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C/S Series 1

AUDITOR'S RIGHTS

AUDITOR RESPONSIBILITY FOR C/SES

An auditor who receives a Case Supervisor direction (C/S) of what to audit on a pc is **not** discharged of his responsibility as an auditor.

The auditor has a series of responsibilities that are part of every C/S he gets to audit.

ACCEPTING THE PC

No auditor is required to accept a specific pc just because the pc is assigned to him.

If an auditor does not believe he can help that particular pc or if he dislikes auditing that particular pc the auditor has a right to refuse to audit that pc. The auditor must state why.

The Case Supervisor, Director of Processing or Director of Review, nor any of their seniors, may not discipline the auditor for refusing to audit a particular pc.

An auditor who refuses to audit his quota of hours or sessions is of course subject to action.

---

*HQS CASE SUPERVISOR INSTANT HAT*  
04.02.18
Thus refusing to audit a particular pc, so long as one is not refusing to audit other pcs, is not actionable.

"I do not wish to audit this pc because ______. I am willing to audit other pcs," is the legal auditor statement in the matter.

Some pcs get a bad name with some auditors, some don't appreciate the auditing, some conflict with a particular auditor's own personality. There are such instances. It does not mean certain pcs cannot be helped by others.

It is also true that an auditor who dislikes a pc may not do a good job so the rule also has a practical side to it.

One auditor disliked young men and did a bad job on them. Another disliked old ladies and chopped them up in session. One pc had messed up several Scientologists and couldn't find anyone to audit him at all.

We are not auditing people to make amends to the world.

Thus an auditor has a right to reject or accept the pcs he is given.

**ACCEPTING A C/S**

When the auditor gets a C/S to do on a case and if he thinks it is not the correct thing to do he has the right to reject the C/S for that pc and require another one he can agree to.

The auditor does not have the right to start doing a C/S and change it during the session except as noted below.

The auditor may not C/S in the auditing chair while auditing the pc. If he has no Case Supervisor at all the auditor still audits from a C/S. He writes the C/S before session and adheres to it in session. To do something else and not follow the C/S is called "C/Sing in the chair" and is very poor form as it leads to Q and A.

**STALE DATED C/S**

A C/S that is a week or two old or a Repair (Progress) Pgm that is a month or two old is dynamite.

This is called a "Stale Dated Pgm" or a "Stale Dated C/S" meaning it is too old to be valid.

It should have been done sooner. The pc of last week when the C/S was written may have been well and happily employed but a week later may have headaches and reprimand from the boss.

It is dangerous to accept a Repair (Progress) Pgm if it is old.

The auditor who sees his C/S is old and sees the pc has Bad Indicators is justified in demanding a fresh C/S giving his reasons why.
A program written in January may be completely out of date in June. Who knows what may have happened in between.

Use fresh C/Ses and fresh Pgms.

Stale Dates only occur in poorly run backlogged Divisions anyway. The real remedy is reorganize and hire more and better auditors.

**ENDING THE SESSION**

When the C/S he has is proving unworkable *during* the session, the auditor has a right to end the session and send the folder to the C/S.

Ending the session is totally up to the auditor.

If the auditor just doesn't complete an action that was producing TA and could be completed it is of course a flunk. Such a case is just not running a basic engram the one more time through that would bring the TA down and give a proper end phenomena. This and similar actions would be an auditor error.

The judgement here is whether or not the auditor's action is justified in ending the session.

Even though he may have made an error, the auditor cannot be blamed for the ending off of the session as that is totally up to him. He can be given a flunk for the error.

**AUDITING OVER OUT RUDS**

Auditing a pc on something else whose ruds are out is a *Major Auditing Error*.

Even if the C/S omits "Fly a rud" or "Fly ruds" this does not justify the auditor auditing the pc over out ruds.

The auditor can do one of two things: He can Fly all ruds or he can return the folder and request ruds be flown.

The Dianetic Auditor is not excused from auditing over out ruds and in an HGC must be specially cautioned not to do so but return the folder for a new C/S. Better still he should learn to Fly ruds.

**INABILITY TO FLY RUDS**

If an auditor cannot get a rud to F/N, cannot get any rud to F/N, he is justified in starting a Green Form.

The auditor solution to no F/N on ruds is to do a GF whether the C/S said to or not.

This is an expected action.

It is understood the auditor would use Suppress and False in trying to Fly ruds.
SESSIONS FAR APART

When a pc has not had a session for some time, or when a pc gets sessions days apart, **ruds must be flown**. Otherwise the pc will get audited over out ruds. This can develop mental mass.

Optimum session scheduling is a series of sessions or a whole program done in a block of sessions close together. This prevents the world from throwing the pc's ruds out between sessions.

Giving sessions far apart barely keeps up with life. The auditing time is absorbed in patching life up.

Rapid gain gets above life's annoyances and keeps the pc there.

UNREADING ITEMS

When an item the auditor has been told to run doesn't read on the meter, even when the auditor puts in Suppress and Invalidate on it, the auditor **must not** do anything with the item no matter what the C/S said.

It is expected he will see if it reads and use Suppress and Invalidate on it. And if it still doesn't read he will be expected **not** to run it.

LISTS

When an auditor whose C/S told him to list "Who or what ______" or any list question finds that the list question does not read, the auditor **must not** list it.

When doing a list ordered by the C/S it is assumed that the auditor will test it for read before listing and that he will **not** list an unreading question. (A read is an actual fall, not a tick or a stop.)

LIST TROUBLE

When an auditor has trouble doing a list and getting an item it is expected he will use a Prepared List like L4B to locate the trouble and handle it.

As it is very hard on a pc to mess up a list it is expected the auditor will handle the situation then and there with no further C/S directions.

HIGH TA

When the auditor sees the TA is high at session start yet the C/S says to "Fly a rud" or run a chain, the auditor **must not try to fly a rud** and he must not start on a chain.
Trying to bring a TA down with ARC Brks or ruds is very hard on a pc as ARC Breaks aren't the reason TAs go up.

Seeing a high TA at start the Dianetic auditor or SCN auditor up to Class II does not start the session but sends the folder back to the C/S and for a higher class auditor to do.

Seeing a high TA at start the Scientology auditor (Class III or above) (a) checks for exteriorization in a recent session and if so the session is ended and the C/S is asked for an "Interiorization Rundown"; (b) if the pc has had an Interiorization Rundown the auditor asks the C/S for permission to do a "C/S Series 53" or a Hi-Lo TA assessment or whatever the C/S indicates. The Int RD may have been (usually is) overrun and needs rehab or correction and it is usual to check it – it is included in a "C/S 53" and a Hi-Lo TA.

These actions are expected of the auditor even when not stated in the C/S.

**GOING ON HOPING**

When a case is running badly session to session the last thing you do is go on hoping, either in auditing or C/Sing.

"Let's try _____", "Then this", "Then this", is not going to solve the case.

You get data. You can get data by a White Form (Pc Assessment Form). You can get data from a GF fully assessed (Method 5). You can get data by 2-way comm on various subjects. You can have the D of P interview and get answers. You can even ask his mother.

You look for case errors. You study the folder back to where the pc ran well and then come forward and you'll find the error every time.

Do not just go on session after failed session hoping. That's pure idiocy.

You get data! from prepared lists, from life, from the pc, from the folder.

Find the bug!

Ah, good Lord, he is a Pinkerton Agent sworn to secrecy! He does yoga exercises after every session. He was tried for murder when he was 16 and nobody has run the engram of it.

Various auditors ran the same engram chain four times.

An auditor ran Int RD twice.

After Power she had her baby and nobody ran the delivery.

He doesn't like to talk but is a "Grade Zero"!

A dozen dozen reasons can exist.

An auditor does not let a C/S C/S hopefully. He refuses the C/Ses until a Folder Error Summary is done and the bug found.
THINGS DONE TWICE

By carelessness the same rundowns can be called for twice and done twice or even more.

A Folder Summary inside the front cover must exist and must be kept up.

Over it there must be a program on which the case is being audited. But just because it's covered, never neglect entering a session and what was run on the Folder Summary (FS).

If Hold it Still is ordered, see if it was run before.

Don't let major Rundowns be done twice.

**Dianetic Items** must never be run twice. Dianetic lists must not be scattered through a folder. Bring them together and keep them together and being brought forward.

COPY

Don't copy Dianetic lists or worksheets from notes or items from lists.

Keep all admin neat and in the original form.

Copying makes errors possible.

RUDS GOING OUT

When the ruds go out during the session the auditor recognizes the following:

- **Pc Critical** = W/H from auditor
- **Pc Antagonistic** = BPC in session
- **No TA** = Problem
- **Tired** = Failed Purpose or no sleep
- **Sad** = ARC Break
- **Soaring TA** = Overrun or Protest
- **Dope Off** = By-passed F/N or not enough sleep
- **No Interest** = Out Ruds or no interest in the first place.

An auditor who isn't sure what it is but runs into trouble with the pc (except on lists which he handles at once always) is smart to end off the session quickly, write down the full observation and get it to the C/S.

The auditor who is an old hand and knows what he is looking at as per above scale (and the C/S the C/S would give) handles it promptly.
AUDITOR’S RIGHTS

Pc Critical = W/H = pull the W/H.
Pc Antagonistic = BPC = assess proper list (such as L1C) and handle.
No TA (or case gain) = Problem = locate the problem.
Tired no sleep or Failed Purpose = check which it is and handle.
Sad = ARC Brk = locate and handle, Itsa earlier Itsa.
Soaring TA = O/R or Protest = find which and handle. Such an O/R is usually by rehab.
Dope Off = lack of sleep or BP F/N = check on sleep, or rehab F/N.
No Interest = no interest in first place or Out Ruds = check for interest or put in ruds.
List goes wrong = BPC = handle or do L4B or any L4 at once.
Ruds won't fly = some other error = assess GF and handle.

The auditor has no business trying to do the C/S given when it collides with and isn't designed to handle any of the above.

If the previous session disclosed such an error and this session C/S was designed to handle and doesn't, the auditor should end off and the next C/S should be "2-way comm for data".

CASE NOT HANDLED

When the auditor or the Examiner collides with a pc who is asserting his case has not been handled, there should not be a new set of actions based on little data but the auditor should end off and the C/S should order a "way comm on what hasn't been handled".

The auditor should not at once take this up as part of any other C/S.

In other words an auditor doesn't change the C/S to a 2-way comm on something not called for by C/S.

MAJOR ACTIONS

An auditor should never begin a major action on a case that is not "set up" for it.
As this can occur during a session it is vital to understand the rule and follow it. Otherwise a case can be bogged right down and will be hard to salvage as now a new action to repair has been added to an unrepaired action. Now, if the auditor starts a major action on a case not "set up" we get two things to repair where we only had one as the major action won't work either.

*Repair* = patching up past auditing or recent life errors. This is done by prepared lists or completing the chain or correcting lists or even 2-way comm or prep checks on auditors, sessions, etc.

*Rudiments* = setting the case up for the session action. This includes ARC Brks, PTPs, W/Hs, GF or O/R listing or any prepared list (such as L1C, etc.).

*Set up* = getting an F/N showing and VGIs before starting any major action. It means just that – an F/N and VGIs before starting any major action. Such may require a repair action and rudiments as well.

*Major Action* = any – but any – action designed to change a case or general considerations or handle continual illness or improve ability. This means a Process or even a series of processes like 3 flows. It doesn't mean a grade. It is any process the case hasn't had.

*Grade* = a series of processes culminating in an exact ability attained, examined and attested to by the pc.

*Program* = any series of actions designed by a C/S to bring about definite results in a pc. A program usually includes several sessions.

The vast bulk of auditing errors come about because C/Ses and auditors seek to use a Major Action to repair a case.

It is a responsibility of an auditor to reject a C/S which seeks to use one or more major actions to repair a case that isn't running well.

The auditor must understand this completely. He can be made to accept a wrong C/S for the pc and even more importantly can in his own session make the error and mess up the case.

Example: Pc has not been running well (no real TA or had a grumpy Exam report). Auditor sees C/S has ordered a major action, not a repair by prepared lists, ruds, etc. The auditor must reject the C/S as he will be made to fail in session by it.

Example: Auditor gets a C/S, "(1) Fly a rud; (2) Assess LX3; (3) Run 3-way recall, 3-way secondaries, 3-way engrams on all / / X items". The auditor can't get a rud to fly. Does the LX3. In other words he flunks by failing to *set up* the case. It could also go this way. Auditor can't get a rud to fly, does a GF, gets no F/N. He *must not* begin a major action but must end off right there.

It is fatal to begin any new process on the case designed to change the case if the case is not F/N VGIs.

The pc who starts processing for the first time and is surely not F/N VGIs must be *set up* by repair actions! Simple rudiments, life ruds, O/R list on life, even assessing prepared
lists on life, these are repair actions. The pc will sooner or later begin to fly. Now at session start you put in a rud, get F/N VGIs and can start major actions.

So the auditor has a responsibility not to be led up a garden path by a C/S which orders a major action on a pc who isn't repaired or by not being able in session to get an F/N VGIs by repair.

The only exceptions are a touch assist or life ruds or the Dianetic assist all on a temporarily sick pc. But that's repair isn't it?

PROGRAM VIOLATIONS

When an auditor receives a C/S and sees that it violates the pc's program he should reject it.

The pc, let us say, is supposed to finish his Dianetic Triples but is suddenly being given a Group Engram Intensive. That violates the program and also the grade.

If the pc is running badly, a repair should be ordered. If not, the program should be completed.

Example: An effort is being made to get the pc to go backtrack. This is a program containing several major actions which probably consists of several sessions. Before this program is complete and before the pc has gone backtrack, the C/S orders "(1) Fly a rud, (2) 3 S & Ds". The auditor should recognize in 3 S & Ds a major action being run into the middle of a program and reject it. The correct action is of course the next backtrack process.

GRADE VIOLATIONS

A pc who is on a grade and hasn't attained it yet must not be given major actions not part of that grade.

Example: Pc is on Grade I. C/S orders a list having to do with drinking. It is not a process on that grade. It could be done after Grade I is attained and before Grade II is begun. The C/S is incorrect and should not be accepted.

ABILITY ATTAINED

Now and then before the full major action is complete or before all the grade processes are run, the pc will attain the ability of the grade or the end phenomena of the action.

This is particularly true of valence shifters or Interiorization Rundowns and can happen in grades.

The auditor should recognize it and, with the F/N VGIs always present at such moments, end off.
I know of one case who had a huge cog about Interiorization on Flow 1 Engrams and was pushed by both C/S and auditor to do Flows 2 and 3 who bogged so badly that it took a long while – weeks – to straighten the case out.

The ability itself gets invalidated by pushing on.

On the other hand this should never be taken as an excuse. "I think he cogged to himself so we ended off." It must be a real "What do you know!" sort of out-loud cog with a big F/N and VVGIs and directly on the subject to end off a major action or a program or a grade before its actions are all audited.

**REVIEWING REVIEWS**

An auditor who gets a C/S or an order to repair a case that is running well should reject doing the action.

I have seen a case ordered to repair who had Ext Full Perception Doing Great. The repair bogged the case. The case then got running well again but a second C/S ordered a new repair which of course bogged it. Then major actions were done. The case was again repaired and rehabbed and became OK. Three times the auditor should have said no.

**FALSE REPORTS**

The vilest trick that can be played on a pc is for an auditor to falsify an auditing report. It may be thought to be "good Public Relations" (good PR) for the auditor with the C/S.

Actually it buries an error and puts the pc at risk.

**Integrity** is a hallmark of Dianetics and Scientology.

Just because psychiatrists were dishonest is no reason for auditors to be.

The results are there to be gotten.

False reports like false attests recoil and badly on both the auditor and pc.

**OVERTS ON PCS**

When an auditor finds himself being nattery or critical of his pcs he should get his withholds on pcs pulled and overts on them off.

An auditor who goes sad is auditing pcs over his own ARC Break.

An auditor worried about his pc is working over a Problem.

Getting one's ruds in on pcs or C/Ses or the org can bring new zest to life.
AUDITORS DON'T HAVE CASES

In the chair no auditor has a case.
If breath shows on a mirror held to his face he can audit.
Faint afterwards if you must but see that the pc gets to the Examiner with his F/N.
Then get yourself handled.

"WHAT HE DID WRONG"

An auditor has a right to know what he did wrong in the session that went wrong.
Most often a sour session occurs only when the rules and data in this HCO B have been violated.
But an auditor's TRs can go out or his listing and nulling is in error.
After a session that went wrong somebody else (not the auditor) should ask the pc what the auditor did. This sometimes spots a false auditing report. But it also sometimes is a false report by the pc.
In any event, the auditor has a right to know. Then he can either correct his auditing or his know-how or he can advise the C/S the pc's report is untrue and better repair can be done on the pc.
Savage action against an auditor is almost never called for. He was trying to help. Some people are hard to help.
Not only does an auditor have the right to be told what was wrong but he must be given the exact HCO B, date and title, that he violated.
Never take a verbal or written correction that is not in an HCO B or tape.
Don't be party to a "hidden data line" that doesn't exist.
"You ruined the pc!" is not a valid statement. "You violated HCO B page ____" is the charge.
No auditor may be disciplined for asking, "May I please have the tape or HCO B that was violated so I can read it or go to Cramming."
If it isn't on a tape, a book or an HCOB it is not true and no auditor has to accept any criticism that is not based on the actual source data.
"If it isn't written it isn't true" is the best defense and the best way to improve your tech.

These are the rights of the auditor with relation to a C/S. They are all technical rights based on sound principles.
An auditor should know them and use them.
If an auditor stands on these rights and gets beaten down he should put all the facts before his nearest OTL or SO ship as something would be very wrong somewhere.

Auditing is a happy business – when it is done right.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:nt.jh

[OTL means Operation-Transport Liaison which was a Sea Organization office that managed orgs or an area and was a forerunner of the Flag Operations Liaison Office (FOLO).]
AUDITING SUPERVISOR AND
AUDITING INSTRUCTORS, DUTIES OF

On the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course and in Academies, Supervision of the Auditing Section is done by the Auditing Supervisor, and Auditing Instructor or Instructors.

The Auditing Supervisor and Instructors are not there to audit cases. This can be a most serious error – using the Auditor only as a robot. This is done in a Co-Audit. It is not done in an auditing section. The auditors being taught in the auditing section are under a heavy discipline – the discipline that they must follow procedure and obtain results. A bad auditing presence, a squirrelly approach, a failure to use what they are taught, can cause two things to happen:

(a) A Pink Sheet on what they must re-do in Theory and Practical or:
(b) A GAE to the next lowest classification for retraining.

The Auditing Section is that section of a training course where auditing occurs. It is \textit{not} where auditing is taught. It is that section where auditing is experienced, as an auditor, as a preclear. Auditing is \textit{taught} in theory and practical. It is only guided in the Auditing Section.

AUDITING ASSIGNMENTS

The Auditing Supervisor (or in some cases the Course Supervisor as at Saint Hill) assigns all sessions and teams. The following rules are observed in this assignment of auditors:

(a) No auditor may be assigned to an upper Auditing level until he or she has passed the Theory and Practical Check Sheets of the lower auditing levels. In other words, only when an auditor is prepared in Theory and Practical is he or she assigned to auditing in the next classification.

(b) No Co-Audit is to occur, by which is meant there is no auditor auditing his own auditor. This makes a minimum of four in a class.

(c) Rock Slammers (as by Sec Check) are assigned to audit Rock Slammers and be audited by Rock Slammers as this tends to protect other students from bad auditing and yet lets the Rock Slammers progress.
(d) Change of auditors is avoided as may be found practical.

Auditing Assignments are posted by class time on a Monday and are seldom changed through the week.

**AUDITING ATMOSPHERE**

Students are heavily indoctrinated into two major maxims about being an auditor:

(a) If the auditor is warm and breath can be detected, he or she is in condition to audit. An Academy or course takes *no* interest in the case of the *auditor*. Courses where attention is dominantly on the *case* of the student and not his ability to audit are always *bad* courses. It is true that people, while they cannot postulate themselves clear, *don't have to act aberrated*. A thetan *can* rise superior to his aberrations. Thus, the less worry about how a student has to be audited before he or she can audit, the better. Scientology is a bootstrap operation. If this idea of "not in case shape to audit" or "not in condition to audit" is let creep in, then we'll *never* make it. So, if they're warm and breath can be detected, they can audit.

(b) Auditing in a common room is noisy and hard on preclears and auditors. But auditing can be done under such conditions. It makes a much better auditor. Preclears soon get used to it. So no attention is given as to how quiet it must be "because of the preclear".

Admittedly these two factors (a and b) contain unrealities. This is a case of that's the way it is.

**SCHEDULING TIME**

Sharp Scheduling, on the dot, is the mark of a successful Academy.

Sessions must begin and end on schedule.

It's part of instruction that the Auditor never be late for a session and to end sessions on the dot.

Time of Session must be tightly adhered to and enforced.

**INFRACTION SHEETS**

The disciplinary weapon is the Infraction Sheet.

An auditing Supervisor does not give these out for bad auditing, however. He gives these out only for Infractions of the Rules of the Academy, including a refusal to follow his auditing directions. Bad technical is handled by Pink Sheet and GAEs.
**OBSERVATION OF AUDITING**

There are three sources of observing auditing used by the Auditing Supervisor and Instructors. These are

(a) Direct observation of the session;
(b) Study of the Auditor's Report;
(c) Observation of the Preclear.

The Auditing Supervisor combines all three, giving the most time to (a) Direct observation of the session.

**THE PINK SHEET**

Fasten a packet of long (legal) pink paper, about 16 substance, to a clip board. Put three pieces of long carbon paper in place to use the first four sheets. Use a black ball point pen. Put a student's name at the top of the sheet. Put in the date.

Sit down near the session or use other inspection devices. Note what the auditor is making mistakes with.

On the left hand side of the paper, in column, write down the exact HCO Bulletins and Drills this Auditor must do in Theory and Practical.

Keep the sheets together. Look over the Auditor's report later. Re-insert the carbons and put down any further things the auditor must do.

Keep one sheet in a basket. Give the Theory Instructor one, give the Practical Instructor one. Give one to the student.

If by the week ending nearest after two weeks from date, the student has not completed this Pink Sheet, he or she is GAE'd to the next lowest class to complete it and any others before being raised again.

This is wholly independent of and in addition to the regular check sheets for classes.

Thus a thorough inspection of an individual student's auditing need be made only once every two weeks.

Nothing in the Pink Sheet System prevents comments on the Auditor's reports or personal discussion with him or her on emergency remedies by note during a session.

**GAE**

Gross Auditing Error (GAE) is the action of the Auditing Supervisor when the Pink Sheet is not completed by the Student or when, in the opinion of the Auditing Supervisor, the errors being made are so gross that a preclear is being heavily damaged (such as Auditor's Code breaches).
A "GAE" may consist of relegating the Auditor to the next lowest class or, if violent and flagrant, and directly against an Instructor's instructions, to the lowest unit of the Academy.

Only in two cases may a GAE be substituted for an Infraction Sheet, and in both cases the student is sent to the lowest unit. First is the flagrant and dogged refusal to follow an order relating to technical matters and the second is breaking Rule 28. These two may not be permitted to come in conflict.

A student's check sheets are not torn up by any GAE, but one that places the student back in the lowest unit causes the student to re-do all his auditing and re-pass it.

**FORMS**

A form for each pc undergoing clearing, giving the steps, must be part of the pc's folder and kept up by the auditor. This is based on the above data.

If a pc has had a recent Problems Intensive and now signs a Clearing Contract this is made part of the Clearing rundown. If done, however, by an outside auditor, the pc must be given another Problems Intensive.

A Special Form showing all steps and evidence of a clear must be sent to me.

The idea is to get results, to turn out clears and to keep HPAs/HCAs well occupied and at a high technical level.

**ACCIDENTAL GOAL FINDING**

It will happen that in cleaning up old goals found or even by sudden disclosure, the HPA/HCA staff auditor may find a goal that fires and is the goal. If so, it is checked out by the Goals Finder and listed unless other orders are given regarding the pc (such as unburdening the goal).

HPAs/HCAs are not, however, to attempt to find goals at this time and it is highly illegal for an HGC to employ non Saint Hill Graduates to find goals no matter what the public pressure. It could be very destructive to Scientology to have a lot of wrong goals about or getting listed.

In due course this last injunction will be released so far as Tiger Drilling the 850 list by HPAs/HCAs is concerned. But wait until technology is better. This will apply only to experienced staff auditors.

**METERS**

Only the latest Mark Meters are to be used by Goal Finders. Mark IV and onwards may be used by HPAs/HCAs.

It would be dishonest to use less.
SUMMARY

HGCs must afford public Clearing of individuals. Clearing Co-Audits of the public are a special role and are to be relegated to District Offices as soon as possible. It is no part of my plans to retain them in a Central Org or City Office.

Only the highest technology and most exact adherence to policy can keep us afloat at this time. These are not ordinary policies. These are survival itself for Scientology.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.cden
QUICKIE OBJECTIVES

Recent investigations into the effectiveness of Drug RDs including their rate of repair and re-repair revealed a marked tendency to quickie Objectives.

Failure to run Objectives fully and completely, especially on a case with an extensive drug history can set up the pc for less than optimum gain on Dianetics. A Drug RD without full and complete Objectives is not a Drug RD.

TWO-WAY COMM

The easiest and very out tech way to quickie Objectives is to run some commands and then put the pc on the meter and 2WC to F/N or do some fast "rehab." But did the Objective process ever get run? What actually F/Ned, the Objective or the 2WC? Any Objectives run this way are invalid.

The tech of Objectives is extensive and still very much in force. They have their own EPs and with these they are fully run to actual change for the pc. Only this is valid handling of Objectives.

CURE

The way to handle auditors who quickie Objectives is a full W/Cing of the subject and a big clay demo of the purpose of Objectives and a big clay demo of what effect Objectives have on running a Drug RD and R3R. Then get the auditor's own Objectives flattened.

Any Drug RD that needs to be repaired or redone must include a careful study of the Objectives to see if they were honestly run and if the valid Objective EPs on the processes themselves were obtained. Where the Objective was obviously quickied just R-Factor the pc you are going to flatten it and do so. If the EP of an Objective was questionable you can ask
the pc what happened and if he F/Ns on a real Objective EP fine, otherwise flatten the process.

A fully completed Drug RD with Objectives sets the stage for the pc to fly up the Grade Chart so do it right the first time.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

As assisted by CS-5

LRH:JE:nc
CCH ANSWERS

The following queries and my reply are useful in the CCHs.
Ron from Ray = 1/8 = 335L

Thanks for Telexes 233L2 and 334L2. That's fine.

Some queries have come up about CCHs. Could we have the latest stable data on

1. When is a physical origination picked up – after command is executed and before acknowledgement, or after acknowledgement?
2. Does one pick up by saying – "How are you doing?" "What happened then?" or "I noticed – so and so – happened. What's going on?" – or is there any other method that we don't have and which is better than any of these?

Love Ray

Ray from Ron = 15.30 = 2/8 = 335L2

1. When it happens.
2. Only by a two way comm query like "What's happening?"
   Never designate the origin.
   Don't make a system out of queries. Three commands nicely done is flat.
   Don't take spoken data from PC about somatics as a reason to keep on.
   Also the process that turns something on turns it off.

Love Ron.

L. RON HUBBARD
PROCESSING

Since 1950 we have had an ironbound rule that we didn't leave pcs in trouble just to end a session.

For fifteen years we have always continued a session that found the pc in trouble and I myself have audited a pc for nine additional hours, all night long in fact, just to get the pc through.

Newer auditors, not trained in the stern school of running engrams, must learn this all over again.

It doesn't matter whether the auditor has had a policy on this or not – one would think that common decency would be enough – as to leave a pc in the middle of a secondary or an engram and just coolly end the session is pretty cruel. Some do it because they are startled or afraid and "Rabbit" (run away by ending the session). Auditors who end a process or change it when it has turned on a heavy somatic are likewise ignorant.

What turns it on will turn it off.

This is the oldest rule in auditing.

Of course people get into secondaries and engrams, go through misemotion and heavy somatics. This happens because things are running out. To end off a process or a session because of the clock is to ignore the real purpose of auditing.

The oldest rules we have are

(a) Get the pc through it.
(b) What turns it on will turn it off.
(c) The way out is the way through.

These now are expressed as policy. A falsified auditor's report is also subject to a Court of Ethics. Any auditor violating this policy letter is liable to an immediate Court of Ethics convened within 24 hours of the offence or as soon as is urgently possible.

Auditing at all levels works well when it is done by the book.
The purpose of Ethics is to open the way for and get in Tech. Then we can do our job.

**There is no modern process that will not work when exactly applied.**

Therefore in the eyes of Ethics all auditing failures are Ethics failures – PTS, Suppressive Persons as pcs, or non-compliance with tech for auditors.

And the first offence an auditor can commit is ceasing to audit when he is most needed by his pc.

Hence it is the first most important consideration of Ethics to prevent such occurrences.

Then we'll make happy pcs, Releases and Clears.

LRH:wmc.jh                                     L. RON HUBBARD
HANDBOOK FOR GROUP AUDITING

(Excerpt)

THE GROUP AUDITOR

Since the publication of Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health in May 1950, the technologies of Dianetics and Scientology have been expanded upon by L. Ron Hubbard bringing about even more impressive results in the handling of the mind.

It was as a result of the success of Dianetics and Scientology that a new profession, that of the group auditor, came about.

In the early 1950's, group auditing was done by auditors who were themselves professional auditors of Scientology but these auditors, and the Church, began to train able persons into this specialized branch of Scientology who were not themselves professional auditors but who quickly became competent group auditors.

A group auditor is one who administers techniques, usually already codified, such as those in this handbook, to groups of children or adults.

Procedure

The group (preclears) is usually assembled and seated in a quiet room where they will not be disturbed by sudden noises or entrances. The group auditor then takes his position in the front of the group and talks to them briefly about what he is going to do and what he expects them to do.

The auditor then begins with his first command. He utters this in a very distinct voice in a very calm and quiet tone so as to be heard without any strain throughout the audience. He allows a pause, as necessary, for all in the group to do what he has said. He acknowledges their execution of the command. Then he either repeats the same command or goes to the next one as indicated. He continues through to the end of the processing session in this manner and closes the session as indicated.

The group auditor should read each command as written, allowing an appropriate interval of time between the commands. Numerous instructions to the auditor appear in the text. These instructions should be noted and followed by the group auditor, but the words in the parenthesis should not be repeated as part of the command.

The Communication Lag

The group auditor will discover that the questions he asks produce a "communication lag" in the preclear. The exact definition of a communication lag is: "The length of time intervening between the posing of a question, or origination of a statement, and the exact
moment that question or original statement is answered." If you will look very closely at this definition you will discover that nothing is said, whatever, about what goes on between the asking of the question or the origination of a communication and its being answered. What goes on in between is lag. It does not matter if the preclear stood on his head, went to the North Pole, gave a dissertation on Botany, stood silent, answered some other question, thought it over, attacked the auditor, or began to string beads. Any other action but answering, and the time taken up by that action, is communication lag.

If you will look around at people you will find them possessed of a great many communication lag mechanisms. In their effort not to be an effect, or in their effort not to be cause, in their aberrations about compulsive communication, and inhibitive communication, and in indulging in impulsive, compulsive and inhibitive communication, they manage to assemble quite a number of interesting mechanisms, but all these mechanisms are communication lag, until the exact question asked has been answered.

It may require anywhere from a third of a second to sixty hours (in very extreme cases undergoing personal auditing) for the preclear to receive and obtain anything like an answer to the command. All this period the preclear finds himself struggling with the command, feeling puzzled, feeling stupid, but seeking to answer it. In an individual session an auditor never interrupts a preclear who is experiencing "communication lag." In group auditing it is inevitable that the auditor will interrupt one or more preclears in his group now and then by giving a new command before they have executed the old one; this is a liability of group auditing. Usually no serious complications result but an auditor should (1) be alert to somebody in the group who is always too slow and (2) be very sure not to use types of commands which always produce communication lags in preclears in individual sessions. Group processing commands are lighter than individual auditing commands mainly because of this communication lag factor.

**Boil-off**

Another manifestation of importance is one called boil-off. This is, to an untrained observer, similar to communication lag. However, boil-off is more like sleep. It is a restimulation of past unconsciousness. It is a reduction of awareness to a point where sleep takes place. Preclears who are in very poor condition are subject to it. Preclears who have not had enough sleep or food are subject to it.

The remedy of boil-off is effected by cautioning the group about a sufficiency of sleep and food or by processing itself. The processing remedies for this condition are contained in Appendix A.
FLATTENING A PROCESS

A process is flat when:

1. There is the same lag from the moment the command is given until the time the preclear answers the command at least 3 times in a row.
2. A cognition occurs.
3. An ability is regained.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:-.rd
RUNNING CCHs

CCHs being run terribly wrong.

Correct version follows: Run a CCH only so long as it produces change in the pc's general aspect.

If no change in aspect for three commands, with the pc actually doing the commands, go on to next CCH.

If CCH producing change do not go on but flatten that CCH.

Then when for three commands executed by the pc it produces no change go on to next CCH.

Run CCHs One Two Three Four, One Two Three Four, One etc.

Use only right hand on One.

The CCHs are run alternated with Prepchecking session by session depending upon whether or not the pc has had a win on either and whether the CCHs in the CCH Session were not left with the pc stuck in one CCH which was producing terrific change and thusly very unflat as a process.

CCHs are not run in Model Session, nor run on the E-Meter, nor are goals set. The reality factor is established before the first command is given.

It is code break clause thirteen to run a CCH that is producing no change or to not flatten in same or subsequent session a CCH that is producing change.

Some pcs get no reaction at first on any CCH; therefore run each one as above, CCH One Two Three Four, One etc, and with Prepchecking being given in alternate sessions, or as stated above in case one of the CCHs has to be flattened off in another session on the CCHs.

L. RON HUBBARD
All right. Now, what burning question do we have today? You mean nobody in this – all right, Reg.

*Male voice: Routine 1, CCHs – what is the guiding factor when you come off Routine 1?*

When do you come off Routine 1?

*Male voice: Yes.*

This is the established criteria. You'd come off of Routine 1 when they were nominally flat. Nominally flat, you don't have to grind them to pieces to the non plus ultra, but you don't want a pc who is getting big changes on Routine 1 to be shifted off of them suddenly. That's your main criteria.

The time to take them off, and the only time you *can* take them off, is when you have gone over CCH 1, 2, 3, 4, and they are, all of them, temporarily flat. You could take the pc off at that time. You could. But the best time to take them off is when they're going through them, not at the beginning of the run when they're not getting any reaction and before you get into the reaction stage of the case.

You know, twenty minutes, no change. Twenty minutes, no change. Twenty minutes, no change. Twenty minutes, no change. "Well, we've done the CCHs." Like hell we have. You've got to go over them a few times and run through that gamut a few times and all of a sudden gog! you know, and whew! and zoog! and so forth.

Now, when you've got that out of the road, you'll find out that CCHs have bitten. That's the criteria, you know. Have the CCHs bitten on this pc at all?

All right. If they've bitten, then you'd run it up to a point where you are actually back to – this is the theoretical perfect end of the CCHs – where they were all running routinely twenty minutes apiece, without any change. And of course, it would be a break of the Auditor's Code to run them any longer. After you've gone through them maybe three times with no marked changes, man. the CCHs are flat – with the proviso that they have actually bitten, while being run. Okay? Does that answer the question?

*Male voice: Yes, it does.*

L. Ron Hubbard
PROCESSING

Since 1950 we have had an ironbound rule that we didn't leave pcs in trouble just to end a session.

For fifteen years we have always continued a session that found the pc in trouble and I myself have audited a pc for nine additional hours, all night long in fact, just to get the pc through.

Newer auditors, not trained in the stern school of running engrams, must learn this all over again.

It doesn't matter whether the auditor has had a policy on this or not – one would think that common decency would be enough – as to leave a pc in the middle of a secondary or an engram and just coolly end the session is pretty cruel. Some do it because they are startled or afraid and "Rabbit" (run away by ending the session). Auditors who end a process or change it when it has turned on a heavy somatic are likewise ignorant.

**What turns it on will turn it off.**

This is the oldest rule in auditing.

Of course people get into secondaries and engrams, go through misemotion and heavy somatics. This happens because things are running out. To end off a process or a session because of the clock is to ignore the real purpose of auditing.

The oldest rules we have are

(a) **Get the pc through it.**

(b) **What turns it on will turn it off.**

(c) **The way out is the way through.**

These now are expressed as policy. A falsified auditor's report is also subject to a Court of Ethics. Any auditor violating this policy letter is liable to an immediate Court of Ethics convened within 24 hours of the offence or as soon as is urgently possible.

Auditing at all levels works well when it is done by the book.
The purpose of Ethics is to open the way for and get in Tech. Then we can do our job.

**There is no modern process that will not work when exactly applied.**

Therefore in the eyes of Ethics all auditing failures are Ethics failures – PTS, Suppressive Persons as pcs, or non-compliance with tech for auditors.

And the first offence an auditor can commit is ceasing to audit when he is most needed by his pc.

Hence it is the first most important consideration of Ethics to prevent such occurrences.

Then we'll make happy pcs, Releases and Clears.

LRH:wmc.jh

L. RON HUBBARD
CCHS
AUDITING ATTITUDE

This is an important bulletin. If you understand it you will get results on hitherto unmoving cases and faster results (1 hour as effective as a former 25) with the CCHs.

Here is what happened to the CCHs and which will continue to happen to them to damage their value:

The CCHs in their most workable form were finalized in London by me in April 1957. That was their high tide of workability for the next five years. After that date, difficulties discovered in teaching them to auditors added extraordinary solutions to the CCHs (not by me) which cut them to about one twenty-fifth of their original auditing value. Pcs thereafter had increasing difficulty in doing them and the gain lessened.

How far were the CCHs removed from original CCH auditing? Well, the other night on TV I gave a demonstration of the proper original CCHs which produce the gains on pcs. And more than twelve old-time auditors (the lowest graded ones out of 36) thought they were watching a demonstration of entirely foreign processes.

Although these auditors had been "well trained" on the CCHs (but not by me) they did not see any similarity between how they did them and how they saw me do them. Two or three students and two instructors thought they were being done wrong. Even the higher ranking students were startled. They had never seen CCHs like this.

Yet, the pc was very happy, came way up tone, lost a bad before-session somatic and within 48 hours had a complete change in a chronic physical problem, all in 1½ hours of proper original CCHs.

The students and instructors "knew they weren't watching the correct CCHs" because there was no antagonism to the pc, because the Tone 40 was not shouted, because there was no endurance marathon in progress. There was just quiet, positive auditing with the pc in good, happy 2-way communication with the auditor and the auditor letting the pc win.

In the student auditing of the next two days, some shadow of the demonstration's attitude was used and the cases audited gained much faster than before. Yet at least two or three still feel that this is far too easy to be the CCHs.

In five years, the CCHs, not closely supervised by me, but altered in training, had become completely unrecognizable (and almost resultless).
Why?

Because the CCHs were confused with Op Pro by Dup which was for auditors. Because the CCHs became an arduous ritual, not a way to audit the pc in front of you. The CCHs became a method of auditing without communicating, of running off strings of drills without being there. And the CCHs are so good that even when done wrong or even viciously they produced some slight gain. The CCHs shade from bright white to dark grey in results, never to black.

Having been perverted in training to a system to make auditors audit them, they became something that had nothing to do with the pc.

What these students saw demonstrated (and which upset them terribly) was this:

The auditor sat down, chatted a bit about the coming session with the pc, explained in general what he was about to do. The session was started. The auditor explained the CCH 1 drill in particular and then began on it. The pc had a bit of embarrassment come off. The auditor took the physical reaction as an origination by the pc and queried it. The routine CCH 1 drill went on and was shortly proved flat by three equal responses. The auditor went to CCH 2. He explained the drill and started it. This proved to be flat. The pc did the drill three times without comm change. The auditor explained and went to CCH 3. This also proved flat and after a three times test, the auditor came off it, explained CCH 4, and went to CCH 4. This proved unflat and was gradually flattened to three equally timed correct responses by the pc on a motion the pc could not at first do. About 50 minutes had elapsed so the auditor gave a ten minute break. After the break the auditor went back to CCH 1, found it flat, went to CCH 2 and found the pc jumping the command and, by putting short waits of different lengths before giving commands, knocked out the automaticity. The auditor went on to CCH 3, found it flat, and then to CCH 4 which was found unflat and was accordingly flattened. The auditor then discussed end ruds in a general way, got a summary of gains and ended the session.

All commands and actions were Tone 40 (which is not "antagonism" or "challenge"). But the pc was kept in two-way comm between full cycles of the drill by the auditor. Taking up each new physical change manifested as though it were an origin by the pc and querying it and getting the pc to give the pc's reaction to it, this two-way comm was not Tone 40. Auditor and pc were serious about the drills. There was no relaxation of precision. But both auditor and pc were relaxed and happy about the whole thing. And the pc wound up walking on air.

These were the CCHs properly done. With high gain results.

The viewers saw no watchdog snarling, no grim, grim purpose, no antagonistic suspicion, no pc going out of session, no mauling, no drill-sergeant bawling and knew these couldn't be the CCHs. There was good auditor-pc relationship (better than in formal sessions) and good two-way comm throughout, so the viewers knew these weren't proper CCHs.

Well, I don't know what these gruelling blood baths are they're calling "the CCHs". I did them the way they were done in April 1957 and got April 1957 fast results. And the processes aren't even recognized!

So somewhere in each year from April 1957 to April 1962 and somewhere in each place they're done, additives and injunctions and "now I'm supposed to's" have grown up
around these precise but easy, pleasant processes that have created an unworkable monster that is called "the CCHs" but which definitely isn't.

Not seeing the weird perversions but seeing the slow graph responses, the vast hours being burned up, I began to abandon recommending the CCHs after 1959 as too long in others' hands. I didn't realize how complicated and how grim it had all become.

Well, the real CCHs done right, done the way they're described here, are a fast gain route, easy on auditor and pc, that goes all the way south.

Take a reread of the June and November bulletins of last year (forget the 20 minute test, 3 times equally done are enough to see a CCH is flat) and, not forgetting your Tone 40 and precision, laying aside the grim withdrawn militant auditor attitude, try to do them as pleasantly as you find them described in the above outlined session, and be amazed at the progress the pc will make.

The CCHs easy on auditor and pc? Ah, they'd observed a lot of CCHs and never any that were easy on auditor or pc. Everybody came to know it was a bullying, smashing, arduous mess, a fight in fact. The only trouble was, the gains vanished when the ARC ran out.

Today, put any pc on the original CCHs done as above until they're flat, then go to 3D Criss Cross and the pc will fly.

Surely you don't have to look and sound so hungry, disinterested and mean when you audit the CCHs. You want to clear this pc, not make him or her into a shaking wreck. The CCHs are easily done (when they're done right).

They'll get lost again, too, unless you remember they can get lost.

I believe Upper Indoc should be canceled in Academies and extra time put on just the CCHs as it is the Upper Indoc attitude carried over that makes the CCHs grim.

**SUMMARY**

The purpose of the CCHs is to bring the pc through incidents and into present time. It is the reverse of "mental" auditing in that it gets the pc's attention exterior from the bank and on present time. By using Communication, Control and Havingness this is done. If you make present time a snarling hostility to the pc, he of course does not want to come into present time and it takes just that much longer to make the CCHs work.

You do the CCHs with the Auditor's Code firmly in mind. Don't run a process that is not producing change. Run a process as long as it produces change. Don't go out of 2-way comm with the pc.

Complete every cycle of the process. Don't interject 2-way comm into the middle of a cycle, use it only after a cycle is acknowledged and complete.

Don't end a process before it is flat. Don't continue a process after it is flat.

Use Tone 40 Commands. Don't confuse antagonistic screaming at the pc with Tone 40. If you have to manhandle a pc, do so, but only to help him get the process flat. If you have
to manhandle the pc you've already accumulated ARC breaks and given him loses and driven him out of session.

Improve the ability of a pc by gradient scale, give the pc lots of wins on CCH 3 and CCH 4 and amongst them flatten off what he hasn't been able to do.

The CCH drills must be done precisely by the auditor. But the criteria is whether the pc gets gains, not whether the auditor is a perfect ritualist.

Exact Ritual is something in which you should take pride. But it exists only to accomplish auditing. When it exists for itself alone, watch out.

Audit the pc in front of you. Not some other pc or a generalized object.

Use the CCHs to coax the pc out of the bank and into present time.

Take up the pc's physical changes as though they were originations. Each time a new one occurs, take it up with 2-way comm as though the pc had spoken. If the same "origination" happens again and again only take it up again occasionally, not every time it happens.

Know what's going on. Keep the pc at it. Keep the pc informed. Keep the pc winning. Keep the pc exteriorizing from the past and coming into present time.

Understand the CCHs and what you're doing. If it all deteriorates to mere ritual you'll take 25 to 50 times the time necessary to produce the same result as I would.

The auditing is for the pc. The CCHs are for the pc. In auditing you win in the CCHs only when the pc wins.

L. RON HUBBARD
Clear Procedure as of Dec 3, 1957, is supplemented by a tape made at Auditors' Conference of Nov 30, 1957.

This current bulletin supplements HCO Bulletin of Dec 3, 1957, which is the Introduction. There will be a series of these, giving a bulletin to each step. The entire series will be published in a photolitho booklet called CLEAR PROCEDURE which will be ready for the December Congress and which will cost $2.00 in the U.S. and 10 shillings in Great Britain. Both booklets will be published by the HCO and will be copyrighted internationally. The booklet published in Great Britain will be a photolitho of the U.S. photolitho copy. The booklet may not be published in whole or in part by anyone but the HCO.

CLEAR PROCEDURE CONTINUED

STEP ONE: PARTICIPATION IN SESSION BY THE PC.

We have long known that ARC was important. Just how important it is was established by some tests I made in London in 1956 wherein every time the pc showed any restlessness or other signs of loss of havingness, instead of remedying havingness I carefully searched out any fancied break of ARC and patched it up. The "loss of havingness" vanished. In other words loss of ARC is even more important than loss of havingness since a repair of ARC restores havingness. Lack of havingness is only one symptom of a lack of communication.

There are two ways an auditor, according to long practice, can err. One of these is to permit two-way communication to a point where the pc's havingness is injured. The other is to chop communication to such a degree that havingness is injured. There is a point past which communication is bad and short of which lack of communication is bad. Here we have auditor judgment at play. Because the pc will fidget or go downscale in tone when his havingness drops an auditor can SEE when the pc's havingness is being lowered. Because a pc will go anaten or start to grind into the process an auditor can tell whether or not the pc feels his communication has been chopped. When either happens the auditor should take action – in the first instance by shutting off the pc's outflow and getting to work and in the second instance by making the pc talk out any fancied communication severance.

Participation in session by the pc is not something the auditor sees to at the beginning of the session and then forgets for the rest of the intensive. This step is continued throughout the intensive and is given as much attention as any process being run at the time. The auditor's
attention is always therefore upon two things – first the continued participation in session and second the action of the process.

Grouped under this head we would also have ways and means of getting the pc into session in the first place. An unconscious pc used to be an apparent road block. A downtone, antagonistic, you-can't-help-me pc was also a rough one. These two things are countered by always carefully starting a session and following through on standard CCH 0.

It is as important to open a session with a baby or an unconscious person as it is with any other preclear. It doesn't matter whether the pc is answering up or not. It is only necessary to assume that the pc would answer if he could answer and that the mechanics of voice and gesture are simply absent from the answer. Therefore one always carefully starts every session, paying attention to what is happening, where it is happening, who is there, help, goals and problems. Obviously anaten or inability to control the body are the present time problem of the unconscious person or the child. One can actually audit this with a plain question and simply assume after a bit it has been answered, then give the acknowledgement and ask another question just as though the pc were in full vocal action. Auditors still fall for the belief, very current, that "unconscious" people are unable to think or be aware in any way. A thetan is seldom unconscious regardless of what the body is doing or not doing.

**Present Time Problem** is a highly vital point of **Preclear Participation**. If a preclear is being nagged too thoroughly by a PT Problem auditing can actually send him downhill if done without addressing the problem. A whole intensive, even seventy-five hours can be wasted if the auditor does not clear the PT Problem.

The preclear generally doesn't know he has one which is nagging him, for the rough PT Problems go into the apathy band and below into forgetfulness rather rapidly. Therefore the auditor should ferret out the PT Problem with an E-Meter. Adroit use of an E-Meter does not include evaluating for the preclear but it certainly does include ferreting out PT Problems. The E-Meter is also used for valences and sometimes psychophysical difficulties. (Auditor: Use the word "psychophysical" rather than psychosomatic and stay out of a medical field.)

**The running of a PT Problem** today is the most. PT Problem, valences, psychophysical ailments, all run beautifully with "Mock up something worse than (terminal)" or "Invent something worse than (terminal)". To run this it is necessary to isolate the Terminal most intimately connected with the PT Problem (or the valence or psychophysical difficulty). One then clears the command (and you always better do that with any command) and lets go.

The whole idea of **worse than** is the whole of the dwindling spiral. People who are "trying to get better" and "be more perfect" and "think the right thought" lose all control of "getting worse", "being imperfect", and "thinking the wrong thought". All these **Worse Thans** are then left on automatic and we arrive at something less than optimum. In fact we arrive with the dwindling spiral. We also arrive with the "point of no return". We also arrive with the declining ability to heal or get well. And we also arrive with old age.

After running "worse than" on the PT Problem, we proceed with other parts of CCH 0. Clearing help will be found quite beneficial. But to get a pc to participate who is downright ugly about it, running help is usually only a partial solution. When these only ones get going
they really snarl on the subject of getting audited. Here CCH 1 is of benefit. No questions asked. But this of course defeats the purpose of Step One.

**Participation of the PC** in the session is necessary in order to place the pc somewhat at the cause point in the actual fact of auditing. This fits the definition. You can always change a body or recover it from some illness by auditing without much helping the pc himself. Therefore the pc, while under auditor control, is still somewhat at cause what with comm bridges and clearing commands, etc. But he is made to feel no bad effects from being **at effect** if ample ARC is used. In other words, the pc can't be entirely at cause in a session or he would be self-auditing, which isn't good, but he can be salvaged from being a total effect by good ARC. When the ARC drops out that DOES leave the pc at more or less total effect, a thing you have probably noticed.

The things to be done in CCH 0 should be done thoroughly at intensive's beginning and should be glanced at whenever a new session starts and should get a bow when a new command is used. But all CCH 0 is is a collection of mechanical aids to assist the pc's participation in the session and to assist the auditor in ARC. Although CCH 0 must be used always, it is not a total substitute for ARC.

The sum of CCH 0 is find the auditor, find the auditing room, find the pc, knock out any existing PT Problem, establish goals, clear help, get agreement on session length and get up to the first real auditing command. CCH 0 isn't necessarily run in that order and this isn't necessarily all of CCH 0, but if any of these are seriously scamped, the session will somewhere get into trouble.

When the participation of the pc ceases in a session, he must be gotten back into session by any means and then participation is re-established. A pc is never permitted to end a session on his own choice. He seeks to end them when his participation drops out of sight.

The trick question "What did I do wrong?" re-establishes ARC.

The problem of handling a pc who is not co-operative, who does not wish to participate, is a highly special problem. In the first place it is the pc's engrams that do not want to continue, in the second place it is the engrams which are doing the talking. One ordinarily tackles this case with a formal opening of session, brief but positive, and then sails in with CCH 0, just as though the person were unconscious, which, of course, the person is.

Participation by an unconscious person, while covered above, requires the additional refinement of technique. **One must always find something the preclear can do and then better that ability.** An unconscious person is usually lying in bed. If not, the command must be varied to fit the environment. But the best command is something like "You make that body lie in that bed." A slightly upper grade process to a person sitting in a chair is "You seat that body in that chair." In such cases a grip on the pc's hand and the use of a slight squeeze each time the auditor acknowledges considerably speeds the process.

There is another special case – or maybe it isn't so special. There are many people who cannot tackle a present time problem with a process. If the auditor sought out a PT Problem and then ran "something worse than a related terminal" or a "problem of comparable or incomparable magnitude" he would find the pc digging in hard, unable to handle the process.
Thus some judgment must be used in such cases. Don't run a PT Problem on somebody in very bad shape casewise.

There is an awful lot to know about starting sessions. The bad off case and the case in very good condition alike require special handling. For the case just mentioned who cannot handle a PT Problem with a process, there is always locational (TR Ten). **TR Ten** will run a PT Problem or anything else if slowly. Thus many a person with a PT Problem can only participate in a session to the extent of **TR Ten**, "YOU notice that (object – wall, floor, chair, etc)." By introducing in the auditor's and pc's bodies as a couple of the items being spotted along with everything else we eventually wind up with "find the auditor, find the auditing room, find the pc". And we get there without a PT Problem being in full bloom.

In running "You notice that object" there are some things that MUST be observed. Most important of these is this one: **Any process which turns on a somatic must be continued until it no longer turns on somatics.** This is true particularly of **TR Ten**, 8-C and **Trio**. The case hangs right there until the process is flat, whether in one day, one year or six. Another thing which must be stressed is the inclusion of the auditor's and pc's bodies. Because some pcs **when exteriorized** snap back in when they see the body is no reason to avoid it in **TR Ten**. Another thing is to make the pc use his eyes to view the objects and if he doesn't turn his eyes toward them, then it is up to the auditor to use manual direction of the head and even pry the eyes open. No balks are ever permitted in auditing. If **TR Ten** is being run at a problem, every now and then the auditor pauses and discusses the problem again with the pc in order to keep it in restimulation until **TR Ten** can run it out.

The high case is a worse problem than auditors commonly believe. In the first place a high case can "blow" a situation out of the bank with considerable ease and if the auditor insists on sledge-hammering it out with a process, then pc participation blows rather than a facsimile.

High case participation can also be misunderstood in that there are a lot of cases that think they are high which aren't. Here's how you tell a real high case from a bogus ("I can do everything") case. A thetan in good shape can be cause. When he looks at something in the bank it becomes the effect. A bogus high case can think anything he wants without anything having an effect on the bank. You want to watch this point because here is the definition of OT thoroughly at work. Pc at Cause. A case that has pictures and everything and is impatient to get on with it **but does not markedly alter the bank with thinking alone** is not a high case but an old "wide open case" of Dianetic days.

Two-way communication **as a process** is the key to all this. If you put a pc on an E-Meter and locate a present time charge, you can, if the pc can somewhat handle his bank, get him to two-way comm the incident flat very quickly – in five or ten minutes at the most. This is all the process used. It would take an actual E-Meter run to give you a full reality on this.

Here we are looking at the basic difference amongst cases. That difference lies in the ability to knowingly **cause**. Bodies are the same, they all react alike. Banks differ only vaguely and only in content and significance. Engrams are engrams and they all behave alike. There is only **one difference** amongst pcs. We called this **Basic Personality** in **Book One**.
We can be a lot more simple about it now that I have my teeth into the subject a few more feet. The difference is degree of knowing causability. What do we mean by cause? The basic, old Scientology definition is still at work. Cause-Distance-Effect. Joe knowingly shoots Bill. Joe is at Cause, Bill is at Effect. Mary gives John a present. Mary is at Cause, John is at Effect. Bill says Boo to Joe. Bill is at Cause, Joe is at Effect. But when we introduce knowing cause and cause at will into this Cause-Distance-Effect idea we see we have something else added. The person at Cause is there because he knows he is there and because he is willingly there. The person at Cause is not at Cause because he does not dare be at Effect. He must be able to be at Effect. If he is afraid to be at Effect, then he is Unwilling Cause and is at Cause only because he is very afraid of being at Effect. Education can show a person he can be at Effect without liability. Then he can be at Cause without having to be because he doesn't dare be at effect. Auditing in its whole operation is teaching the pc this. Pc slides from terrified effect to tolerated effect to knowing cause with regard to any incident he contacts if he is audited properly. The pc who has to get rid of all his engrams because he has to get rid of them because it's all too horrible winds up, with good auditing, into a tolerance of the pictures since he has learned he can tolerate them and so can swing around to Cause.

So we have this great difference in pcs. Degree of knowing causability is the extent that he is willing to be at Cause and the extent he is willing to know he is at Cause plus the ability to cause things.

You will see this on an E-Meter in PT Problem handling. Bill has a PT Problem. It drops a dial when first contacted. The auditor, using his understanding of Scientology, two-way comms on it. The incident discharges and no longer registers after a few minutes. Mary has a PT Problem. It drops steeply on the E-Meter. The auditor tries to two-way comm on it. The charge remains the same or Mary begins to disperse. She doesn't hold to the subject. The auditor at length finds that two-way comm only serves to run down her havingness. The charge remains on the meter dial. What is the difference between Bill and Mary? Bill can be at knowing cause, Mary is either obsessive cause or heavy effect. Bill can blow facsimiles. Mary cannot. On Mary the auditor is very wise to enter upon TR Ten.

One version of TR Ten is called Short Spotting. "You notice that (nearby object)." So long as the pc can see with his eyes the object or feel the auditor's hand on it the process works. It is spotting right up close. If run with mediumly near and far objects (such as the room wall) it is very effective in getting a case going. It has given some cases their first reality on auditing. BUT the rule still holds here about somatics. When a somatic is turned on with a process, turn it off with that process. See Auditor's Code 13. This is entirely true of Short Spotting. In that it almost always turns on somatics, when you start it, you have to flatten it and that's often lengthy.

Remember this about pc participation. A low case can't handle the bank, therefore you keep high ARC and kid-glove him through a session. A very high case doesn't need dynamite, therefore you retain his participation by going as rapidly as you can. A medium, average case needs ARC, something of dynamite, something of kid-gloves, something of two-way comm.
And in all good auditing cases improve. Just because you start a pc low doesn't mean he'll always stay low. Check the case often. See if his causability is rising. If it isn't, he isn't improving and you better go easier or heavier. Probably when a case doesn't improve you didn't handle a PT Problem. That is the only thing which can keep a case from gaining. So check every session for one.

There are probably thousands of ways to gain the participation of the pc, there are probably thousands of ways to open a session. There are probably an infinite number of tricky things you can do. However, this breadth of choice should not obscure the following.

1. A pc who is not participating in the session is not at Cause.

2. An auditor who isn't able to maintain ARC, who isn't able to "Freeze" a process for a short time, even a tone 40.0 process, and re-establish ARC, will not get results.

3. The end-all of processing is the attainment of a goal, the goal of OT. One always processes the problems and difficulties of the pc, he does not process the process. Processes only assist in processing the pc. They will not do anything by themselves. Processes are a road map to the goal of OT, they are nothing in themselves. The target is the condition, the disabilities of the pc. How one achieves the eradication of these difficulties is secondary to the fact of their eradication. Scientology is a route attained after several thousand years of no attainment by Man and the route is important and valuable and must be travelled correctly, but the concern is the pc, not the route.

4. A new auditor can be adrift with his tools. He is uncertain as to what he is attacking. He should have reality on engrams, locks, key-ins, secondaries, the time track, the key buttons of Scientology such as Communication, Control and Havingness. Given an understanding of all these and the theory of Scientology itself he can almost pilot his way through a case with two-way comm. But two-way comm will not work if one doesn't understand all the above. So two-way comm is not conversation. The pc has had a few trillion years of that and it hasn't made him well, so two-way comm is a highly specialized thing, done with full understanding of the thetan, bank and body. Good two-way comm means participation by the pc.

5. Scientology is a precise commodity, something like engineering. A pc is a precise thing, part animal, part pictures and part God. We want the ability to handle things and the God, and the less unthinking responses in the pc, the better off he will be. Therefore a PC who isn't cogniting regularly is being processed beyond his ability to do and it is necessary to drop back downscale to find something he can do.

6. The golden rule of processing is to find something the preclear can do and then to improve his ability to do it. At once you will have participation. The highest ability one pc had was to get drunk: a resolution of his case was entered upon by having him invent ways to get drunk.

7. The attention span of children and psychos is not necessarily a factor since it is only the phenomena of dispersal against mental blocks, keying in of incidents. The auditor can pay attention to it or not as he likes. Short, regular sessions on people with limited
attention span get more gain per week than a steady grind since the participation is maintained.

8. The auditor remains at Cause in all sessions without forbidding the pc to be at Cause. See the rules in Dianetics: The Original Thesis.

L. Ron Hubbard

[Further material can be found in Scientology: Clear Procedure-Issue One on page 172. The above HCO B was reissued on 29 September 1970.]
OBJECTIVES NOT BITING

This HCOB contains data on objectives, based on current folder study, which is vital to C/Ses.

A major reason for the quickying of objectives is running too-steep-a-gradient objectives on cases that need lower gradient objectives first. (Running too steep a gradient can also lead to grinding on with no change.)

During a study of folders of pcs currently being run on objectives during purif and pcs being run on objectives after Purif, there were cases who were said to be "flattening" processes such as S-C-S and Op Pro by Dup in very short amounts of time (like 20 mins, 40 mins). These cases were not getting any real EP – more an assertion that they were done or a very minor win, often just a statement from the auditor that the process was "flat" – sometimes the process was ended on pc protest.

Those same cases, when put on very low gradient objectives, started running the process and winning like mad!

By low gradient objectives, I mean: Mimicry; PT Differentiation (getting the pc to tell the difference between objects by actual touch); Dangerous Environment Process ("Look around the environment and find something that isn't being a threat to you."); "Notice that…"; "Feel my arm. Feel your arm.", the Animal process and other objective processes for invalids and children (such as those given in the Introductory and Demonstration Processes and Assists pack).

On those cases, these low gradient objectives bit, turned somatics on and off and the pc ended up with a real cognition and very good exam report.

One of the pcs went through the treason and enemy conditions in session on the objective process, PT Body Orientation (Have the pc locate a part of his body and recognize it as such). He had thought that he was "brown hair" (his hair color is brown) and went up through various recognitions that he wasn't body parts and that he wasn't his past and arrived at the cognition that he really is a thetan – which was quite a win!

The folders reviewed and handled as above were not all heavy druggies, nor were they what would be called especially rough cases; some were what would be called "average"
cases on a Class IV org's or mission's lines, these days. These were ordinary people who hold jobs, etc.

This is further confirmation of the necessity to undercut due to the deterioration of society. Indeed, the world – thanks to psychologists, drugs and TV – is going down the tubes.

Today a high percentage of cases starting out in auditing have a very short attention span and can only respond to very light processes.

C/Ses and auditors who have been used to handling the cases of persons who have had Scientology processing and training could easily overlook just how low one has to go to undercut the cases of beginning pcs today. One very experienced C/S, who has mainly C/Sed for Scientologists and upper level cases in recent years, was somewhat shocked to find that processes ordinarily reserved for the more difficult cases a decade ago, were necessary for the majority of beginning pcs today. Sometimes we as Scientologists tend to overlook how far we have progressed and how rapidly society is going down.

Undercutting cases has been necessary since the early '50s and will go on being continuously necessary in the future. So auditors and C/Ses are again alerted to this. Success with beginning pcs and lower level cases is dependent on correctly choosing a process that the pc can do and make gains on. It is also necessary to be able to detect when a pc is not running a process successfully because it is too high.

WHEN TO UNDERCUT

In 1955, London, I gave a dissertation on objectives not biting in the second lecture of the Hubbard Professional Course (Tape 5511C08). The main points were as follows:

A. When a pc is being run on too high a process, the auditor is running the process on a machine; no matter how brightly the pc may answer, the process is being run on a machine.

B. If you are running the pc too high, there are two things missing: communication lag and cognition; the pc will trot like a well-trained horse through the whole process, without any communication lag, without any cognitions.

Thus we have the rule:

**An objective process that produces a communication lag, will produce a cognition; a process that does not develop a communication lag, will not produce a cognition.**

The only thing that has changed since 1955 is how far one must undercut today, to get a process that is within the ability of the PC to do and which will produce change.
CAUTIONS

Not every case needs to be undercut as far as those described above; on the other hand, some cases will have to be undercut lower than those described.

C/Ses and auditors can also err in the other extreme and try to re-run all of a pc's objectives over again (as has already happened in some areas). Doing so is out tech and results in the pc grinding on and on or becoming protesty – sometimes surprisingly so.

There is a vast difference between flattening a process that is producing change and forcing on over pc protest or other bad indicators (or a lack of good indicators).

Objective processes (or any other processes for that matter) that have been run to EP, must not be run again; it violates the auditor's code to do so.

SUMMARY

C/Ses and auditors should look over cases being run on objective processes and if these are not running very well and going to a full EP, then there are either auditor errors or the case is being run on too high a gradient or the same process or processes are being run again after they have already been flattened.

This data, hot off my research line, is being issued to you now (pending a full publication regarding objective processes) so that faster and better results can be obtained on pcs being run on objective processes and in objective co-audits, right away.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

Assisted by
Senior C/S International

LRH:DM:bk
And this is March the 29th, 1954. This is a talk on the evolution and use of Self Analysis. This book is relatively misunderstood. In the first place, it is obvious that a process as simple as that contained in Self Analysis would not do anything for anybody. That's obvious. And in the second place it's obvious that everybody's in better shape than this book calls for.

The various processes which are available to an auditor as we go up along the line – include one that is about the lowest rung you can hit, which is mimicry – treatment of psychotics. You mimic them. You mimic them physically; that is, not verbally but physically. They're lying down doing nothing; you lie down and do nothing. They'll get irked after a while. You've gone into communication with them. That in essence is communication, duplication. So that's about as low as we can get beyond some mechanical aids for psychotics.

But with Self Analysis we have a medium which (1) will not get people into trouble, (2) which is very easy to use and (3) which cuts across practically all the cases you will encounter. In other words, there's a certain security in using it because it wouldn't matter who walked up to you, Self Analysis would do something.

Well, now Self Analysis does an awful lot of things. But it also has some limitations. Let's look at the limitations before we go into what it will do and how we use it.

Those limitations are very, very marked. On a great many cases – I would say the majority of cases – Self Analysis works for quite a few hours. It works probably very, very well for about fifty hours and then slumps, and in many cases will slump earlier than that. But by slump, that doesn't mean the person goes back to his original state. That merely means the process hangs fire. The person just doesn't improve. His IQ doesn't improve above a certain point, and so on. It'll improve him up to a certain point, in other words, and then hang fire.

But you'll notice a curve upwards – a rather steep curve right up front – a curve so steep in terms of advancement in the early stages of the use of Self Analysis that it's almost a vertical line. It's a tremendous advance, you know, in its first uses on almost any case. Because it, in using it, cracks through the neurotic level. And it just cracks through it. And it cracks through it on the same level as firing a rocket. But like a rocket, it runs out of fuel in a hurry.
So we can crack somebody up through a level of his immediate workaday world. The problems of havingness, his surroundings, immediate conflicts, things like this have a tendency to diminish. And he gets less worried than previously. And life goes on much better for him. But if we just kept on using Self Analysis, he would get up to a saturation point. Because you're just handling energy that he's already handled. In other words, we've taken up the available supply in the universe in which he finds himself and there we have it.

A professional auditor would know many processes which would do better or maybe faster work. But, you know, the fact of the matter is that case after case he would crack up through a certain level, you know, he'd push them up to a certain level faster if he simply opened a copy of Self Analysis and started in anyplace – particularly its next-to-the-last list.

Now, over here in the next-to-the-last list, it says, "The following usually stabilizes any of the above conditions." And here we get the most important process in Self Analysis.

L. RON HUBBARD
A C/S may and should know exactly what is wrong with a case. When he "knows" by hunches or intuition and does not bother to confirm or make a wider effort, he can miss the case entirely.

Example: C/S says to himself – I know what's wrong with Joe. His wife. So I'll C/S "O/W on your wife".

Some of the time the C/S will be right. This gives him a win and confirms him in sloppy C/Sing. He does not bother to know before he C/Ses.

A C/S who gets a low percentage of cracked cases and a low percent of F/N VGIs at Examiner usually fails to "know before he goes". He just goes, which is to say he just writes programs and C/Ses without finding out enough about the case.

A skilled C/S may very well be able to figure out exactly what's wrong with the case. That's his job. But how does he find out anything about the case at all?

The answer is very simple. So simple it gets missed. the C/S gets data on the case.

How does he do this?

The broadest, most used answer to how to know is prepared lists. These have all sorts of questions on them that read or don't read. There are lots of these lists beginning with the famous PC Assessment Form. There are all sorts of lists. An end product of any list is data on the pc one uses to program and C/S the case.

The next answer to how to get data is lists prepared by the C/S himself and which are assessed by the Auditor.

Another answer is 2-way comm on questions written by the C/S. "What do you consider hasn't been handled on your case?" is a jewel which gives you the hidden standard to List and Null and run Who or what would have ______ to BD F/N Item and O/W on the item found. But there are dozens more. "How do you feel about your family?" "R Factor: The C/S is concerned about your saying your case sags after wins in auditing. Could you tell me exactly what happens and what your history has been on this?" There is no limit to such questions. And, if taken from what the pc says to Examiner or from auditors' comments on Worksheets, they will usually F/N. But mainly they give data.
When regular actions fail, there is always the D of P. "D of P to Interview Richard Roe and find out what he's trying to do in session. Also how he looks, mannerisms, etc."

Data, Data, Data. Now you have a picture of this case.

**COMBINED ACTION**

Usually, by prepared lists issued or from C/S prepared lists, the C/S finds and gets handled by the auditor in the same session much of what is wrong. This combines finding out with handling.

Any prepared list carried to F/N on each read (Method 3) or the indicated action done will give case gain. Maybe it's all the case gain one could ask for.

But such reads even if F/Ned and the text in the Worksheet give the C/S new data about this case.

**BROAD SHOOTING**

Even if he now KNOWS, the C/S does not narrowly shoot at one target. He gives alternatives as well in his C/S.

Example: C/S knows pc is concerned about F/Ns. He does not necessarily just write "Prepcheck F/Ns". Instead the C/S writes "Assess Auditors, Auditing, Dianetics, Scientology, F/Ns, Processing, false reads. Prepcheck each reading item, taking largest read first." This gives a broader band, more chance of hitting the button needed.

There are many ways to do this. Example: You "know" it is a misdefined word. You don't C/S "Find the misdefined word". You write, "Assess Method 3 and Handle the Word Clearing Correction List". For you see, the session might also have been run over an out rud.

**EVALUATION**

To abruptly C/S everything the pc has just said is a Q and A. But worse, it can lead to evaluation.

**LITTLE FLAGS**

Pc Remarks are like little Flags that may signal a much deeper deposit of aberration. Only the little flag shows. "I don't like women," can uncover a whole background. "I keep getting this pain in my side" opens the door to a whole chain of operations and one to be done next week!

But by the broad rule, the C/S doesn't dive at it. He says "Pc has pain in side. I . C/S 54."
Not "List the somatics in his side". But a whole coverage of accidents, illnesses. One will also have a side pain as a result. "Appendicitis Operation" is enough to give anyone a pain in the side if never audited out!

TAGGING CASES

A C/S who sees a case is thick foldered and not well tags the case "Resistive". There are 7 resistive cases listed in the Class VIII material. For this the C/S has "GF40 Expanded Method 3" and then handles the lists and engrams indicated in it in his next C/S.

If this doesn't handle, the case is in an out Ethics situation that should be looked into.

The C/S mentally tags the easy ones and the tough ones. The tough ones he plays¹ on the Resistive Cases side.

The C/S can also find an auditor considers a fast case a bad case when it is just a fast case.

PRIMARY RECORD

The primary record is the pc's folder. When the case does not run well it can be assumed that the case is

(a) Resistive (b) Errors have been made in auditing.

These two assumptions are valid in all cases which do not easily resolve. They are both valid because the case, being resistive, was running poorly, was hard to audit and C/S earlier.

From the folder, from prepared lists, from C/S's own additions to prepared lists, from C/S's own prepared lists, from 2WC on questions and from D of P Interviews one can get enough data to intelligently program and C/S a case.

All this may seem very obvious. But, in word clearing the most Common C/S error has been to fail to order a Word Clearing Correction List done. Instead one reads, "Correct the last word found". This misses that the whole thing may be being done over a withhold or ARC Break. It might be another word entirely. So a C/S who does this risks the wrong target. He is not C/Sing broadly enough.

Also one sees a repair or life program consisting of two or three special processes and without any lists at all.

One also sees a program which seeks to handle several things the C/S "knew" were wrong followed by "8. C/S 53, 9. GF 40X, 10. C/S 54." Having gone, this program then seeks to find out. It's quite backwards.

Thus the C/S who goes before he knows is going to have an awful lot of no F/Ns at the Examiner.

¹ Editor: plays = place – maybe a duplication error from a dictaphone?
The watchword is **know before you go**.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder
POLICY ON THE DIRECTOR OF PROCESSING'S INTERVIEWS

It should be made plain by the director of Processing to all persons he interviews that he is not processing them, but is only asking questions or obtaining information.

During all such interviews the Director of Processing should remember that he is not an Auditor and as such does not have to maintain the Auditor's Code; quite to the contrary, the Director of Processing should never permit the preclear to retain any idea which is not correct. It is the job of the Director of Processing to evaluate for the preclear with a reality and with truth.

The approximate length of time for all interviews is about twenty minutes.

L. RON HUBBARD
Executive Director
INTERVIEWS

"A proper org board is a perpetual combination of flows which do not collide with one another and which do enter and do experience the desired change and which do leave as a product."

Org Series 1
HCO PL 13 Sep 70, Iss II
BASIC ORGANIZATION

Interviews play a vital part in the correct routing and smooth flow of pcs and students on org lines.

They are an integral part of the functioning system of an org.

Depending upon how needed interviews are assigned and carried out, org lines and therefore org products can be slowed or impeded or bypassed or disrupted, or they can be speeded up and made to flow more smoothly, with real products as the result.

The right type of interview, standardly done at the right time (when needed) by the right org terminal on the right public (PC or student) will always serve to grease the org lines.

Mis-used or mis-assigned interviews can and will scramble the scene, and with a scrambled scene the products suffer.

An interview is defined as a face-to-face meeting between the interviewer and another person, where questions are asked of the person to obtain data needed to accomplish the purpose of the interview.
"The purpose of the interview" is the key phrase here. If one doesn't know the purpose of the type of interview his post calls for, it can all go sadly awry.

That's when you get a Reg taking up case problems with a PC or attempting some kind of case debug or promising him a specific result. Or the D of P getting into questions of finance in an attempt to sell a PC more auditing, or even doing some sort of auditing under the guise of a "D of P interview." Or one or both of these posts attempting to, wear a "consultant" hat. You get a mix-up of functions, a mix-up of the lines, and you don't get the needed or expected result.

This bulletin serves to lay out several of the main types of interviews used in an org and get them briefly defined as to purpose and function so the lines can and will flow smoothly.

**TYPES OF INTERVIEWS**

**REGISTRAR INTERVIEW:** The Registrar interview is given to determine what service the person wants, to channel and intensify his wants, sign him up for service and re-sign him for further services and to assist him in the resolution of any problems in signing up for the service.

The Registrar uses the Reg Interview to familiarize the person with the service, to give him explanatory literature on training or processing, to answer his questions (but NOT technical questions) about a service, and to assist him in the handling of the finance for the service, acting in a financial consultant capacity.

Registrars sign people up for training and for processing. With the org promoting and delivering its services properly, a healthy majority of the sign-ups should be for training as we are in the business of making auditors, and therein lies our real expansion.

The Reg interview of the trainee or potential trainee is ordinarily a straightforward uncomplicated procedure. It's a matter of: What training, if any, has he had? With that determined, it's a matter of signing him up for his next (or first) level of training and any prerequisites required for that level. It's a very direct route up the Training Bridge, and the Reg's job handling such sign-ups is comparatively simple.

The Reg interview when signing up a PC for processing may entail more know-how and handling on the part of the Reg.

The Reg must be familiar with the tech the org delivers and with technical results and wins achieved. But a Reg must not assign auditing hours or C/S the case or promise that such and such a rundown will be done. That is the hat of the C/S. But a Reg does give interviews and he should be trained to find a person's ruin. He establishes a comm line with the person and establishes himself as a terminal to help the person get onto the service he needs and wants as swiftly as possible.

Signing the person up for the required number of hours or intensives per his Technical Estimate is a part of the Reg interview and registration cycle. (Tech Estimate: the estimated number of hours or intensives that will be needed for the PC to make case progress and get...
stable results.) But determining the correct Tech Estimate for the PC is not part of the Reg interview. That is only done by a qualified tech terminal. The Reg's role here is to interview the person and initially sign him up and have him pay for the service on a conditional basis, pending his Technical Estimate and acceptance on HGC lines. He then routes the person for his Technical Estimate and, when that is made, the Reg now completes the cycle by signing the person up for the hours required by the Technical Estimate. (Ref. HCO PL 10 March 78 HGC PC APPLICATION FORM, HCO PL 30 Nov 71 Corrected and Reissued 2 Dec 71 BLIND REGISTRATION, and HCO PL 19 Aug 60 REGISTRAR LOST LINE)

(The interview given the PC by the Technical Estimator is covered in its own section in this issue, along with listed references on the Tech Estimate Line.)

Should a PC who is mid-auditing (not yet a completion) need to purchase more hours, the sign-up is handled promptly in a routine Reg interview. Occasionally, however, such an interview might go like this:

PC: "Ted brought me down here and I'm supposed to sign up for more hours to complete my auditing, but I don't want to buy more auditing here. I don't want any more auditing."

Reg: "Well, we'd better have you see the D of P so we can get data on this!"

That's the totality of the Reg interview in that situation. The Reg promptly puts it on the proper lines so the necessary data can be obtained. He notifies the D of P who gets the folder to the C/S at once. The C/S, after going over the folder, can then determine what needs to be taken up in the D of P interview, or whether it would be handled by the PC's regular auditor or requires sending the PC to the Qual Div for a review.

The Reg might also encounter a PC needing more hours to complete a rundown who is willing to sign up and pay for the additional time but who is not VGIIs on his auditing, or who originates he is having a rough time in his auditing and/or has bad indicators. The Reg would, of course, sign the PC up for the additional hours promptly.

But in either of the above or similar cases, the Reg would also write up a BI (Bad Indicator) report and route it directly to the Snr C/S in Qual, so he could look into it, with a copy to the HGC C/S. It's not a matter of the Reg routing the PC to Qual, however, as the PC is still on Tech lines. (Ref. HCOB 26 Sep 74 HANDLING FLUBBED PCs)

Note that the Reg doesn't interview the PC to get the data about the bad auditing or bad indicators; the Reg simply writes up a report to the Snr C/S with a copy to the HGC C/S as to what he heard and observed with this PC. These lines got all crossed up in earlier days when the D of P more often than not was also the Reg, and this got people confused. But any confusion must be taken out of it and the correct routing and correct interviewing put in.

When an individual has completed an org service and has routed through Qual and Success as complete, a Reg interview is always given to re-sign him for his next service. This is ordinarily a smooth, routine cycle, as a standardly completed student or PC will have good indicators at the prospect of getting onto his next action. But should the Reg encounter bad indicators or a resistance to getting further services, it is an indicator that something has been missed on the student or PC. That is a matter for Qual correction, not something that would be
handled in a Reg interview. In such a case the Reg, maintaining good ARC, efficiently routes the person to Qual where the matter does get handled. (Ref. BPL 4 Dec 71, Issue I, RE-SIGN UP REFUSALS, HANDLING OF)

The Reg is there to sign the person up, to re-sign him and to route him to the proper terminal for what he needs. There is no charge, ever, for a Registrar interview.

**HGC PC TECHNICAL ESTIMATE INTERVIEW:** The Technical Estimate interview is done to obtain necessary data from the applicant so that an accurate estimate can be made of the number of hours or intensives the person will need to get stable results from his auditing.

When a PC has been initially signed up for services and has been tested, he is routed to the Technical Estimator. (This could be the D of P or a technically qualified person deputized by the D of P for this purpose.) The Estimator, having reviewed the person's test results, folder, and forms filled out by the Registrar, interviews the applicant, using the HGC PC Estimation Form (BTB 12 Feb 78R, Reiss. 6.7.78). Such an interview covers what the applicant wants to accomplish, somatics or other problems he is trying to handle, length of time on earlier actions, and other information pertinent to the case.

When all the necessary data has been obtained, and when the Technical Estimate for that individual has been made, the Estimator gives the person an R-Factor regarding his estimate, handles any questions he may have, and sends the applicant back to the Registrar for final sign-up for the estimated number of intensives.

That's the essence of the Tech Estimate interview. It's: "What do you want to accomplish with auditing?", followed by lots of questions about the state of the case. Also asked would be the time it has taken him to do this or that action. For instance, the Estimator needs to know that it took the PC 25 hours to do Grade 0 and 1 in order to estimate how long it will take him to do Grade 2, 3 and 4. It can be done either metered or unmetered. (When done in the field by a Remote Reg or Tours personnel it is usually unmetered.) Though it follows the HGC PC Estimation Form it is never done rotely.

The routing for a Tech Estimate is to the Registrar, to Testing, to the Tech Estimator and back to the Registrar for full sign-up. This line and all of its actions are fully covered in the following issues:

- **HCO PL 30 Nov 71**
  - IMPORTANT BLIND REGISTRATION
- **Corr. & Reiss. 2.12.71**
- **B.P.L. 10 Mar 78 II**
  - IMPORTANT, THE TECH ESTIMATE LINE
- **Reiss. 6.7.78**
- **B.T.B. 12 Feb 78R**
  - HGC PC TECH ESTIMATION FORM
- **Reiss. 6.7.78**
- **HCO PL 10 Mar 78**
  - HGC PC APPLICATION FORM
- **B.P.L. 10 Mar 78 IV**
  - TOURS AND MAIL PROCESSING INCOME, HANDLING OF
Technical Estimates and Tech Estimate interviews are not charged for, but are given when the applicant has initially signed up and made a donation for service.

**D OF P INTERVIEW:** As D of P interviews are sometimes misunderstood as to their purpose and function, and sometimes mis-used (by having other actions thrown into them erroneously under the label of "D of P interview"), this issue spells out what a D of P interview is and what it is not.

Briefly, a D of P interview is an interview given to a PC on auditing lines by the D of P, as ordered by the C/S:

1. to get data for the C/S which is not otherwise available to him for C/Sing and programming the case,
   or
2. to give the PC an R-factor on what is going on in order to dispel a mystery for him.

The C/S would order a D of P interview when he needs data not contained in the usual sources (the worksheets, PC folder, FES, test scores, exam reports, ethics or medical records). To use it otherwise, to call for such an interview in lieu of folder study, for example, would be lazy C/Sing.

But the D of P interview is used when the C/S needs data from the PC himself, or when he suspects his C/Ses aren't being done or that the auditor can't audit. It is used when he has reason to believe there may be omitted or hidden matter or false reports in the worksheets, or when it appears that additives are being entered into the session. Ordinarily it is used only when the case is packed up. And primarily what the C/S wants to know from this is: "What did the auditor do?" The data obtained is then used, if it applies, for correction of the auditor as well as for C/Sing and programming the case. The D of P interview is also used when it is suspected that factors are being put in on the PC outside of the session.

Such an interview may also be ordered to find out what the PC is confused or in mystery about so that it can then be explained to him. (Note: You don't explain tech to the PC, but if he has a confusion or a mystery you do explain to him what is going on and what is expected of him.)

D of P interviews, then, are to get data, not to try to "audit" or try to accomplish a result. The D of P does not audit, he does not rehab, he does not Date/Locate anything on the PC. That D of P interviews do sometimes accomplish a result is incidental, and this must not be used as a reason for the D of P to get into attempting to audit or rehab the PC. Those are actions for the auditor to do.
There will be times when the C/S wants specific, muzzled questions asked of the PC and nothing else. In such instances the D of P carries out his instructions exactly, asking only those questions he has been instructed to ask.

D of P interviews are always done on the meter, with all PC answers, PC indicators and tone level, meter reads and their size and any blowdowns marked. Thus, the D of P must have his TRs in, must have Qual Okay to operate an E-Meter and must be able to meter accurately. While the interview is not done to get case gain, the D of P would normally end the interview on an F/N and should try to do so.

As the D of P is the In Charge of all PCs when they are in the org, he himself may originate a D of P interview when it is warranted. For example, on observing bad indicators in a PC he could initiate an interview with the PC at once and then get the data immediately to the C/S. Or he would alert the C/S to the situation and suggest an interview be done.

Otherwise, the D of P interview is given per C/S order. It may not be ordered by a Registrar or other org terminal. It is only done, when needed, on PCs who have signed up, paid for and are on HGC lines for auditing. Otherwise it can easily lead into Free Service and has done so in some instances in the past, to the detriment of the org. Though it is done as part of the overall cycle of delivering paid auditing, the time spent in a D of P interview is not subtracted from the auditing hours the PC has paid for.

There are many other functions the D of P carries out as a part of his hat. But this clarifies what we term a D of P interview. It is its own action and must not be confused with a Reg interview, a Technical Estimate, a Consultant type of action or a 2-way comm action C/Sed for and carried out by an auditor in an actual session or anything else other than what it is. Properly used, it is of great assistance to the C/S for data he needs which is otherwise unavailable.

**QUAL CONSULTANT INTERVIEW**: This is a case-cracking type of interview, done by the posted Qual Consultant. (Optimumly, any org would have this post filled by a single-hatted terminal, in its Qual Division.)

Here you have a technical person using a metered interview to unravel a case that's in trouble or in bad condition and being mysterious. He uses the interview to get the data needed to resolve it.

The consultant interview is not a Tech C/S-ordered action. It's done when there's a hidden factor in the case and you haven't got all the data. The hidden factor may be in the auditing or C/Sing that has been done; therefore it is not a Tech C/S-ordered action. A D of P interview in such an instance could cloud the issue. It calls for a Qual Consultant action because it's something the C/S and auditor should have seen but they didn't see. So it is a matter of what didn't they see or what did they do or not do?

It can be ordered by the Senior C/S in Qual when something has gone very wrong with a case, or it can be originated by the Qual Consultant himself where he has spotted bad indicators or been alerted to a poor success story or something similar.
This type of interview is done on a person who is not really on auditing lines. He's been pulled off auditing lines, possibly for the above reasons, or he's somewhere around auditing lines and you see he is fouled up, or he has come on Qual lines because he is fouled up. It's not limited to PCs but would be done on very slow or dropped out students as well.

The consultant interview is always metered, is always begun with "I'm not auditing you," and is quite a different action than auditing. One might call it a review session of sorts with the difference here being that the consultant does what he needs to do to get the data that can then be used to resolve the case in a session. He guides the interview as he needs to, deftly getting the PC off "grandmother" who doesn't read or marital problems that start the TA up, and steers it skillfully to what the trouble really is.

When I'm doing one of these things I don't just find out what is wrong and indicate the BPC, I push it through until I know what is wrong and in addition I finish the person up with an F/N. I take it to a resolution of his immediate problem and I indicate the bypassed charge. Then it's a matter of writing up the interview and getting it into the folder.

The person will probably require further auditing on it, but now at least the case has been cracked a bit and it's known what it's going to take to unravel the rest of it.

What is described here is a consultant interview, which is its own type of action and which may sometimes reveal the need for a Review session.

The interview is not charged for. However, if it becomes necessary to take the person into session to handle, it is then invoiced on standard Qual lines.

SOLO CONSULTANT INTERVIEW AT AN AO: At an Advanced Org, the C/S, lacking data on what has gone wrong with a messed up case, or solo session, sends the solo auditor who is on auditing lines to the Solo Consultant for a metered interview.

This terminal must be a skilled technician and be very, very familiar with the Advance Course materials, as the solo auditor: (a) very often doesn't present a complete enough picture of what happened in the session, and/or (b) could have MUs on the material and not be running it standardly. In this case a correction list would not necessarily pick it up because the solo auditor doesn't know that he doesn't know. He doesn't realize what he's doing wrong.

The Solo Consultant using the meter and his knowledge of the materials, can find out. In his interview he does a swift debug action, going A to B to get what's hanging the case up. He handles what can be handled on the spot, indicating immediate bypassed charge that comes up, for example. He notes the full data for the C/S so that a full Review cycle can be C/Sed for, if needed, or cramming or retread ordered, if that is required.

The Solo Consultant interview is not charged for, as the PC is already on org lines on a signed up and paid for solo auditing action.

ETHICS OFFICER/MAA INTERVIEWS: The Ethics Officer or the MAA in a Sea Org Org conducts ethics interviews as an HCO function, gets PTS (Potential Trouble Source) A to J checks done and sometimes does full PTS interviews.
Students or PCs, where out-ethics is obvious or suspected, are interviewed to determine the extent and nature of the out-ness so the correct ethics gradient can be applied. The interview should include bringing the person to an understanding of ethics and the conditions and guiding him through any needed ethics handling cycles or correct application of the conditions.

Whether or not the interview is done metered depends on what type of ethics action the Ethics Officer is doing. For example, if he were trying to find out who stole something, he had better do this on a meter to ensure that he gets the data and does not miss withholds or clean cleans. Any Ethics Officer must be meter trained and be able to do a correctly metered ethics interview when it is called for. Ideally he should be able to do HCO Confessionals too. An Ethics Officer must ensure that ethics is gotten in to the degree that tech can then go in.

The PTS interview is given to determine whether or not the person is PTS and if so, the type of PTSness which is in need of handling. It is done on a meter with all reads marked, on a PC or student who is manifesting symptoms of PTSness, such as becoming sick, losing gains or roller-coastering. The interview may be given in HCO or by a classed auditor, but in any case it must always be done by a person who knows his PTS tech well, who has good TRs and knows 2-way comm and who has been trained to operate a meter properly.

The PC or student will often require more handling of the PTS condition after the interview, but it is through the interview that it is determined what type of PTSness (if any) is involved to be handled.

If a PC is mid-auditing, the MAA or Ethics Officer should always check with the PC's C/S before doing a PTS interview or any metered ethics action. (Ref. HCOB 8 March 71R, C/S Series 29R, CASE ACTIONS, OFF LINE)

Full worksheets are always kept for any PTS interview and are sent to the person's PC folder. The worksheets of an ethics interview are filed in the person's ethics file and a copy of these, or a report on the interview, is sent to the person's PC or student folder.

Ethics and PTS interviews when given to PCs and students who are on lines on signed up and paid for services are not charged for.

**CHAPLAIN INTERVIEW:** A Chaplain's interview is for people who feel wronged, people who have fallen off the Bridge or are about to, people whose burdens appear to be too great and who need a terminal and some communication to help them sort it all out.

The whole purpose of the Chaplain interview is first to provide a terminal for a person who simply needs to be heard and understood. From there it's a matter of channeling the person into something he can do about it on the correct gradient. Such a person may actually be on org lines but having difficulty on the lines or he may have fallen off the lines altogether.

The interview gets the person into communication in order to obtain the data necessary to channel and direct him to the specific area where the situation can be addressed and handled.
The Chaplain's interview itself is not charged for. Some of the services available in the Chaplain's Department such as Marriage Counseling, Chaplain's Courts, etc. are charged for at very nominal fees.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR/COMMANDING OFFICER INTERVIEW:** When a person has completed his services, he is interviewed by the CO or ED before he routes out of the org.

This provides the CO or ED with the opportunity to do a direct check on the products his org is producing. If he doesn't see a shiny product, if the person isn't 100% satisfied with the service he's received, it tells a CO or ED there's out tech in his org, as the person has already gone through Qual and Success lines. He acts at once to get a fast review done to handle any bypassed charge and/or repair needed, at no charge to the person. Should the person then validly need more hours to fully complete the service, he is signed up for them standardly.

This type of interview is covered quite fully in HCO PL 21 September 80 MONITORING TECH QUALITY IN ORGS. It is a useful tool for the CO or ED, not only for promoting goodwill and good PR but for ensuring no overt product gets out of his org and that the org is delivering standard tech with good wins for those it services.

The interview may be given to a person who is not yet complete on his services, should the CO or ED notice that he has bad indicators. Ordinarily, however, it is given to students and PCs who have completed their signed up and paid for services. This interview is never charged for.

**HOST INTERVIEW:** On Flag there is an LRH Host whose duty it is to see to the well-being and good servicing of Flag public.

The purpose of the initial Host interview is to welcome the person arriving for services, brief him and orient him to the scene and provide him at once with a stable terminal who is interested in his welfare and will be a terminal for him throughout his stay.

Thereafter the Host interviews Flag PCs and students as needful to ensure they are being serviced and to ensure any service outness is handled by the proper terminals.

Returning persons are similarly welcomed, re-briefed and brought up to date on any changes in services or new facilities.

There is no charge for any Host interview, as this is included as a part of signed up and paid for Flag services.

While these are by no means all the types of interview an org uses, they are the more major interviews given on an org's service lines.

Interviews – correctness of – can make or break an org's lines and an org's viability.

With the necessary distinctions made between them and with interview hats separated out and worn effectively, particles can flow easily on the lines. The result will be an increase in quantity and quality of the valuable final products of the org.
L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER
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AUDITOR'S WORKSHEETS

A very fast way for a C/S to do himself in is to fail to insist on **good legible handwriting**.

When a C/S has auditors who can't write well and rapidly, he gets misunderstood words when he tries to read the worksheets.

One temporary solution is to make the auditor block print the word in red above each hard to read word. Some auditors go to an extreme of block printing the whole W/S.

The more permanent solution is to have Auditors in Cramming practice writing **well** and **clearly** no matter how slowly and then, maintaining the same clarity, speed it up. The auditor after many such practice sessions winds up writing clearly and fast. This can be increased until an auditor can write clearly as fast as people talk.

The occasional headaches a C/S might get are not from the restim of the case he's studying but are from the words on W/Ses he can't make out.

If a C/S does not insist on both block print clarification and auditor writing practice, he will wind up not reading worksheets and may even get foggy about certain cases.

A remedy is to go back to the first folders not understood and get the words clarified and then keep this C/S Series HCO B in.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

**PS:** In the 19th Century secretaries wrote beautiful copperplate longhand faster than a man could talk. So don't say it can't be done.

LRH:nt.kjm.rd
THE THREE GOLDEN RULES OF THE C/S
HANDLING AUDITORS

There are three firm rules in handling auditors which make the difference between good auditors and poor auditors or even having auditors or no auditors at all.

1. **Never fail to find and point out an actual goof and send the auditor to cramming.**
2. **Never invalidate or harass an auditor for a correct action or when no technical goof has occurred.**
3. **Always recognize and acknowledge a technically perfect session.**

By reversing these three things a C/S can wreck and blow every auditor in the place.

By always doing these three things correctly the C/S winds up with splendid auditors.

An auditor who knows he goofed and yet gets a well done doesn't think the C/S is a good fellow. He holds the C/S in contempt and his auditing worsens.

An auditor who didn't goof and yet is told he did becomes bitter or hopeless and begins to hate the C/S.

The test of a C/S in the auditor's eyes is "Is he spot on?" meaning is the C/S accurate in giving the right program, the right C/S, spotting the goof and ordering Cramming, and being well enough trained to see and commend a well done.

You never get Bad Indicators in an auditor or student when you state the truth.

You only get Bad Indicators when your statement is not true.

"PR" (Public Relations cheery falsehoods) has nothing to do with getting good indicators.

Good indicators in auditors are made with **truth**.

"You goofed, go to Cramming, do TRs 101 to 104 until you cease to alter commands."

"Well done by Exams. Practice Handwriting so I don't take so long reading your worksheets."

"This F/N VGIs at session end and the Bad Exam Report do not agree. Is there any way this report was falsified? Is there any goof you didn't write down?"
or

"Very well done" on a very well done totally ON Tech, ON Admin and Correct Auditor's C/S session.

Auditors work well even for a bad tempered C/S when that C/S is always "Spot on" with program, C/S, Auditor's grade or censure of auditor and to cramming.

Auditors like a businesslike accurate C/S.

A "good fellow" C/S who "lets it slide" and says nothing becomes a very bad fellow indeed in auditors' eyes.

A C/S who doesn't recognize and who invalidates good auditing is looked on as a suppressive even when it's just ignorance.

The Golden Rules of C/Sing are

1. Never fail to find and point out an actual goof and send the auditor to Cramming.
2. Never invalidate or harass an auditor for a correct action or when no technical goof has occurred.
3. Always recognize and acknowledge a technically perfect session.

Only those C/Ses who follow these Golden Rules are truly loved by their auditors.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd
HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 8 MARCH 1971

*C/S Series 29*

**CASE ACTIONS, OFF LINE**

A C/S can be plagued by off line case actions of which he is not informed.

The existence of these can wreck his carefully laid out programs and make a case appear incomprehensible.

Thus it is up to a C/S to suspect and find these where a case isn't responding normally in auditing.

1. **Life knocking ruds out faster than they can be audited in.**

   Schedule sessions closer together and give very long sessions so life hasn't a chance to interfere. Can go as far as requiring person via the D of P to stay in a hotel away from the area of enturbation or not associate until case is audited up high enough.

   Shows up most drastically in Interiorization Intensives where no ruds can be run unless the RD is complete. Thus Int has to be done in one session, with the 2 wc Int-Ext the next day.

2. **Pc physically ill before next session and auditing of a major action being done on a sick pc who should have another C/S entirely.**

   Happens when delayed or late new Exam reports don't get into folder before C/Sing it. Ginger up Exam routing.

   Happens when auditors are not alert to the pc's illness and audit anyway. Make auditors not audit and report at once sick pcs.

   Pcs hiding general illness may show up as no case gain. Answer is to get a full medical exam.

3. **Self-Auditing.**

   Detected by no lasting gain. Hi-Lo TA Assessment will show it up.
Two way Comm on when they began to self audit (usually auditor scarcity or some introverting shock).

4. **Coffee Shop Auditing.**

   Meterless fool around, often by students, stirring up cases.
   
   Forbid it in an area.

5. **Touch and Contact Assists interrupting a general course of auditing, often to no F/N.**

   Make all such assists be done on a worksheet and make it mandatory to take the pc to an examiner afterwards.
   
   W/S and Exam Rpt then appear in folder.
   
   The C/S can then get in the other actions (Ruds, S & D, HCO B 24 July 69) on the injured pc.

6. **Study Rundowns.**

   An illegal and offbeat line can occur when auditing out misunderstoods in study or "Management Word Rundown" or such occurs in the middle of a general auditing program.
   
   Require that C/S okay is required.
   
   Get such done at the START of courses and BEFORE a major auditing cycle is begun. Enforce this hard as the other answer that will be taken will be to do it at the end of the cycle and wreck major auditing program results.

7. **Illegal Patch-Ups.**

   Sometimes all through an intensive there is another auditor unknown to the C/S who 2 wcs the pc or audits the pc who is complaining to him or her.
   
   Shows up in the Hi-Lo TA Assessment.
   
   Forbid it.

8. **People talking about their cases.**

   Past life reality is often badly hurt by people who talk about being Napoleon, Caesar and God. This makes "past lives" an unreal subject by bad comparison.
Restimulative material is sometimes used to "push someone's buttons".

Bullbait that uses actual processes or implants should be stamped out hard.

9. Advanced Course material insecurity.

I have seen several cases wrecked by careless storage of Ad Course materials where lower levels could get at them.

One notable case was a suppressive who got hold of Ad Course materials and chanted them at his wife to drive her insane. She recovered eventually. He didn't.

When a C/S gets a whiff of upper level materials on a lower level pc worksheet he should make an ethics matter of it and get it traced.

10. Illegal drug use.

A pc who suddenly relapses onto drugs or who has a long drug history can cause a case to look very very odd. The TA flies up. The case, running okay, suddenly ceases to run.

Addicts can come off it if given TRs 0 to 9 and an HAS Course (modern).

Drug chains are rehabbed and run out by Dianetics.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder
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SESSION GRADING WELL DONE, DEFINITION OF

A "well done" to an auditor requires a precise meaning. It is not given by the C/S because an auditor is a friend or because he would be offended if he didn't get one.

"Well Done" given by the C/S for a session means the pc had F/N VGIs at the examiner immediately after the session.

This then presupposes that session lines include an Examiner even if it's a receptionist and it includes the use and understanding of Exam Reports. (See HCO PL 26 Jan '70, Issue III, or any rewrite and Exam tech.)

It presupposes the Examiner has a meter to hand and that the pc makes a statement.

Thus, if there are no Exam Reports there can't be a well done given, eh? True enough. A C/S who C/Ses without Exam Reports done by a different person than the auditor is asking to fly blind and to get auditor "PR" (public relations or brag) and false auditing reports.

No F/N at Exam no well done.

This is harsh as early on pcs often get no F/N at Examiner. But in every case there are current earlier tech errors on the case when the F/N doesn't get from the session to the Examiner. It is also harsh because the failure to get the F/N to the Examiner could be a C/S error! But (see HCO B 24 May '70, "Auditor's Rights", C/S Series 1), the auditor should not have accepted the C/S.

The C/S could be too heavy, or the case needed a repair first or the process ordered is not part of a proper program.

Hours successfully audited includes only "Well Done" or "Very Well Done" sessions.

VERY WELL DONES

An auditor gets a "Very Well Done" when the session by worksheet inspection, Exam Report inspection is:
1. F/N VGIs at Examiner.
2. The auditing is totally flubless and by the book.
3. The whole C/S ordered was done without departure and to the expected result.

**NO MENTION**

A no mention of well done or very well done or anything simply means:

1. F/N did not get to Examiner.
2. No major auditing errors exist in the session.

**FLUNKS**

A Flunk is given when:

1. The F/N did not get to Examiner and didn't occur at session end.
2. Major errors or flubs occurred like no EP, multiple somatic, unflown ruds, etc.
3. The C/S was not followed or completed.
4. Auditor's Rights listed errors occurred.
5. No F/N and BIs at Examiner.

The exact error must be noted on the worksheet and in the next C/S along with the Flunk.

**FLUNK AND RETRAIN**

When an auditor does not improve but continues to get No Mentions and Flunks, he requires retraining.

Such retraining must include:

1. Cleaning up all Misunderstoods of tech.
2. Cleaning up willingness to audit.
3. Cleaning up overt on people and pcs.
4. Examination by inspection of TRs.
5. Staring material missed or not grasped as per session troubles.

**INVALIDATION**

Invalidative remarks should not be made by a C/S. Experience has shown they do no good and also do harm.
But there are 2 methods of invalidating an auditor's auditing:

1. Let him go on flubbing and getting no results.
2. Direct invalidation of his intentions or future or potential.

In 1, nearly all auditors who stop auditing never really knew how to audit in the first place or have gross misunderstands or have accumulated intentional or unintentional overts on pcs or have been too harshly invalidated. When they don't really grasp the ease and simplicity of auditing they get into other troubles.

A really well trained, smooth auditor never gets any real charge on his case on the subject of auditing.

When you let an auditor flub, the whole subject gets invalidated and he loses his value because he goes into doubt. This can be said with complete confidence today as the whole of Dianetics and Scientology is there and it works very very well indeed if it is used and if the C/Sing and auditing is correct and flubless.

AUDITOR HANDLING

The C/S is really not just the Case Supervisor, he is also the auditors' handler. Like a boxer's trainer or a star's director, the C/S handles his guys. They are all a bit different, auditors. There are prima donnas and meek mousey ones and steady-on ones and all kinds.

They get the credit for the sessions from the pcs most often. They really don't like not to be C/Sed.

And they value the well dones and the very well dones and they flinch at the flunks. And the honest ones know all about it before they turn it in. And some don't mention the flub but think you're a fool if you miss it.

So it's important to have a constant in assigning what the auditor is given for the session.

Well Done Auditing Hours are all that's valid for a stat.

So a C/S must be very exact and correct in his determination of well done, very well done, no mention and (forlornly) a flunk.

This should remove argument from the matter and bring certainty.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder
HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
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INSTRUCTION & EXAMINATION:  
RAISING THE STANDARD OF

The basic reason students remain long on courses stems from inept criticism by instructors regarding what is required.

There is a technology of criticism of art, expressed beautifully in the Encyclopaedia published by Focal Press.

In this article it stresses that a critic who is also an expert artist tends to introduce unfairly his own perfectionism (and bias and frustrations) into his criticism.

We suffer amazingly from this in all our courses. I had not previously spotted it because I don't demand a student at lower levels produce results found only in higher levels.

You can carelessly sum this up by "letting the student have wins" but if you do you'll miss the whole point.

Example: A student up for a pass on his Itsa is flunked because he or she couldn't acknowledge.

But a student at the Itsa level hasn't been taught to acknowledge.

This student hasn't even read the data on acknowledgement.

So the student can't pass Itsa level and so never does get to the level where acknowledgement is taught – and if he does, really never passed, in his own mind, Itsa and so hasn't advanced.

And we catch all our students this way and they don't therefore learn.

How is this done? How could this be?

The instructor is an expert auditor. That's as it should be. But as an expert auditor, bad execution of a level above where the student is studying, pains the instructor. So he flunks the student because the auditing looks bad.

But look here. The student wasn't being checked out as an auditor. The student was only being checked out on Itsa.
Further, the action of auditing as a whole is so easy to an instructor who is an expert auditor that he fails to take it apart for instruction.

If I say the following, it will look ridiculous and you'll get the point better: The student is up to pass TR 0. The Instructor on check out looks the student over and says "You flunked the test." The student says "Why?" The Instructor says "You didn't take the Class VI actions to clear the pc of all his GPMs." All right, we can all see that that would be silly. But Instructors do just that daily, though on a narrower band.

The Instructor puts in additives. As an expert auditor it seems natural to him to say "You flunked your test on Itsa because you never acknowledged the pc." You get the point. This really is as crazy wide as the ridiculous example above. What does Ack have to do with Itsa? Nothing!

Because the Instructor is an expert auditor, auditing has ceased to have parts and is all one chunk. Okay. A good auditor regards it that way. But the poor student can't grasp any of the pieces because the whole chunk is being demanded.

What's Itsa? It's Listen. Can the student listen? Okay, he can listen but the expert says, "He didn't get 15 divisions of TA per hour." On the what? "On the meter of course." What meter? That's Level II and Itsa is Level 0. "Yes," the expert protests, "but the pc didn't get any better!" Okay, so what pc is supposed to get better at Level 0. If they do it's an accident, usually. Now does this student pass? "No! He can't even look at the pc!" Well, that's TR 0 of Level I. "But he's got to look like an auditor!" How can he? An auditor has to get through a comm course before you can really call him that. "Okay, I'll drop my standards...." the expert begins. Hell no, expert. You better pick up your standards for each Level and for each small part of auditing.

What's it say at Level 0? "It says 'Listen'!" Okay, then, damn it, when the student is able to sit and listen and not shut a pc down with yak, the student passes. "And the meter?" You better not let me catch you teaching meters at Level 0.

And so it goes right on up through the Levels and the bits within the Levels.

By making Itsa mysterious and tough, by adding big new standards to it like TA and Ack you only succeed in never teaching the student Itsa! So he goes on up and at Level IV audits like a bum. Can't control a pc. Can't meter, nothing.

So the expert tries to make a student do Class VI auditing the first day and the student is never trained to do any auditing at Level 0.

This nonsense repeated at Level I (by adding a meter, by purist flunking "because the pc couldn't handle an ARC Break") and repeated again at Level II ("because the pc couldn't assess") and at Level III etc. etc.

Well, if you add things all the time out of sequence and demand things the student has not yet reached the student winds up in a ball of confusion like the cat getting into the yarn.
So we're not instructing. We're preventing a clear view of the parts of auditing by adding higher level standards and actions to lower level activities.

This consumes time. It makes a mess.

The new HCA always tries to teach his group a whole HCA course his first evening home. Well, that's no reason seasoned veterans have to do it in our courses.

If you never let a student learn Level 0 because he's flunked unless he does Level VI first, people will stay on courses forever and we'll have no auditors.

Instructors must teach not out of their own expertise but out of the textbook expected actions in the Level the student is being trained in. To go above that level like assessment in Level II or Ack and meters at Level 0 is to deny the student any clean view of what he's expected to do. And if he never learns the parts, he'll never do the whole.

And that's all that's wrong with our instruction or our instructors. As expert auditors they cease to view the part the student must know as itself and do not train and pass the student upon it.

Instead they confuse the student by demanding more than the part being learned.

Instruction is done on a gradient scale. Learn each part well by itself. And only then can assembly of parts occur into what we want – a well trained student.

This is not lowering any standards. It's raising them on all training.

**BULLETIN CHECK OUTS**

The other side of the picture, theory, suffers because of a habit. The habit is all one's years of formal schooling where this mistake is the whole way of life.

If the student knows the words, the theory instructor assumes he knows the tune.

It will never do a student any good at all to know some facts. The student is expected only to use facts.

It is so easy to confront thought and so hard to confront action that the Instructor often complacently lets the student mouth words, ideas that mean nothing to the student.

**All theory check outs must consult the student's understanding.**

If they don't, they're useless and will ARC Break the student eventually.

Course natter stems entirely from the students' non-comprehension of words and data.

While this can be cured by auditing, why audit it all the time when you can prevent it in the first place by adequate theory check-out?

There are two phenomena here.
FIRST PHENOMENON

When a student misses understanding a word, the section right after that word is a blank in his memory. You can always trace back to the word just before the blank, get it understood and find miraculously that the former blank area is not now blank in the bulletin. The above is pure magic.

SECOND PHENOMENON

The second phenomenon is the overt cycle which follows a misunderstood word. When a word is not grasped, the student then goes into a non-comprehension (blankness) of things immediately after. This is followed by the student's solution for the blank condition which is to individuate from it—separate self from it. Now being something else than the blank area, the student commits overts against the more general area. These overts, of course, are followed by restraining himself from committing overts. This pulls flows toward the person and makes the person crave motivators. This is followed by various mental and physical conditions and by various complaints, fault-finding and look-what-you-did-to-me. This justifies a departure, a blow.

But the system of education, frowning on blows as it does, causes the student to really withdraw self from the study subject (whatever he was studying) and set up in its place a circuit which can receive and give back sentences and phrases.

We now have "the quick student who somehow never applies what he learns".

The specific phenomena then is that a student can study some words and give them back and yet be no participant to the action. The student gets A+ on exams but can't apply the data.

The thoroughly dull student is just stuck in the non-comprehend blankness following some misunderstood word.

The "very bright" student who yet can't use the data isn't there at all. He has long since ceased to confront the subject matter or the subject.

The cure for either of these conditions of "bright non-comprehension" or "dull" is to find the missing word.

But these conditions can be prevented by not letting the student go beyond the missed word without grasping its meaning. And that is the duty of the Theory Instructor.

DEMONSTRATION

Giving a bulletin or tape check by seeing if it can be quoted or paraphrased proves exactly nothing. This will not guarantee that the student knows the data or can use or apply it
nor even guarantees that the student is there. Neither the "bright" student nor the "dull" student (both suffering from the same malady) will benefit from such an examination.

So examining by seeing if somebody "knows" the text and can quote or paraphrase it is completely false and must not be done.

Correct examination is done only by making the person being tested answer

(a) The meanings of the words (re-defining the words used in his own words and demonstrating their use in his own made up sentences), and

(b) Demonstrating how the data is used.

The examiner need not do a Clay Table audit just to get a student to pass. But the examiner can ask what the words mean. And the examiner can ask for examples of action or application.

"What is this HCO Bulletin's first section?" is about as dull as one can get. "What are the rules given about…..?" is a question I would never bother to ask. Neither of these tell the examiner whether he has the bright non-applier or the dull student before him. Such questions just beg for natter and course blows.

I would go over the first paragraph of any material I was examining a student on and pick out some uncommon words. I'd ask the student to define each and demonstrate its use in a made up sentence and flunk the first "Well…. er…. let me see…. " and that would be the end of that check out. I wouldn't pick out only Scientologese. I'd pick out words that weren't too ordinary such as "benefit" "permissive" "calculated" as well as "engram".

Students I was personally examining would begin to get a hunted look and carry dictionaries – but they wouldn't begin to natter or get sick or blow. And they'd use what they learned.

Above all, I myself would be sure I knew what the words meant before I started to examine.

Dealing with new technology and the necessity to have things named, we especially need to be alert.

Before you curse our terms, remember that a lack of terms to describe phenomena can be twice as incomprehensible as having involved terms that at least can be understood eventually.

We do awfully well, really, better than any other science or subject. We lack a dictionary but we can remedy that.

But to continue with how one should examine, when the student had the words, I'd demand the music. What tune do these words play?

I'd say "All right, what use is this bulletin (or tape) to you?" Questions like, "Now this rule here about not letting pcs eat candy while being audited, how come there'd be such a
rule?" And if the student couldn't imagine why, I'd go back to the words just ahead of that rule and find the one he hadn't grasped.

I'd ask "What are the commands of 8-C?" And when the student gave them, I'd still have the task of satisfying myself that the student understood why those were the commands. I'd ask "How come?" after he'd given me the commands. Or "What are you going to do with these?" "Audit a pc with them" he might say. I'd say, "Well, why these commands?"

But if the student wasn't up to the point of study where knowing why he used those commands was not part of his materials, I wouldn't ask. For all the data about not examining above level applies very severely to Theory Check out as well as to Practical and general Instruction.

I might also have a Clay Table beside my examiner's desk (and certainly would have if I were an HCO hat checker, to which all this data also applies) and use it to have students show me they knew the words and ideas.

Theory often says "Well, they take care of all that in Practical." Oh no they don't. When you have a Theory Section that believes that, Practical can't function at all.

Practical goes through the simple motions. Theory covers why one goes through the motions.

I don't think I have to beat this to death for you.

You've got it.

L. RON HUBBARD
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[Modified by HCO PL 4 October 1964 (reissued 21 May 1967), Theory Checkout Data, page 181.]