepting lunch and dinner breaks.)

1. The Examiner is the terminal for pre-auditing statements and any communications you wish to give to the C/S. (Case Supervisor)
2. The Examiner is the terminal to go through to see the Qual Consultant. (Examiner will make an appointment for you.)
3. The Examiner is the terminal to see to give the C/S data regarding any physical body difficulty and any planned visit to or report from a doctor while you are receiving an intensive.
4. The Examiner is the terminal you see after each auditing session.

### **MEDICAL DOCTORS AND PHYSICIANS**

(of all kinds – professional and nonprofessional)

### **CHEMISTS, PHARMACEUTISTS AND DRUGGISTS**

1. Always inform the Examiner and DofP of any drugs taken or visits to a doctor, etc, since your last intensive, when you are about to begin another intensive.
2. When receiving an intensive and you require clinical-medical service always inform firstly (when possible) the Pc Examiner and the DofP before receiving treatment.

Information regarding any treatment received without prior DofP knowledge must be given to the DofP and Pc Examiner after such treatment.

3. When eating any food, if it doesn't taste good, don't eat it. Less time physically ill means more auditing time for you.
4. Exercise regularly.
5. Drink at least 8-9 glasses of fluid daily (water, coffee, juice, tea, etc.)
6. Eat regularly; three good protein and vegetable meals a day are required – not snacks of carbohydrates from a canteen.
7. Get enough sleep. Seven to eight hours minimum are required. If you need more, be sure you get it.
8. If you are currently under medical treatment or taking medications, please advise the DofP and Pc Examiner. Take no medicines without obtaining the DofP's OK so that auditing does not get delayed.



9. Drinking of alcohol is prohibited whilst receiving an intensive.
10. Drugs in any way, shape or form are strictly prohibited. Do not take aspirin, car or airsick tablets or any other form of drug or medication without the approval of the DofP, who will also clear it with the Case Supervisor.

### **FURTHER PC RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES**

1. Do not discuss your case or the processes used with anyone outside session except the Pc Examiner or Qual Consultant.
2. Report any difficulties to the PC Examiner, Chaplain, and/or DofP.
3. Do not engage in any 2nd Dynamic irregularities with another.
4. Be ready for a session when scheduled for one. Always inform Tech Services **well in advance** if you can't make it, or if you will be late.
5. Sleep and eat well.
6. Do not take any drugs, pills, doctor's preparations, alcohol, etc when on auditing lines and receiving an intensive.
7. In your own interest, do not do anything you know is dishonest or unlawful.
8. Do not engage in other practices while receiving an auditing intensive. This includes "bathing in light", psychiatry, yoga, hypnotism, meditation, spiritualism, mysticism, extreme dieting, etc. If on a special diet as part of medical treatment, inform the DofP.

The above regulations are required to ensure that *you* receive the full service and benefit you deserve.

The DofP will answer any other question you may have.

Training & Service Bureau

By order of

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:BL:JW:mes



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 17 MARCH 1965

Issue II

Remimeo

*HCO (Division 1)*

*Justice*

*Staff Hat*

**RIGHTS OF A STAFF MEMBER,  
STUDENTS AND PRECLEARS TO JUSTICE**

1. HCO is the Justice agency of Scientology and Scientologists in addition to other functions.
2. All matters of internal Justice in orgs, Committees of Evidence and complaints are taken to the HCO personnel so indicated on the Org Board.
3. All Scientologists and staff members in accepting posts or membership agree to abide by the HCO Codes. These include the Justice Codes.
4. HCO Justice applies to all Scientology and Scientologists.
5. When we say *Legal* matters we mean outside law and law agencies such as attorneys, civil courts, suits, contracts and corporation and copyright matters. This comes under Division 3.
6. When we say JUSTICE we mean HCO, Division 1, Internal activities such as Committees of Evidence, internal enforcement and discipline. Scientology Justice safeguards the rights of Scientologists, prevents injustice, prevents punishment by whim, and brings order. Before the Justice Codes, discipline was inequitable and often unjust. The HCO Justice Codes bettered this by making offenses and penalties known and milder. HCO Justice prevents wrongful disgrace, demotion, transfer or dismissal and protects the staff member's reputation and job from being falsely threatened.
7. In a Condition of Emergency assigned to a Department or org, staff members may be subjected to demotion, transfer or dismissal as the Assignment of the Condition of Emergency suspends the Justice Codes. There is no recourse, then. In addition, offenses may still be made the subject of Committees of Evidence. The thing to do is not get into such a state. Lessened traffic and other matters all found on the OIC charts of each week are the *sole* evidence used to assign a Condition of Emergency. A Condition of Emergency cannot be assigned unless these graphs show a declining condition.
8. When the org or department is not in a Condition of Emergency, the protective Justice Codes are in full force.

9. A staff member who believes he has been falsely wronged (unless a Condition of Emergency exists in his department or org) may request a Committee of Evidence of HCO with himself as an Interested Party and this *must* be granted him. He must however agree to abide by its findings. It can restore any lost pay in cases of injustice but not damages. No senior executive in the org may be named as an Interested Party in matters of recourse requested by a junior but below the level of Executive Councilman may be called as witnesses. An Executive Councilman cannot be called before *any* Committee of Evidence by anyone in his or her org including other Councilmen of that org. Only a senior org may call Executive Councilmen of a junior org before a Committee of Evidence and then only for a crime or high crime and then only in the premises of the senior org. Do not then seek to name Executive Councilmen as interested parties in any Committee of Evidence and do not seek to name any member of any senior org in any Committee of Evidence requested by anyone in an org junior to it.
10. If a staff member wishes to sue a fellow staff member or right a wrong he or she may request a *Civil* Committee of Evidence of HCO. HCO usually [appoints] *one* senior staff member on which the two contenders can agree. The senior staff member holds a session or sessions and both contenders must abide by his findings and award of any money or damages or return of property. There is no further appeal. A *Civil* Committee of Evidence follows the same procedure and has the same rights as any other Committee of Evidence. A Civil Committee of Evidence may not be called by contending co-auditors. These must seek out the D of P and abide by the D of P's advice.
11. Students or pcs may not request Committees of Evidence for causes occurring during a course or an intensive but may appeal in writing to the Division 2 Service Executive. They must report matters covered under the Justice Code, however, to HCO.

There are no student rules and regulations except the Justice Codes. All others are abolished. The penalties that can be awarded are for an error, an instructor reprimand, for a misdemeanor, a pink sheet which must be completed before classification is given, for a crime, one to three weeks at the student's expense in the HGC. A Committee of Evidence can also be convened on a student or preclear for offenses as covered in the Justice Codes.

12. In times of stress, commotion, riot or threats to person, an HCO personnel may instantly deputize any other Scientologist merely by saying loudly, "HCO. Bring Order," making it known in any way that the Scientologist or Scientologists present should intervene or act. Any Scientologist whose help is thus commanded at once becomes deputized by Division 1 by the fact of required assistance and may not be charged before a Committee of Evidence for any act committed in rendering assistance to HCO during the period of stress and must be protected by the organization from any civil authority and the organization must pay any fines or expenses incurred or reasonable costs for damage to dress or hospital aid. When the incident is over, the HCO personnel must say, "HCO thanks you for bringing order," thus ending the deputization.

An HCO Personnel requiring an eviction of a person or persons from a premises or meeting or area need only point to the person or persons and say, "HCO. Order!" Any

staff member or Scientologist present is instantly deputized as above and must act promptly to carry out the eviction or be liable under Justice Codes when failing to do so. This can be used in any circumstances, no matter how mild the offender even down to slovenly or unauthorized persons on the premises or in any office. When the person or persons are removed, the HCO personnel removes the deputization by saying, "HCO thanks you for order." These orders apply even when the person causing a disturbance is an officer, director or councilman of another division and none may be disciplined for complying but may be liable under Justice Codes for not doing so.

13. When personnel of other divisions foresee stress or danger, while they themselves have ample authority in their own divisions to handle their own personnel, where Scientologists in general are involved, they may not take Justice in their own hands as it is a Division 1 HCO hat and Divisions must not cross in functions. Where mixed divisions or not staff persons are concerned they should be careful to have an HCO personnel present or available, a wise precaution in event of the possibility of charges or Committees of Evidence resulting, in which case an HCO personnel as a witness would bear weight.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml.cden





HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, Bast Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 16 NOVEMBER 1971

Remimeo

**CONDITIONS: AWARDS AND PENANCES**

(Cancels the following HCO Policy Letters:

Sept 26, 67 CONDITIONS, AWARDS & PENALTIES  
July 21, 68 PENALTIES FOR LOWER CONDITIONS  
Oct 18, 67 PENALTIES FOR LOWER CONDITIONS  
Oct 6, 70 ETHICS PENALTIES  
Oct 19, 71 ETHICS PENALTIES REINSTATED

Restores

Mar 22, 68 CONDITIONS PENALTIES, NEW EMPLOYEES AND PERSONS NEWLY ON POST.)

While the motto, "Hat, don't hit" remains, it has been claimed by HCO's that control of out-ethics is impossible with awards only. The re-introduction of penances is, therefore, done to enable HCO to carry out its duties.

The following are the current conditions:

- Power:** Pay and full bonuses. Awarded #25.00 credit for Org services at own org or is payable by Org as credit against services in a higher Org. Has top priority on Org service lines. Gold star on Comm basket and on Org Board.
- Affluence:** Pay and half bonuses. Awarded <15.00 credit for Org services at own org or is payable by Org as credit against services in a higher Org. Has next priority on Org service lines. Blue star on Comm basket and Org Board.
- Normal:** Pay, but no bonuses. Awarded \$5.00 credit.
- Operation:** for Org services at own Org or is payable by Org as credit against services in a higher Org. Has normal handling on Org service line. No ribbon or flag.
- Emergency:** Pay, but no bonuses. Must submit and execute a 2 ½ hour Amends Project in own time. May have Org services, but no priority. Red ribbon on Comm basket and red flag on Org Board.
- Danger:** Pay, but no bonuses. Must submit and execute a 5 hour Amends Project in own time. May have no Org services except for Cramming, Word Clearing, Hat Checking or training. May not be audited. Yellow ribbon on Comm basket and yellow flag on Org Board.
- Non-Existence:** Pay, but no bonuses. Must submit and execute a hour Amends Project in own time. Is off all training and auditing except for Cramming, Word Clearing or hatting actions necessary to handle own post. Minimal meal breaks.

No entertainments – parties, group celebrations. Austere working uniform or clothing. May not have time off or receive vacation while in this condition. A black ribbon is placed on their Comm basket and a black flag by their name on the Org Board.

**Liability:** Pay, but no bonuses. Must submit and execute a 10 hour Amends Project in own time. Is off all training and auditing except for Cramming, Word Clearing or hatting actions necessary to handle own post. Minimal meal breaks. Austere working uniform or clothing. May not have time off or receive vacation while in this condition. A gray ribbon is placed on their Comm basket and a gray flag by their name on the Org Board. Must wear a gray armband on left arm.

**Doubt:** No pay. Either required to leave the premises or required to work in a designated, specific area under close supervision. Must submit and execute a 15 hour Amends Project in own time. May receive no Org services while in this Condition. Austere working uniform or clothing. May not have time off or receive vacation while in this Condition. Expected to repay the amount carelessness or neglect has cost Org in actual money. No privileges. Required to return all Scientology materials, policies, directives, HCOBs, religious items, certificates and awards, and artifacts whatsoever to the duly appointed HCO terminal for custody and safe keeping (usually the Ethics Officer or MAA). All Advanced Course Materials must be returned to Advanced Courses Admin. An orange ribbon is placed on their Comm basket and an orange flag by their name on the Org Board. Must wear an orange armband on left arm.

**Enemy:** Writ of Expulsion from the Church and suspension of all Certificates and Awards. May not be trained or processed or admitted to any Org, Mission or Scientology group activity. The only persons an individual declared in this Condition may communicate to is an Ethics Officer, Master-At-Arms, a Hearing Officer or a Board or a Committee of Evidence. No longer considered a member of the Church, nor deserving of the Church's support in any secular matter. The individual has by his or her actions removed himself from the Church. Must be reported to the Guardian Office.

**Treason:** Writ of Expulsion from the Church and cancellation of all Certificates and Awards. Sever permitted to practice as a Minister of the Church. May not be communicated with. Debarred from training and processing and Advanced Courses forever. Not covered by amnesties. Must be reported to the Guardian Office in case further action is necessary.

The Controller and Guardian WW  
for  
L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:MSH:JK:mes

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 1 SEPTEMBER AD 15  
Issue VII

Remimeo  
All Hats

Div 1  
ETHICS

## ETHICS PROTECTION

Ethics actions must parallel the purposes of Scientology and its organizations.

Ethics exists primarily to get technology in. Tech can't work unless Ethics is already in. When tech goes out Ethics can (and is expected to) get it in. For the purpose of Scientology amongst others, is to apply Scientology. Therefore when tech is in, Ethics actions tend to be dropped. Ethics continues its actions until tech is in and as soon as it is, backs off and only acts if tech goes out again.

The purpose of the org is to get the show on the road and keep it going. This means production. Every division is a production unit. It makes or does something that can have a *statistic* to see if it goes up or down. Example: a typist gets out 500 letters in one week. That's a statistic. If the next week the same typist gets out 600 letters that's an **up** statistic. If the typist gets out 300 letters that's a **down** statistic. Every post in an org can have a statistic. So does every portion of the org. The purpose is to keep production (statistics) up. This is the only thing that gives a good income for the staff member personally. When statistics go down or when things are so organized you can't get one for a post, the staff members' pay goes down as the org goes down in its overall production. The production of an organization is only the total of its individual staff members. When these have down statistics so does the org.

Ethics actions are often used to handle down individual statistics. A person who is not doing his job becomes an Ethics target.

Conversely, if a person *is* doing his job (and his statistic will show that) Ethics is considered to be *in* and the person is *protected* by Ethics.

As an example of the proper application of Ethics to the production of an org, let us say the Letter Registrar has a high statistic (gets out lots of effective mail). Somebody reports the Letter Registrar for rudeness, somebody else reports the Letter Registrar for irregular conduct with a student. Somebody else reports the Letter Registrar for leaving all the lights on. Proper Ethics Officer action = look up the general statistics of the Letter Registrar, and seeing that they average quite high, file the complaints with a yawn.

As the second example of Ethics application to the production of an org, let us say that a Course Supervisor has a low statistic (very few students moved out of his course, course

number growing, hardly anyone graduating, a bad Academy statistic). Somebody reports this Course Supervisor for being late for work, somebody else reports him for no weekly Ad comm report and bang! Ethics looks up the person, calls for an Ethics Hearing with trimmings.

We are not in the business of being good boys and girls. We're in the business of going free and getting the org production roaring. Nothing else is of any interest then to Ethics but (a) getting tech in, getting it run and getting it run right and (b) getting production up and the org roaring along.

Therefore if a staff member *is* getting production up by having his own statistic excellent. Ethics sure isn't interested. But if a staff member isn't producing, shown by his bad statistic for his post, Ethics is fascinated with his smallest misdemeanor.

In short a staff member can get away with murder so long as his statistic is up and can't sneeze without a chop if it's down.

To do otherwise is to permit some suppressive person to simply Ethics chit every producer in the org out of existence.

When people do start reporting a staff member with a high statistic, what you investigate is the person who turned in the report.

In an ancient army a particularly brave deed was recognized by an award of the title of Kha-Khan. It was not a rank. The person remained what he was, **but** he was entitled to be forgiven the death penalty ten times in case in the future he did anything wrong. That was a Kha-Khan.

That's what producing, high statistic staff members are – Kha-Khans. They can get away with murder without a blink from Ethics.

The average fair to poor statistic staff member of course gets just routine ethics with hearings or courts for too many misdeeds. The low statistic fellow gets a court if he sneezes.

Ethics *must* use all org discipline only in view of the production statistic of the staff member involved.

And Ethics must recognize a Kha-Khan when it sees one – and tear up the bad report chits on the person with a yawn.

To the staff member this means – if you do your job you are protected by Ethics. And if you aren't so protected and your statistic is high, cable me.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 27 MAY 1960

Issue II

Re-issued from Sthil

BPI  
MA (not a lead article  
but a 2<sup>nd</sup> place)

## LETTER TO A SCIENTOLOGIST

Dear Scientologist:

For a long ten years I have had to wear many hats. Amongst them is an Ethics hat by which I have had to protect, often with small support, the good name and standards of conduct of Dianetics and Scientology.

To say the least the hat and necessary actions of counter-attack and defense have been distasteful to me. And in this regard, I humbly ask your help.

We have the answers today as to the why of "squirrels". We know the reason for their overts against Dianetics and Scientology. Technically, with overt-withhold and the phenomena of help we not only understand them but can straighten out their insecurity and hates to their own benefit.

Could you help me in this? It must be evident by now after ten long years that if there were any twist or untruth, betrayal or insincerity intended by me or organizational people, we long since would have passed away. The rumours that are put out by unbalanced people achieve only harder work for me and for good people everywhere.

In ten consistent years you should have proof enough that I'll stay at my post and do my job and overcome barriers, technical or administrative, organizational and field, somehow.

I dislike punishments and quarrels and entheta as much as any of you. Sometimes I haven't handled these things well, but I have tried to do my job as best I could here on a muddy earth.

Today nothing can destroy us or our works. I have no fear for our future and I know what we can do. Available to your hands is the technology necessary to handle rumor mongers, unethical persons and enturbulators. You can help me by handling them and getting them to good auditors, preferably an HGC, and preventing them from upsetting others and our task. Winning is so easy now, success is in our very grasp.

What failure do you think I feel when I am asked to cancel a certificate? With all the wealth of truth before him, someone avails himself or herself of no part of it and with a glass of water held in hand, dies of thirst.

Yet some of this burden lies with you. When an auditor forgets his personal auditing, and audits without being clear, why does the field permit him to crack up? Why haven't his

friends and associates thought enough of him to force him to get processing from a reliable source? Why do they wait for him, overworked already, to emerge from the tangle of some emotional crisis utterly unstrung and hating everything, before they offer processing?

Clearing the executives, the auditors, the people of Scientology is your job now. When you hear somebody "going bad", running away and raving against us all, don't harbour him and sympathize – you'll kill him. Make him go to the nearest HGC or an auditor with altitude over him and get his overts off and his ability to help increased.

There are thousands of auditors across the world. Few of them are clear. Once or twice a year amongst all these one of them turns upon us. Rumours fly. People wonder. Eyebrows raise. Why? In a few years they'll be clear. We've just begun the project. Right now they are not. Instead of standing around blinking, wondering even believing such wild tales, why aren't you being effective? The person doing bad and untrue things needs assistance. The least you can do is drive or force him to an HGC where supervised auditing (and not patty-cake) will straighten the person out and make life bright again.

My lines are heavy. My days are long. To these should we also add my Ethics hat?

A breakthrough has happened here in 1960's spring bigger even than O/W. We're clearing people fast in HGCs. It just began to happen. But it isn't happening to auditors in the field yet and it won't for quite some while. Meanwhile must I go on and act to minimize the damage being done by people not only not yet clear but heavily caved in?

You could help me by pressing these people in toward auditing, by understanding the why of their rumours and hates and getting them processed. And you can help by insisting that "names" in Scientology get processed regularly by competent auditors in an HGC (not by some "friend" who'll patty-cake) until they're really cleared. I myself have had scores of hours of processing since last fall. If I could be clearer than I am, what's that make the case of other Scientologists?

You could lighten my lines, and my heart, if you'd share this burden even a little bit. Hold the field together until they are all clear.

Now, certain you will help in this and let me get on to wider work, I wish to celebrate the occasion of HGCs, using new technology, beginning to make clears again, by announcing the complete and unqualified restoration of all certificates and awards ever cancelled since 1950. They're all in force again. Let's get on with our job.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 10 JUNE 1960

MA

## WHAT WE EXPECT OF A SCIENTOLOGIST

We inherited, when we began, a great many hidden errors in the society, so deeply laid they seemed right. "Everybody knows that..." is a tombstone of progress for it contains unsuspected lies that bring the wittiest of us to grief. "Everybody knows that Man is Evil" was only one of the many things we found wrong, exposed and dropped from our own knowledge.

However, in the field of what is expected of a Scientologist, we have for ten years carried along an inherited error. It is this: "Everybody knows that a specialist in a science hangs out a shingle and, if a professional, becomes a private practitioner."

Now listen. Psycho-analysis was developed in 1894 by Sigmund Freud. Everybody who studied it was expected to hang out a shingle and start practising. It took half a century for psycho-analysis to become generally known by the people. Yet how could it miss? Its tenet was that if you were sexually uninhibited you would be happy.

The psycho-analyst took his cue from the medico of his day. If you could heal you were a healer with a shingle.

Well, I'm afraid a lot of us have bought this too. If we were trained in Scientology as a professional we should hang out our shingle as a practitioner. With all due respect to the Scientologist in professional practice (where they have every right to be) this is not a true idea. It is a borrowed idea. It's as old as the witch doctor.

A Scientologist is the being three feet behind society's head. And society runs on eight dynamics, not in a sick room. Some of us, of course, would become professional practitioners. But a professional Scientologist is one who expertly uses Scientology on any area or level of the society.

A housewife who does not have professional level skill in Scientology could not expect to run a wholly successful family or keep order in her neighbourhood and keep her family well. A factory foreman could not possibly handle his crews with full effectiveness without professional Scientology skill. The personal assistant to a corporation executive could not do a fully effective job without being a professional Scientologist. A corporation president without a certificate will someday fail. And the head of a country would go to pieces if he didn't know Scientology from a professional angle.

How can these people handle life if they have no expert knowledge of how to handle life.

Now we don't expect everyone in the world to become a trained auditor. But we expect the people who are making the world to have a knowledge of how to make it go.

A *trained* Scientologist is not a doctor. He is someone with special knowledge in the handling of life.

We have many, many personal success stories in Scientology. They begin with a book acquaintance and bloom when professional skill enters the background. These people, small people, big people, drove a wedge for themselves into companies, societies, with Scientology and then took over control of the area. They succeeded where they never would have dreamed they could. And every time one of us drives in such a wedge, we all win because the world is brought nearer to a sane and decent world.

The factories, the marts of trade, the homes, the neighbourhoods, these are the places we want *trained* Scientologists. In that way alone, we're on the busy, still healthy communication lines of the world.

Some of us need to run centres and schools just to give the rest of us service when required. Training at a pro level must continue and *must* be kept good. And service and communication must be given. Hence, we have Central Organizations on every continent and HCOs. But if we avoid the throbbing comm lines of the world and act like doctors, we will not win soon enough as a group.

Any trained Scientologist can win to success in society. Heightened IQ, a knowledge of life, a forthright attitude – with these things it is easy for him or her to improve a social or business position, to get higher pay, to exert wider personal influence. This we know we can do, we have done it so often so let's improve the ability.

Process people weekends, run a co-audit some evenings of the week at home, but get on the active lines of the world and make your presence felt.

It takes full training to do it. It's been done from our books alone but not always well. It takes tough Academy training to make a Scientologist, so don't go at it half armed.

And stop feeling apologetic because you are not a "full time auditor". We are the auditors to the world, not to a handful of the sick.

We are not doctors. We are the world's trouble shooters. When we make a company win, the whole world wins, when we make a neighbourhood win, we all win.

A full time Scientologist makes life better wherever he is. And that is enough pro activity for anyone.

What do we expect of you? To become the best Scientologist that can be and to get on the comm lines of the world and bring a big win where it counts. We don't expect you to hang up a shingle as a doctor and have a private practice. We'll respect you if you do. But we'll respect you just as much and even more if you get trained as a pro and go out and up in the world of action and of life.

Hit for the key spots by whatever means, the head of the women's club, the personnel director of a company, the leader of a good orchestra, the president's secretary, the advisor of the trade union – any key spot. Make a good sound living at it, drive a good car, but get your job done, handle and better the people you meet and bring about a better earth.



And stop feeling hangdog because you "aren't auditing full time". Nobody expects you to.

We'll keep centres going to service your needs, some of us, we'll provide ammunition and books. And the rest of us had better invade every activity there is on a high level of success and make our influence felt on the comm lines of the world.

Scientology is the only game on Earth where everybody wins.

So let's help the world win.

LRH:js.rd

L. RON HUBBARD



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 9 FEBRUARY 1974R  
Revised 17 February 1980

Remimeo

*Ethics*

**CONDITION BELOW TREASON  
CONFUSION FORMULA AND  
EXPANDED CONFUSION FORMULA**

*Ref:* HCO PL 14 FEB. 80 ORDER VERSUS DISORDER

(This HCO PL has been revised due to the discovery that the condition of Confusion can be far more extensive than was previously envisaged and may require additional steps to get out of it. The original formula is not cancelled as it has proven very successful but there are some additional steps that may be needed to get the person or area fully out of the condition.)

**CONFUSION FORMULA**

There is a condition below Treason.

It is a condition of **Confusion**.

In a condition of Confusion the being or area will be in a state of random motion. There will be no real production, only disorder or confusion.

In order to get out of Confusion one has to find out where he is.

It will be seen that the progress upward would be in Confusion, find out where you are; in Treason, find out that you are; and for Enemy, find out who you are.

The formula for Confusion is:

**Find out where *you* are.**

(*Note:* It is important that the person who is in Confusion be cleared up on the definition of Confusion as contained in *Modern Management Technology Defined*. This is done before the formula itself is started.)

The additional formula for the condition of Confusion is:

1. Locational on the area in which one is.

2. Comparing where one is to other areas where one was.
3. Repeat step 1.

### EXPANDED CONFUSION FORMULA

Where a person is in Confusion and his own MEST or the MEST of his post is messed up or in a state of disorder, then the Expanded Confusion Formula is done.

The Expanded Confusion Formula consists of all the steps given above for the Confusion Formula with the following additions:

4. The checklist given in HCO PL 14 FEB. 80, ORDER VERSUS DISORDER, lists all the points that need to be checked for and handled in order to get the basics of organization in on an individual or area, and all these points are checked for and handled as part of the Expanded Confusion Formula. Each point is checked and any handling needed for that point is done right away before continuing with the checklist.
5. Repeat step 1 (Locational).

Where a condition of Confusion exists, all these steps can be done to handle the condition. On the other hand, if someone has a huge win on the first steps and comes out of Confusion, one would not force him to do all the other steps and keep him in the condition when he has actually come out of it. He would still handle the points on HCO PL 14 FEB. 80, ORDER VERSUS DISORDER, but this must *not* be used to keep someone in a condition of Confusion and refuse to upgrade him when he has come out of the condition.

The purpose of the formula is to get someone located in his present time environment, knowing where he is and where the various things he needs to operate with are, so that he is no longer in a condition of Confusion.

For someone who is actually in a condition of Confusion this can be a huge win and it will start him on the road to Power. It can be a turning point in his life.

The formula is complete when the person has made it out of Confusion, knows where he is, has established order in his area and knows the basics of how to operate out of that area.

When this end result has been achieved, the person will be ready to be upgraded and move on up through the other conditions. The fact that he has not completed all steps of the formula must not be used as a reason to keep someone in Confusion when he has honestly made it out of that condition.

Lack of this condition sometimes brings about an assignment of Treason in which the person cannot actually find out that he is and so occasionally does not make it on up the conditions.

Many more persons are in this condition than is generally realized.

Now, with the expansion of the formula, anybody who is in this condition can really make it out of Confusion and on up through the other conditions.

Doing Confusion fully and properly gives one a very firm footing so that he can make it up the conditions and be truly successful in his area.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:gal



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 16 JANUARY 1966

Remimeo  
Executive Hats

## **DANGER CONDITION**

The Conditions of Operation are (6) Power, (5) Power Change, (4) Affluence, (3) Normal, (2) Emergency, (1) Danger and (0) Non Existence.

The formula of a Danger Condition is:

1. By-pass (ignore the junior or juniors normally in charge of the activity and handle it personally).
2. Handle the situation and any danger in it.
3. Assign the area where it had to be handled a Danger Condition.
4. Handle the personnel by Ethics Investigation and Comm Ev.
5. Reorganize the activity so that the situation does not repeat.
6. Recommend any firm policy that will hereafter detect and/or prevent the condition from recurring.

The senior executive present acts and acts according to the formula above.

A Danger Condition is normally assigned when:

1. An emergency condition has continued too long.
2. A statistic plunges downward very steeply.
3. A senior executive suddenly finds himself or herself wearing the hat of the activity because it is in trouble.

## **PERSONNEL**

In Step 4 of the Danger Formula one has to call in Ethics to investigate and must order a hearing and also a Comm Ev as indicated on any person or persons whose negligence or non-compliance brought the situation about.

## EXAMPLES

### Example 1

The AdComm of the Distribution Division never orders or takes effective action to remedy the gross divisional statistic which has been at continuing emergency level for some time.

The Org Exec Sec is being pulled in to handle the situation as the statistic's continuous low will swamp the org eventually and no reasonable advices from the Org Exec Sec have been accepted or used despite the continuing danger to the org from that Division.

The Org Exec Sec therefore acts personally with personal work and (1) By-passes the Secretary, (2) Gets the FSM programme going and ads placed and a Congress scheduled and advertised all on an urgent basis, all on a by-pass of existing channels, (3) Has the Division assigned a Danger Condition, (4) Orders an Ethics investigation of all personnel in the Division and brings any persons whose non-compliances or crimes were responsible before a Committee of Evidence including the Secretary, (5) Appoints personnel and reorganizes the Distribution Division, (6) From the Ethics Investigation and Comm Ev, sifts out any needful policy or change and forwards it to the Office of LRH for consideration for issue.

### Example 2

The Letters in – Letters out statistic takes a very steep dive (perhaps only  $\frac{1}{8}$ <sup>th</sup> the former number). The HCO Area Sec instantly acts to (1) By-pass all lines, (2) Get mailings out urgently, put expeditors on writing letters, get a magazine in the mails, all off her own bat, using anyone to hand, (3) Demand the Dissem and Dist Divs be put in Danger Condition and if refused cables LRH, (4) Order an Executive Ethics investigation of all areas of outflow that would be responsible for org outflow and demands of the HCO Exec Sec a Comm Ev on any personnel found by investigation to have been negligent or non-compliant with policy concerning letters and any kind of mailing out, and failing to get such assignment cables LRH, (5) Demand new personnel on key outflow posts, (6) Recommend any firm policy outgrowing from the investigation and Comm Ev to the Office of LRH.

### Example 3

The Tech Sec suddenly discovers he or she is totally wearing the D of T hat and statistics are falling in that Dept although there is a D of T. The Tech Sec has already attempted to get the D of T's hat on many times. The Tech Sec then: (1) By-passes the D of T, (2) Immediately handles the Academy on a personal full time basis to sort out the students, establish precise schedules, get in proper check sheets and routes slow students to Cramming and nattery ones to Ethics and gets completions going, (3) Gets the Department assigned a Danger Condition, (4) Demands an Ethics investigation and a Comm Ev on personnel on whom non-compliance or crimes are discovered, (5) Gets a new D of T and/or Supervisors, (6) Recommends any firm policy found required in the Ethics Investigation or Comm Ev.



## EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

When I find a hat forced upon me despite all efforts of mine to handle it previously and which I have then to handle, I follow the Emergency formula.

When an org is in general danger or a dangerous situation has arisen, I follow the Danger Condition Formula.

By the time anything gets to a point where I have to wear the hat, statistics on it must have been bad for some time and I find by experience that non-compliance will be discovered inevitably, which is why the situation rolled all the way up the lines to me.

As Danger Condition is handled by a by-pass of those who were supposed to handle it, then I also by-pass in assigning a Danger Condition, which is to say, the Condition is assigned not by chain of command but by direct Sec Ed.

## SUMMARY

Emergencies when they continue are usually caused by crimes or negligence and are always accompanied by non-compliance.

A continued emergency inevitably results in real catastrophe for higher executives. It causes them heavy overwork at the very least. Sometimes a danger condition threatens finally the whole org unless handled.

In the current society the manager or executive has no recourse to law or the culture. Errors can be made or omissions can occur unknown to him, which actually can threaten not only his job but his person.

The usual action in our organizations is to let things run as long as they run well. When they begin to show poorer statistics an Emergency Condition is assigned and we usually talk it over with the person who is head of that activity, and try to help. If the condition continues we warn. And if the statistics still go down, we usually transfer and find somebody else. At the point where a senior executive finds he is being made to look bad by continued emergency on a lower echelon, he has no choice but to assign a Danger Condition. The head of the activity is not always removed but certainly must be investigated. If permanent, it takes a Comm Ev to remove or transfer.

It will always be found that non-compliance with policy and orders has for some time existed. It will sometimes be found that lies and false reports also existed. And one always finds negligence and idleness and inattention where statistics continue to go down.

It is *very* bad to assign a Danger Condition or to By-Pass *unless* the statistics are continuing to go down or have continued at a dangerous level for some time without real improvement.

A senior executive is soft in the head if he thinks statistics just *stay* down. They are *always held* down hard. Emergencies don't just happen because someone is idle. Emergencies are made actively. It takes a lot of counter-effort to jam an org's flows – if you don't believe it then measure it by the effort *you* exert trying to get things going. What's pushing back so

hard? Emergencies are *made*. They don't just happen. And any hearing in an area where statistics just won't come up will reveal not mere negligence but actual crimes as well.

The senior executive's only protection is to handle the bad situation and follow the Danger Condition formula.

If that seems ruthless, it still is necessary if one is to be at all successful.

### ASSIGNMENT

Only the Adcouncil, an Executive Secretary or Secretary may assign a Danger Condition. A Director or Officer may request one on their sections or personnel.

If one was incorrectly assigned and statistics were in fact up it will of course come out in the hearing.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml.rd

[*Note:* The original mimeo issue of this Policy Letter omitted *Emergency* from the Conditions of Operation in the first paragraph. *Emergency* has been included here per amending HCO P/L 8 February 1966, Issue III.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 3 MAY 1972

Remimeo  
Executive Hats

*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 and 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 comm. eved 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 1**

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 PL 9 Avril 1972 [Revised]: "CORRECT DANGER CONDITION HANDLING", 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 downstats 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 much better.

And that's a win for everybody.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:mes.rd



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 4 APRIL 1972

Issue I

Remimeo

*Establishment Officer Series 14*

**ETHICS**

The normal level of an unhatted Dev-T non-producing org is out ethics.

The reason you see so many heavy ethics actions occurring – or situations where heavy ethics actions should occur if they aren't – in such an org is that it has its **Exchange** flows messed up.

It is important to know this fact as this factor alone can sometimes be employed to handle persons in the area whose ethics are out.

**CRIMINALITY**

Unless we want to go on living in a far nowhere some of the facts of scenes have to be confronted.

An inability to confront evil leads people into disregarding it or discounting it or not seeing it at all.

Reversely, there can be a type of person who, like an old-time preacher, sees nothing but evil in everything and, possibly looking into his own heart for a model, believes all men are evil.

Man, however (as you can read in HCO B 28 Nov 70, C/S Series 22, "Psychosis"), is basically good. When going upon some evil course he attempts to restrain himself and caves himself in.

The Chart of Human Evaluation in *Science of Survival* was right enough. And such people also can be found by the Oxford Capacity Analysis where the graph is low and well below a center line on the right.

This sort of thing can be handled of course by auditing but the Est O does not depend on that to handle his staff's problems.

Criminal actions proceed from such people *unless checked* by more duress from without not to do an evil act than they themselves have pressure from within to do it.

Criminality is in most instances restrained by just such an imbalance of pressures.

If you have no ethics presence in an org, then criminality shows its head.

Such people lie rather than be made to confront. They false report – they even use "PR" which means Public Relations to cover up – and in our slang talk "PR" means putting up a lot of false reports to serve as a smoke screen for idleness or bad actions.

Unless you get Ethics in, you will never get Tech in. If you can't get Tech in you won't get Admin in.

So the lack of Ethics permits the criminal impulse to go unchecked.

Yes, it could be handled with Tech. But to get money you have to have Admin in.

Unless there is Ethics and ways to get it in, no matter how distasteful it may seem, you will never get Tech and Admin in.

Of course there is always the element of possible injustice. But this is provided against. (See HCO PL 24 Feb 72, "Injustice".)

When Ethics is being applied by criminal hands (as happens in some governments) it can get pretty grim.

But even then Ethics serves as a restraint to just outright slaughter.

Omitting to handle criminality can make one as guilty of the resulting crimes as if one committed them! So criminality as a factor has to be handled.

It is standardly handled by the basic Ethics P/Ls and the Ethics Officer system.

## EXCHANGE

The unhatted unproducing staff member, who is not really a criminal or psychotic, can be made to go criminal.

This joins him to the Criminal ranks.

The Ethics system also applies to him.

However there is something an Est O can do about it that is truly Est O tech.

This lies in the field of **Exchange**.

If you recall your Product Clearing, you will see that exchange is something for something.

Criminal exchange is nothing from the criminal for something from another.

Whether theft or threat or fraud is used, the criminal think is to get something without putting out anything. That is obvious.

A staff member can be coaxed into this kind of thinking by **permitting him to receive without his contributing**.

This unlocks, by the way, an age-old riddle of the philosophers as to "what is right or wrong".

**Honesty** is the road to **Sanity**. You can prove that and do prove it every time you make somebody well by "pulling his withholds". The insane are just one seething mass of overt acts and withholds. And they are very physically sick people.

When you let somebody be dishonest you are setting him up to become physically ill and unhappy.

Traditional Sea Org Ethics labeled Non-Compliance as Liability and a False Report as Doubt. And it's true enough.

When you let a person give nothing for something you are factually encouraging crime.

Don't be surprised that welfare districts are full of robbery and murder. People there give nothing for something.

When *exchange is* out the whole social balance goes out.

Every full scholarship ever given by an org wound up in a messy scene.

When you hire a professional pc who just sits around making do-less motions while people audit him and contribute to him **do not be surprised if he gets sicker and sicker**.

He is contributing nothing in return and winds up in overwhelm!

Similarly if you actively prevented someone from contributing in return you could also make him ARC Broken and sick.

It is **Exchange** which maintains the inflow and outflow that gives a person space around him and keeps the bank off of him.

There are numbers of ways these flows of Exchange can be unbalanced.

It does not go same out as comes in. Equal amounts are no factor. Who can measure good will or friendship? Who can actually calculate the value of saving a being from death in each lifetime? Who can measure the reward of pride in doing a job well or praise?

For all these things are of different values to different people.

In the material world the person whose Exchange Factor is out may think he "makes money". Only a government or a counterfeiter "makes money". One has to produce something to *Exchange* for money.

Right there the Exchange Factor is out.

If he gives nothing in return for what he gets the money does not belong to him.

In product clearing many people it was found that some considered their food, clothing, bed and allowance were not theirs because they produced. They were theirs "just by being there". This funny "logic" covered up the fact that these people produced little or nothing

on post. Yet they were the first to howl when not getting expensive (to the org) auditing or courses or tech!

Thus such a person, not hatted or made to produce, will get ill.

It is interesting that when a person becomes productive his morale improves.

Reversely it should be rather plain to you that a person who doesn't produce becomes mentally or physically ill. For his *exchange* factor is out.

So when you reward a downstat you not only deprive upstats, you also cave the downstat in!

I don't think Welfare States have anything else in mind!

The riots of the ancient city of Rome were caused by these factors. There they gave away corn and games to a populace that eventually became so savage it could only enjoy torture and gruesome death in the arena!

A lot of this exchange imbalance comes from child psychology where the child is not contributing anything and is not permitted to contribute.

It is this which first overwhelms him with feelings of obligation to his parents and then bursts out as total revolt in his teens.

Children who are permitted to contribute (not as a cute thing to do but actually) make non-contributing children of the same age look like raving maniacs! It is the cruel sadism of modern times to destroy the next generation this way. Don't think it isn't intended. I have examined the OCAs of parents who do it!

So if a person is brought up this life with the exchange all awry, the Est O has his hands full sometimes!

He is dealing with trained-in criminality!

### WHAT HE CAN DO

The remedy is rather simple.

First one has to know all about **Exchange** as covered in the Product Clearing policy letters.

Then he has to specially clear this up with people who do not produce.

He should get them to work on it as it relates to **all their Dynamics in relationship to every other Dynamic.**

That means he has to clear up the definitions of dynamics with *care* and then have the person draw a big chart (of his own) and say what he gives the 1<sup>st</sup> Dynamic and what it gives him. Then what he gives the second dynamic and what it gives him. And so on up the dynamics.

Now, have him consider "his own second dynamic". What does his second dynamic give his first dynamic? What does his second dynamic give the second dynamic and what does it give him?

And so on until you have a network of these exchange arrows, each both ways.

Somewhere along the way, if your TRs are good and you have his attention and he is willing to talk to you he will have quite a cognition!

That, if it's a big one is the End Phenomena of it.

And don't be surprised if you see a person now and then change his physical face shape!

### CONDITIONS BY DYNAMICS

An Ethics type "action" can be done by giving the person the conditions formulas (pages 189, 237, 245, 247, 249 of Vol 0, Basic Staff Hat. HCO PL 14 Mar 68 – page 247 – gives one the table.)

Method 4 the person on the Table of Conditions and pick up any other misunderstandings.

Have the person study the *formula* of each of these Conditions in the table so that he knows what they are and what the formulas are.

When he has all this now with no misunderstood words you must clear up the words related to his dynamics 1 to 8 and what they are.

Now you're ready for the billion dollar question.

Ask him what is his condition on the first dynamic. Have him study the formulas. Don't buy any glib PR.

Don't evaluate or invalidate. When he's completely sure of what his condition really is on the first dynamic he will cognite.

Now take up the second dynamic by its parts-sex, family, children. Get a Condition for each.

Similarly go on up each one of the dynamics until you have a condition for each one.

Now begin with the first dynamic again. Continue to work this way.

You will be amazed to find he will come out of false high down to low and back up again *on each dynamic*.

Somewhere along the line he will start to change markedly.

When you have a person in continual heavy ethics or who is out-ethics (Ethics bait, we say) and who is floundering around, you can do an S&D on him and quite often save his future for him.

When you have such a person you do this one first before you do the Exchange by Dynamics.

In other words, you use this on "Ethics bait" and then when he's come out of such, you do Exchange by Dynamics on him.

### SUMMARY

When all looks black, and you are getting false reports, and the things said done were not done and what was really being done were overt products and despite all your work, the stats just *won't* go up, you still have three answers:

1. **Get in Ethics on the org.**
2. **Get Exchange done on individuals.**
3. **Get in Conditions by Dynamics on the ethics bait.**

And after that keep a strong just Division 1 Dept 3.

You'll be amazed!

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:sb.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 29 APRIL 1965  
Issue III

Remimeo

## **ETHICS REVIEW**

(Correction to HCO Pol Ltr 24 April 1965  
and additional Ethics data)

As per HCO Pol Ltr of 28 April 1965, and others of later date, orders to auditing or training may not be made as a sentence or used in an ethics court or by a Comm Ev or any other reason. Auditing and training are awards.

A student who is disruptive of discipline and acts contrary to the ethics codes may not be ordered to review by the D of P, D of T or ethics personnel or other persons in an org.

### **ORDERING STUDENTS & PCS**

Tech and Qualifications personnel, particularly the Tech Sec and Qual Sec and D of Estimations, the D of P and D of T, D of Exams and D of Review and D of Certs may order students or pcs to review or to course or to HGC or anywhere in and around these two Divisions without any ethics action being implied. It is just normal, done to get students and pcs on the road to higher levels.

Ethics actions may only suspend training or deny auditing.

Therefore, a student ordered to ethics for discipline who does not then give adequate promise and example of good behaviour and compliance must be thoroughly investigated even to his or her own area and in the meanwhile may not be trained or processed.

The student, however, may not be dismissed or expelled unless full ethics actions and procedures have been undertaken.

All sentences carrying a denial of training or processing must carry a means of the right to be trained or processed being restored in a specified time or under specified conditions.

## STUDENTS AND PCS & ETHICS

The routine action of ethics is to request a reappraisal of behaviour and a signed promise of good behaviour for a specified time. If the student or pc refuses to so promise, then the next action of ethics is an investigation of the student's course or pc's processing behaviour. When then confronted with the data, if the student still refuses to promise, ethics undertakes a full investigation in the student's or pc's own area. If the student or pc still refuses to cooperate, the student goes before a court of ethics which may pass sentence.

## RECOURSE

*Only* after sentence has been passed by a legal body such as a court of ethics or committee of evidence or after an illegal disciplinary action may a student or pc ask for a *recourse*.

Normally before asking for recourse a student or pc *petitions* the office of L. Ron Hubbard if unwilling to accept the discipline but this must be done at once.

If the petition is unfavorably acted upon, the student or pc may ask for recourse.

Recourse must be requested of the convening authority that had local jurisdiction over the student or pc and may not be requested of higher authority. A request to higher authority than the ethics activity that passed sentence is a petition, not recourse.

## COMM EV

A committee of evidence is considered the most severe form of ethics action.

One must not be idly threatened or requested.

Only a Comm Ev can recommend suspension or remove certificates or awards or memberships or recommend dismissal.

The office of LRH passes on all Comm Ev findings before they can go into effect.

A staff member may not be suspended or demoted or transferred illegally out of his division or dismissed without a committee of evidence.

Only after that action, (or wrongful demotion, transfer or dismissal) as above, may recourse be requested.

Students or pcs, however, may be transferred, demoted in level or grade by a court of ethics. And the action of sending the student or pc to a court of ethics is of course a type of suspension which may be prolonged in the face of non-cooperation.

A student or a pc is not a staff member in the ethics sense of the word by simple enrollment on a course or in an HGC or review.



A staff member who is temporarily a student or pc in the Academy or Review or the HGC is not covered as a student or pc by his staff member status. He may be transferred about or demoted as a student or pc by Tech and Qual personnel or suspended as a student or pc by ethics. This however may not affect his staff member status as a staff member. Because he or she is transferred or demoted or suspended by Tech personnel or ethics when a student or pc does not mean he or she may be transferred, demoted or dismissed from his or her regular staff post unless the person's staff status permits it.

### **POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES**

Staff members found to be potential trouble sources are handled like any other potential trouble source – but unless provisional or temporary, may not be affected by this in their staff post. They are of course denied auditing or training until they handle or disconnect but this may not also suspend, transfer or dismiss them (unless of provisional or temporary status).

This ethics action (the potential trouble source) is in lieu of any discipline and disciplinary actions that go beyond temporary suspension of training or processing until the matter is settled, must be undertaken by a court of ethics or a Comm Ev.

### **ARC BROKEN STUDENTS OR PCS**

An ARC break is not an extenuating circumstance in ethics or disciplinary matters and is only taken into account on the person of the auditor who made the ARC break and didn't repair it.

The plea of "ARC broken" is inadmissible in any ethics matter as a defence or justification of misdemeanours, crimes or high crimes.

### **LIGHT TOUCH**

Scientology ethics are so powerful in effect, as determined by observation of it in use, that a little goes a very long ways.

Try to use the lightest form first.

Students are quite caved in by it when it is applied, by actual observation.

Our lines are too powerful and direct and what we mean to a person's future, even while he or she is nattering, is so well understood down deep that ethics action is a far worse threat than mere wog law.

The being who is guilty knows with certainty that he is offending against the future of all, no matter what his surface manifestations or conduct. Further, while wog law at the worst can only cause him or her some pain and a body by execution or one lifetime's loss of liberty, we threaten his eternity. Even while he screams at us he knows this down deep.

My first instance of this was a very dangerous psychotic who was largely responsible for a great deal of the public commotion in 1950. This person desisted and caved in the moment the thought was suggested to her by a non-Dianetic friend that she was threatening all Mankind. She suddenly saw it as truth and instantly gave up all attacks and utterances.

Even the fellow who could push the button on atomic war knows, really, it's only one lifetime per person he is blowing up, only one phase in earth's existence he or she is destroying. That we exist here could actually restrain him. The mere destruction of a planet might not as it's temporary.

Our discipline is quite capable of driving a person around the bend because of what he or she is attacking,

Therefore we can all too easily make a person feel guilty by just a whisper.

I've now seen a student, simply asked a question by ethics, promptly give up and ask for his Comm Ev and expulsion. He hadn't done more than a poor auditing job. Nobody was talking about a Comm Ev or expulsion and he had not a bit of defiance in it. He just caved right in.

You are threatening somebody with oblivion for eternity by expulsion from Scientology. Therefore realize that an ethics action need not be very heavy to produce the most startling results.

Down deep they know this even when they are screaming at us.

One suppressive person who had committed a high crime of some magnitude, went quite insane after departing Scientology and then realizing what he had done.

Therefore, use ethics lightly. It is chain lightning.

### **LEVELS OF ETHICS ACTIONS**

Ethics actions in degree of severity are as follows:

1. Noticing something non-optimum without mentioning it but only inspecting it silently.
2. Noticing something non-optimum and commenting on it to the person.
3. Requesting information by ethics personnel.
4. Requesting information and inferring there is a disciplinary potential in the situation.
5. Talking to somebody about another derogatorily.
6. Talking to the person derogatorily.
7. Investigating in person by ethics.
8. Reporting on a post condition to ethics.

9. Reporting on a person to ethics.
10. Investigating a person by interrogating others about him.
11. Asking others for evidence about a person.
12. Publishing an interrogatory about a person that points out omissions or commissions of ethics offenses.
13. Assigning a lowered condition by limited publication.
14. Assigning a lowered condition by broad publication.
15. Investigating a person thoroughly in his or her own area.
16. Interrogation stated to be leading to a court of ethics.
17. Interrogation in a court of ethics.
18. Sentencing in a court of ethics.
19. Suspending a court of ethics sentence.
20. Carrying out a court of ethics discipline.
21. Suspension or loss of time.
22. A committee of evidence ordered.
23. A committee of evidence publicly ordered.
24. Holding a committee of evidence.
25. Findings by a committee of evidence
26. Submitting findings of a committee of evidence for approval.
27. Waiting for the findings to be passed on or carried into effect.
28. Suspending findings for a period for review.
29. Modifying findings.
30. Carrying findings into effect.
31. Publishing findings.
32. Demotion.
33. Loss of certificates or awards.

34. Denial of auditing or training by a Comm Ev for a considerable period of time.
35. Dismissal.
36. Expulsion from Scientology.

The above is a rough guide to the severity of discipline.

Note that none of it carries any physical punishment or detention.

Short suspension of training or processing up to ninety days is considered under 18. above and is not to be compared with 34. where the time is measured in years.

Just issuing the ethics codes is itself a sort of discipline but it is more broadly welcomed than protested as it means greater peace and faster accomplishment.

L RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.cden

[Note: (Quoting LRH ED 70 INT 16 December 1968) "AN OPERATING STANDARD RULE – No matter how stiff the ethics action is you have to apply to keep the show on the road, remember this: YOU MUST KEEP THE DOOR OPEN – IF IT'S ONLY A CRACK".]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 26 DECEMBER 1968

Remimeo

(Note: This data is turned out as an HCO B *and* a Pol Ltr [issued as each one] as may apply very broadly in both the OEC and Level IV or above Courses.)

### THE THIRD PARTY LAW

I have for a very long time studied the causes of violence and conflict amongst individuals and nations.

If Chaldea could vanish, if Babylon turn to dust, if Egypt could become a badlands, if Sicily could have 160 prosperous cities and be a looted ruin before the year zero and a near desert ever since – and all this in **spite** of all the work and wisdom and good wishes and intent of human beings, then it must follow as the dark follows sunset that something must be unknown to Man concerning all his works and ways. And that this something must be so deadly and so pervasive as to destroy all his ambitions and his chances long before their time.

Such a thing would have to be some natural law unguessed at by himself.

And there *is* such a law, apparently, that answers these conditions of being deadly, unknown and embracing all activities.

The law would seem to be:

**A third party must be present and unknown in every quarrel for a conflict to exist.**

or

**For a quarrel to occur, an unknown third party must be active in producing it between two potential opponents.**

or

**While it is commonly believed to take two to make a fight, a third party must exist and must develop it for actual conflict to occur.**

It is very easy to see that two in conflict are fighting. They are very visible. What is harder to see or suspect is that a third party existed and actively promoted the quarrel.

The usually unsuspected and "reasonable" third party, the bystander who denies any part of it is the one that brought the conflict into existence in the first place.

The hidden third party, seeming at times to be a supporter of only one side, is to be found as the instigator.

This is a useful law on many dynamics.

It is the cause of war.

---

One sees two fellows shouting bad names at each other, sees them come to blows. No one else is around. So *they*, of course, "caused the fight". But there *was* a third party.

Tracing these down, one comes upon incredible data. That is the trouble. The incredible is too easily rejected. One way to hide things is to make them incredible.

Clerk A and Messenger B have been arguing. They blaze into direct conflict. Each blames the other. **Neither one is correct and so the quarrel does not resolve since its true cause is not established.**

One looks into such a case **thoroughly**. He finds the incredible. The wife of Clerk A has been sleeping with Messenger B and complaining alike to both about the other.

Farmer J and Rancher K have been tearing each other to pieces for years in continual conflict. There are obvious, logical reasons for the fight. Yet it continues and does not resolve. A close search finds Banker L who, due to their losses in the fighting, is able to loan each side money, while keeping the quarrel going, and who will get their lands completely if both lose.

It goes larger. The revolutionary forces and the Russian government were in conflict in 1917. The reasons are so many the attention easily sticks on them. But only when Germany's official state papers were captured in World War II was it revealed that *Germany* had promoted the revolt and financed LENIN to spark it off, even sending him into Russia in a blacked out train!

One looks over "personal" quarrels, group conflicts, national battles and one finds, if he searches, the third party, unsuspected by both combatants or if suspected at all, brushed off as "fantastic". Yet careful documentation finally affirms it.

---

This datum is fabulously useful.

In marital quarrels the *correct* approach of anyone counseling, is to get both parties to carefully search out the *third* party. They may come to many *reasons* at first. These *reasons* are not beings. One is looking for a third *party*, an actual *being*. When both find the third party and establish proof, that will be the end of the quarrel.

Sometimes two parties, quarreling, suddenly decide to elect a being to blame. This stops the quarrel. Sometimes it is not the right being and more quarrels thereafter occur.

Two nations at each other's throats should each seek conference with the other to sift out and locate the actual third party. They will always find one if they look, and they *can* find the right one. As it will be found to exist in fact.

---

There are probably many technical approaches one could develop and outline in this matter.

There are many odd phenomena connected with it. An accurately spotted third party is usually not fought at all by either party but only shunned.

Marital conflicts are common. Marriages can be saved by both parties really sorting out *who* caused the conflicts. There may have been, in the whole history of the marriage, several, but only one at a time.

Quarrels between an individual and an organization are nearly always caused by an individual third party or a third group. The organization and the individual should get together and isolate the third party by displaying to each other all the data they each have been fed.

Rioters and governments alike could be brought back to agreement could one get representatives of both to give each other what they have been told by *whom*.

**Such conferences have tended to deal only in recriminations or conditions or abuses. They must deal in beings only in order to succeed.**

This theory might be thought to assert also that there are no bad conditions that cause conflict. There are. But these are usually **remedial by conference unless a third party is promoting conflict.**

In history we have a very foul opinion of the past because it is related by recriminations of two opponents and has not spotted the third party.

"Underlying causes" of war should read "hidden promoters".

There are no conflicts which cannot be resolved unless the true promoters of them remain hidden.

---

This is the natural law the ancients and moderns alike did not know.

And not knowing it, being led off into "reasons", whole civilizations have died.

It is worth knowing.

It is worth working with in any situation where one is trying to bring peace.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:rw.rd





HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 24 FEBRUARY 1969

Remimeo

*An Ethics Policy Letter*

**JUSTICE**

In an extension of 3rd Party technology (see HCOB of THIRD PARTY LAW) I have found that false reports and suppression are very important in 3rd Party Technology.

We know as in the above HCOB that a Third Party is necessary to any quarrel. Basically it is a 3 Terminal Universe.

In reviewing several org upsets I have found that the 3rd Party can go completely overlooked even in intensive investigation.

A 3rd Party adds up to suppression by giving false reports on others.

In several cases an org has lost several guiltless staff members. They were dismissed or disciplined in an effort to solve enturbulation. Yet the turbulence continued and the area became even more upset by reason of the dismissals.

Running this back further one finds that the real 3rd Party, eventually unearthed got people shot by **False Reports**.

One source of this is as follows:

Staff Member X goofs. He is very furious and defensive at being accused. He blames his goof on somebody else. That somebody else gets disciplined. Staff Member X diverts attention from himself by various means including falsely accusing others.

This is a 3rd Party action which results in a lot of people being blamed and disciplined. And the real 3rd Party remaining undetected.

The missing point of justice here is that the disciplined persons *were not faced with their accusers* and were not given the real accusation and so could not confront it.

Another case would be a 3rd Party simply spreading tales and making accusations out of malice or some even more vicious motive. This would be a usual 3rd Party action. It is ordinarily based on False Reports.

Another situation comes about when an executive who can't get an area straight starts to investigate, gets 3rd Party False Reports about it, disciplines people accordingly and totally misses the real 3rd Party. This enturbulates the area even more.

The basis of all really troublesome 3rd Party activities is then **False Reports**.

There can also be **false perception**. One sees things that don't exist and reports them as "fact".

Therefore we see that we can readily run back an investigation by following a chain of false reports.

In at least one case the 3rd Party (discovered only after it was very plain that only he could have wrecked two divisions, one after the other) also had these characteristics:

1. Goofed in his own actions;
2. Furiously contested any knowledge reports or job endangerment chits filed on him;
3. Obsessively changed everything when taking over an area;
4. Falsely reported actions, accusing others;
5. Had a high casualty rate of staff in his division or area.

These are not necessarily common to all 3rd Parties but give you an idea of what can go on.

---

After a lot of experience with Ethics and Justice I would say that the real source of upset in an area would **be false reports** accepted and acted upon without confronting the accused with all charges and his or her accusers.

An executive should not accept any accusation and act upon it. To do so undermines the security of one and all.

What an executive should do, on being presented with an accusation or down stats or "evidence" is conduct an investigation of false reports and false perceptions.

An area is downstat because of one or more of the following:

1. No personnel;
2. Personnel not trained;
3. Cross orders (senior orders unattended because of different junior orders);
4. Area doing something else than what it is supposed to do;
5. An adjacent area dumping its hat;
6. False perception leading to false stats;
7. False reports by rumour or misunderstanding;
8. False reports from single rare instances becoming accepted as the condition of the whole;
9. False reports on others defensively intended;
10. False reports on others maliciously intended (real 3rd Party);

11. Injustices cumulative and unremedied;
12. Actions taken on others without investigation and without confronting them with their accusers or the data.

This is a list of probable causes for an upset or downstat area.

## SECURITY

The personal security of the staff member is so valuable to him apparently that when it is undermined (by false accusations or injustice) he becomes less willing and less efficient and is the real reason for a PTS condition.

## JUSTICE

The only thing which can actually remedy a general insecure feeling is a renewed faith in justice.

Justice would consist of a refusal to accept any report not substantiated by actual, independent data, seeing that all such reports are investigated and that all investigations include confronting the accused with the accusation and where feasible the accuser, **before** any disciplinary action is undertaken or any condition assigned.

While this may slow the processes of justice, the personal security of the individual is totally dependent upon establishing the full truth of any accusation before any action is taken.

---

Harsh discipline may produce instant compliance but it smothers initiative.

Positive discipline is in itself a stable datum. People are unhappy in an area which is not *well* disciplined because they do not know where they stand.

An area where only those who try to do their jobs are disciplined encourages people to hide and be inactive.

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

Therefore we get a policy: Any false report leading to the unjust discipline of another is an act of **Treason** by the person making the false report and the condition should be assigned and its penalties fully applied.

A condition of **Doubt** should be assigned any person who accepts and disciplines another unjustly on the basis of a report which subsequently turns out to have been false.

---

This then is the primary breakdown of any justice system – that it acts on false reports, disciplines before substantiation and fails to confront an accused with the report and his accuser before any discipline is assigned, or which does not weigh the value of a person in general against the alleged crime even when proven.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:ldm.ei.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 15 MARCH 1969

Remimeo  
Ethics Officers  
HCO

**THIRD PARTY**  
**HOW TO FIND ONE**

The way **not** to find a 3<sup>rd</sup> party is to compile a questionnaire that asks one and all in various ways, "Have you been a **victim**?" "Do you feel ARC Broken about Ethics?"

Any officer, B of I or Comm Ev that uses this approach (1) Does not find any 3<sup>rd</sup> Party and (2) Caves in people.

A 3<sup>rd</sup> Party is **one who by false reports creates trouble between two people, a person and a group or a group and another group.**

To find a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party one has to ask

- 1 . (a) Have you been told you were bad?  
(b) What was said?  
(c) *Who* said it?
2. (a) Have you been told someone was bad?  
(b) What was said?  
(c) *Who* said it?
3. (a) Have you been told someone was doing wrong?  
(b) What was said?  
(c) Who said it?
4. (a) Have you been told a group was bad?  
(b) What was said?  
(c) Who said it?

---

This is quite capable of running a couple light years of track so a questionnaire should have a limiter such as "In this organization ....."

This is also a considerable process! And it may have a lot of answers. So a lot of space should be left for each question.

By then combining names given you have one name appearing far more often than the rest. This is done by counting names. You then investigate this person.

Usual action, if they are not an enemy, is to issue a Non-Enturbulation order and say why.

---

The **victim** type questionnaire will only give you your most valuable executives, Who have been trying to get people to do their jobs!

We have had experience with this so **it is a Comm Ev offense** to use a **victim** type approach and say one is "looking for a third party".

This Pol Ltr is *vital* to HCOES, HCO Secs, E/Os and **Missionaires**.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:Idm.ei.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 25 AUGUST 1969

Remimeo

## THIRD PARTY INVESTIGATIONS

This Policy Letter is an expansion of HCO Policy Letter of 15 March 1969 3<sup>rd</sup> PARTY, HOW TO FIND ONE by L. Ron Hubbard.

### R-FACTOR

An R-Factor is necessary before the investigation is begun. It must be understood by the persons involved (a) what a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party is, (b) how the 3<sup>rd</sup> Party will be located, and (c) it may be necessary to indicate that it is not an auditing activity.

### HOW MANY?

Many names will come up. They were influenced by the 3<sup>rd</sup> Party. They went into agreement with him. By going into agreement with him, they spread the activity which was originated by the 3<sup>rd</sup> Party. There will be only one 3<sup>rd</sup> Party at the basic of the chain.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Party = False Report. Anyone that went into agreement with him carried it forward, usually believing it to be true.**

### EXAMPLE

Third Party Investigation with Jill and Alan:

"A" Questions asked to Jill and Alan.

- 1 a. Have you been told you were in bad.  
b. What was said.  
c. Who said it.
- 2 a. Have you been told someone was bad.  
b. What was said.  
c. Who said it.

3. a. Have you been told someone was doing wrong.
  - b. What was said.
  - c. Who said it.
  
4. a. Have you been told a group was bad.
  - b. What was said.
  - c. Who said it.

"B" Questions asked Jill.

1. a. Have you been told you were in bad with Alan (Jill).
  - b. What was said.
  - c. Who said it.
  
2. a. Have you been told Alan (Jill) was in bad.
  - b. What was said.
  - c. Who said it.
  
3. a. Have you been told Alan (Jill) was doing wrong.
  - b. What was said.
  - c. Who said it.

After asking these questions of Jill they are asked of Alan.

"C" Any person coming up on both sides, for instance Roger, is noted. You then ask the "B" questions, using Roger's name. Ask them of Jill, then of Alan.

As a new name comes up, use it in "B".

This is continued until you come up with a name, use it in "B", and Jill and Alan cannot find anyone that "told you you were in bad with .....", or "told you ..... was in bad", or "told you ..... was doing bad".

**That is your 3<sup>rd</sup> party. There was no one saying things about this person *because he started it all.***

As long as they can give you answers to "B", there is someone earlier. This is how you get the **basic 3<sup>rd</sup> Party.**



**INDICATORS**

If you have indicated the wrong 3<sup>rd</sup> Party, you will see it in the absence of GIs. Continue until you hit **the one**, at which time GIs will come in on both individuals.

CPO Maria Bosselaar

for

Lt. Cmdr. Diana Hubbard

Flag 3<sup>rd</sup> Mate/CS-1

for

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:DH:MB:eky.ei.rd



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 1 MAY 1965

Issue I

Remimeo  
Staff Member Hats  
Executive Hats

## STAFF MEMBER REPORTS

Staff members must personally make certain reports in writing.

Failure to make these reports involves the executive or staff member not making a report in any offense committed by a junior under him, or, in case of job endangerment, by a senior over him.

These reports are made to the Ethics Section of the Department of Inspections and Reports.

The report form is simple. One uses a clipboard with a packet of his division's color-flash paper on it. This includes a piece of pencil carbon paper. This is the same clipboard and carbon one uses for his routine orders.

It is a despatch form addressed simply to the Ethics Section. It is dated. It has under the address and in the center of the page the person or portion of the org's name. It then states what kind of a report it is (see below).

The original goes to Ethics by drawing an arrow pointing to "Ethics" and the carbon goes to the person or portion of the org being reported on *by channels* (B routing).

The following are the reports required:

1. *Damage Report.* Any damage to anything noted with the name of the person in charge of it or in charge of cleaning it.
2. *Misuse Report.* The misuse or abuse of any equipment, materiel or quarters, meaning using it wrongly or for a purpose not intended.
3. *Waste Report.* The waste of org materiel.
4. *Idle Report.* The idleness of equipment or personnel which should be in action.
5. *Alter-is Report.* The alteration of design, policy, technology or errors being made in construction.
6. *Loss or Theft Report.* The disappearance of anything that should be there giving anything known about its disappearance such as when it was seen last.
7. *A Found Report.* Anything found, sending the article with the despatch or saying where it is.
8. *Noncompliance Report.* Noncompliance with legal orders.

9. *Dev-t Report*. Stating whether off-line, off-policy or off-origin and from whom to whom and subject.
10. *Error Report*. Any error made.
11. *Misdemeanor Report*. Any misdemeanor noted.
12. *A Crime Report*. Any crime noted or suspected but if suspicion only, it must be so stated.
13. *A High Crime Report*. Any high crime noted or suspected but if only suspected must be so stated.
14. *A No-Report Report*. Any failure to receive a report or an illegible report or folder.
15. *A False Report Report*. Any report received that turned out to be false.
16. *A False Attestation Report*. Any false attestation noted, but in this case the document is attached to the report.
17. *An Annoyance Report*. Anything about which one is annoyed, giving the person or portion of an org or org one is annoyed with, but the Department of Inspections and Reports and a senior org are exempt and may not be reported on.
18. *A Job Endangerment Report*. Reporting any order received from a superior that endangered one's job by demanding one alter or depart from known policy, the orders of a person senior to one's immediate superior altered or countermanded by one's immediate superior, or advice from one's immediate superior not to comply with orders or policy.
19. *Technical Alter-is Report*. Any ordered alteration of technology not given in an HCOB, book or LRH tape.
20. *Technical Noncompliance Report*. Any failure to apply the correct technical procedure.
21. *Knowledge Report*. On noting some investigation is in progress and having data on it of value to Ethics.

---

These reports are simply written and sent. One does *not* expect an executive to front up to personnel who err. One *does* expect an executive to make a report routinely on the matter, no matter what the executive also does.

Only in this way can bad spots in the organization be recognized and corrected. For reports other than one's own collect and point out bad conditions before those can harm the org.

---

These reports are filed by Ethics in the ethics files in the staff member's folder or in the folder of the portion of the org. A folder is only made if Ethics receives an ethics report.

Unless the staff member is part of a portion or an org that is under a State of Emergency, **five** such reports *can* accumulate before Ethics takes any action. But if the report is deemed very serious, Ethics may take action at once by investigating.

If a State of Emergency exists in that portion of the org or org, **one** report can bring about a Court of Ethics as there is no leeway in an Emergency condition.

The most serious reports, which are the only ones taken up at once, are technical alter-is, noncompliance, any false reports, false attestations, no-reports, misdemeanors, crimes and high crimes. The others are left to accumulate (except in Emergency when *all* reports on that portion or org are taken up at once).

---

### CLEANING THE FILES

An amnesty for a portion or an org or a general amnesty can be declared by the Office of LRH Saint Hill. An amnesty will be effective up to a date three months before it is issued. The ethics files are therefore nullified previous to the date declared in the amnesty.

An amnesty signalizes a feat of considerable moment by a portion of an org or an org or Scientology.

An HCO Executive Letter can compliment a portion of an org or an org and wipe out the ethics files of the portion of an org or the org complimented. An award is usually added for the persons responsible.

An assignment of a State of Normal Operation after an Emergency (but not assigning Affluence) cleans the portion of an org or the org's ethics files.

An *individual* may clean his own file by approaching Ethics and offering *to make amends*.

The person may be shown but may not touch his ethics files which are always kept locked when the office is empty. The person should present a written and signed *amends project petition* to Ethics. Ethics attaches the person's file to it and sends it safely to the Office of LRH "Ethics Authority Section." If accepted as adequate amends by the Office of LRH, it is authorized by the "Ethics Authority Section" and returned to Ethics which places it on its "projects time machine."

When accomplished the *amends project* is taken off the time machine and forwarded to the Inspections Section which inspects and verifies it is done and sends all to the Office of LRH "Ethics Authority Section" which then authorizes the retirement of the reports on the person.

If the project comes off the time machine without being done, the matter goes at once to a Court of Ethics.

Any *amends project* must benefit the org and be beyond routine duties. It may not only benefit the individual. Offers to "get audited at own expense in Review" are acceptable

as auditing will benefit everyone. "To get trained at own expense up to \_\_\_\_\_ and serve the org two years afterwards" is acceptable amends. But the person's staff pay is also suspended entirely during any auditing or training undertaken as amends. "To get another department's files in order on my own time" would be acceptable amends. Getting a celebrity into Scientology would be acceptable amends. No work one would normally do himself on post is acceptable amends. A donation or fine would not be acceptable amends. Doing what one should do anyway is not amends, it is the expected. No org funds may be employed in an amends project.

No amends are thereafter accepted if the person has failed to complete an amends project since the effective date of the last amnesty applying to the person's portion or org.

Any bonus *specifically given by the person's name* also cleans the person's ethics files without comment.

The responsibility for handling the cleaning of files is that of the Ethics Section of the Department of Inspections and Reports which notes amnesties, compliments and specific bonus awards and handles its ethics files accordingly.

No *amends projects* may be accepted except through the Office of LRH, and a superior may not bring a junior who wishes his files cleaned by *amends* into Ethics and assist him to make the proper project applications. It must be voluntarily done by the junior.

No amnesties, compliments or bonuses may be made or declared except by the Office of LRH and authorized also from Saint Hill.

L. Ron Hubbard  
Founder

LRH:ml.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 4 OCTOBER 1968  
(Reissued from Flag Order 1432)

Remimeo

## ETHICS PRESENCE

The reason an executive can get compliance is because he has Ethics presence. If you haven't got it, you won't.

When you issue orders you are using power and force. If you are also **right** in what you get compliance with and your programmes are clear, correct and beneficial – boy do you win.

But it is not the rightness of a programme that gets compliance. It is Ethics Presence.

Rightness does not get compliance because there are always counter intentions in the way. If you go on the assumption that one and all want things to go right you are going to make a dog's breakfast out of it.

There are only a few with a good forward look and who are relatively unaberrated.

Men will keep the accounts straight only because you can muster bayonets to enforce that they do.

Ethics presence is an X quality made up partly of symbology, partly of force, some "now we're supposed to's" and endurance.

One of the reasons the press now print what we say is that we have **endured** the biggest shellackings anybody could muster up. We've gained Ethics presence publicly by it.

Endurance asserts the truth of unkillability. We're still here, can't be unmocked. This drives the SP wild.

Because of the Sea Org we appear to have unlimited reach and in some mysterious way, unlimited resources. The ability to appear and disappear mysteriously is a part of Ethics presence.

As an Executive you get compliance because you have Ethics presence and persistence and can get mad.

The way you **continue** to have Ethics presence is to be maximally right in your actions, decisions and dictates. Because if you're wrong the other fellow gets wrapped around a pole for complying. And the **pain** of **that** starts to outweigh your own Ethics presence.

So, when you issue orders you are using force and power. You can, however, get in such a frame of mind you cease to use the softer arts as well. Against non-compliance you add ferocity with the aim of continuing your comm line.

Wrath **is** effective but used in moderation and only in moments of urgency.

Man has been invalidated to such an extent that he starts to do **himself** in – that's the secret of aberration. He denies himself, then mocks up pictures to do himself in with.

If you continue to invalidate and chop people, they will start to do themselves in even harder – so if you continue to use heavy ethics on someone, you play right into the hands of his bank.

Self-invalidation is merely the accumulation of invalidation of oneself by others. The point being, that you better temper the lightning with sunshine occasionally.

If you use heavy ethics on wogs, they are being invalidated from **altitude**. You can't build up competent people by invalidating them.

Without in any way softening your approach, you should know that real force is dependent upon ARC, and the major threat is the interruption thereof.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:ei.cden



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 overt. 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 overt 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 overt 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 overt. 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

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 27 OCTOBER 1964

Remimeo  
Franchise  
Sthil Students  
Sthil Staff

**POLICIES ON PHYSICAL HEALING, INSANITY  
AND "TROUBLESOME 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.

### THREATENING 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 "Threatening 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 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 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 "Troublesome 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.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw



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

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:

(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 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.

(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.

(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 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.

(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".

(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 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



## BOARD POLICY LETTER

5 APRIL 1972RB

Issue I

Re-Revised 2 September 1977 (to change reference in first line to 7 May 69 which revised PL 27 October 64, the original reference, and to correct the following quote.)

Remimeo  
HCO Sec Hat  
Dir I&R Hat  
E/O Hat

### PTS TYPE A HANDLING

#### DEFINITION

Per HCO Policy Letter of 7 May, 1969, Policies on "SOURCES OF TROUBLE", "a 'source of trouble' 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 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."

#### 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. This is not mandatory for doing the PTS/SP Detection Checksheet (BPL 31 May 1971RF).

### 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 exception to this is a full PTS Rundown done in the HGC.)

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 Whys found. Each case is individual. Remember, too, there is always the possibility of a **no** situation. And if the person thinks he's 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

BDCS:LRH:MSH:AH:lf:pat



## 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 POLICY LETTER OF 21 APRIL 1970

Remimeo  
Pub Divs  
E/Os  
HCO

## FIELD ETHICS

It has come to attention that at least one org was not prospering because it was being suppressed by its own field.

One or more SPs operating in its neighbourhood were active in making the Ethics Officer and the Execs wrong and enturbulating staff.

Whereas one should go lightly in handling a Franchise or group with Ethics (these are PR areas not Ethics areas), there is an entirely different sort of condition where an SP can be active in the neighbourhood of an org and all but crash it.

Field influence on a large org is best handled by having a Public Ethics Officer (Div 1 Dept 3) to whom the public can apply and to whom Public Divisions can appeal or to whom Public Divisions can direct persons.

There have been many upsets of this kind over the years and they have almost destroyed the org in each case.

Some examples follow:

1. A rich pc corrupted org Execs with large loans. The org disintegrated.
2. Execs were persuaded to give personal outside service which knocked out their integrity.
3. A staff was constantly worked on to work outside the org as they weren't making enough money (and ignoring their jobs in the org they of course didn't make enough money).
4. An SP hung about an org invalidating its Execs to staff until the Execs caved in.
5. An SP who had been sacked corrupted other staff with 2D and kept the org upset.
6. An SP hung about spreading false rumors which caved in Execs.
7. A fool, not necessarily an SP, handed out money in the field around the org (not to staff members) and suddenly said the sums were "loans to Scientologists" who "didn't repay them" and got the org involved in trying to patch it all up.
8. An SP so worked over Ethics personnel they no longer did their job and the org went into a decline.

Any way you look at it, when you ignore Ethics tech and fail to handle an SP the org and its staff will eventually suffer.

The prime targets are the Execs of an org and its HCO personnel. When these are made ineffective the rest of the staff catches it heavily.

Like it or not, staff needs to be protected from such capers. Sweetness and light and reasonableness by HCO and Execs wind staff members and the org up in a ball of trouble.

This is a loony-bin planet. If it weren't we wouldn't be working at making it sane.

Protect the org! So the staff can do its job!

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:kjm.cden