

C/S SERIES

CASE SUPERVISOR SERIES 1970-1976

CONTENTS

23	Aug. 71	1	Auditor's Rights	
12	June 70	2	Programming of Cases	10
13	June 70	3	Session Priorities—Repair Pgms and Their Priority	16
14	June 70	4	The Return Program	21
15	June 70	5	Repair Example	24
16	June 70	6	What the C/S Is Doing	28
19	June 70	7	C/S Q and A	32
19	June 70	8	Chart of Human Evaluation	35
21	June 70	9	Superficial Actions	37
24	June 70	10	Repairing a Repair	42
25	June 70	11	C/S Series 11	44
25	June 70	12	Glossary of C/S Terms	48
30	June 70R	13R	VIII Actions	50
3	July 70	14	C/Sing 2-Way Comm	54
16	Aug. 70	15	Getting the F/N to Examiner (High, Low TAs and Chronic Somatics)	56
21	Aug. 70	16	Session Grading—Well Done, Definition of	59
26	Aug. 70	17	Incomplete Cases	62
11	Sept. 70	18	Chronic Somatic, Dianetic Handling of	64
6	Oct. 70	19	Folder Error Summaries	65
8	Oct. 70	20	Persistent F/N	67
10	Nov. 70	21	C/S Responsibility for Training	69
28	Nov. 70	22	Psychosis	72
17	Dec. 71R	23RA	Interiorization Summary	76
28	Feb. 71	24	Metering Reading Items	79
5	Mar. 71	25	The Fantastic New HGC Line	81
6	Mar. 71	26	New Uses for the Green Form	86

6	Mar. 71	27	Long C/Ses	87
7	Mar. 71 RA	28 RA	Use of Dianetics	89
7	Mar. 71	28RA-1	Use of Quadruple Dianetics	91
8	Mar. 71	29	Case Actions, Off Line	94
19	Mar. 71	30	C/Sing Auditor-C/Ses	96
31	Mar. 71	31	Programming and Misprogramming	99
4	Apr. 71RA	32RA	Use of Dianetics	100
4	Apr. 71-1R	32RA-1R	Use of Quad Dianetics	102
5	Apr. 71RA	33RA	Triple Reruns	105
5	Apr. 71	33RA-1	Triple and Quad Reruns	108
6	Apr. 71	34	Non-F/N Cases	112
16	Dec. 71 RA	35RA	Interiorization Errors	115
21	Apr. 71 R	36R	Dianetics	118
21	Apr. 71-1R	36RB-1R	Quadruple Dianetics—Dangers of	122
3	June 71	37R	High and Low TA Breakthrough	127
15	June 71	37R Add.	Hi-Lo TA Assessment Rules	131
16	June 71R	37RAdd.2R	Low TA Assessing	132
26	June 71	37R Add. 3	C/S Series 37R Addition 3	133
26	May 71	38	TRs Course and Auditing—Mixing Major Actions	136
31	May 71R	39R	Standard 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ Hour Intensive Programs	139
7	June 71	40	Low TAs	141
9	June 71	41	C/S Tips	142
9	June 71	42	C/S Rules	145
9	June 71	43	C/S Rules	147
10	June 71	44R	C/S Rules—Programming From Prepared Lists	149
31	Oct. 71	44R Add.	44R—C/S Rules—The Sequence of Programs (BTB)	151
19	June 71	45	C/S Rules	152
19	June 71	46	Declares	153
20	June 71	47	The Supreme Test of a C/S	154
15	July 71	48R	Drug Handling	156
15	July 71 R	49R	Assists	159
15	July 71	50	C/S Case Gain	161
17	July 71	51	Out of Valence	162
19	July 71	52	Internes	163
24	Nov. 73RB	53RJ	Short Hi-Lo TA Assessment C/S	165
28	July 71	54	Dianetics, Beginning a Pc on	168
8	Aug. 71	55	The Ivory Tower	170
25	Aug. 71	56	How To Get Results in an HGC	172
1	Sept. 71	57	A C/S as a Training Officer—A Program for Flubless Auditing	176
7	Sept. 71	58	Programming Cases Backwards	182

14	Sept. 71	59	Dianetic List Errors	184
15	Sept. 71	60	The Worst Tangle	185
22	Sept. 71	61	The Three Golden Rules of the C/S— Handling Auditors	186
28	Sept. 71	62	Know Before You Go	188
2	Oct. 71	63	C/Sing for New Auditors or Veterans	191
5	Oct. 71	64	F/Ning Auditors	193
6	Oct. 71 R	65R	Auditing of Staff & Public (BTB)	194
3	Nov. 71	66	Auditor's Worksheets	196
30	Nov. 71 R	67	The Code of a C/S (BTB)	197
8	Dec. 71	68	The C/S and Cramming Cycles (BTB)	199
12	Dec. 71R	69R	Mandatory C/Sing Checklist (BTB)	200
3	Jan. 72	69 Add.	C/Sing Checklist	203
12	Dec. 71R	70R	How To Write Up a Cramming Order (BTB)	204
19	Dec. 71	71	D of P Operates by OCAs	205
24	Feb. 72	71A	Word Clearing OCAs	207
20	Dec. 71	72	Use of Correction Lists	209
23	Dec. 71	73	The No-Interference Area	211
16	Feb. 72	74	Talking the TA Down Modified	213
10	Apr. 72	75	PreOTs Don't C/S	214
17	Apr. 72	76	C/Sing a PTS Rundown	216
19	Apr. 72	77	“Quickie” Defined	218
20	Apr. 72	78	Product Purpose and Why and WC Error Correction	220
24	Apr. 72	79	PTS Interviews	222
15	June 72	80	“Dog Pcs”	223
16	June 72R	81R	Auditor's Rights Modified	225
28	Dec. 72RA	81-1RA	Auditor's Rights Addition Revised (BTB)	227
10	Aug. 72	82	Dianetic HCO B—Interest	229
11	Aug. 72RA	83RA	Correction Lists (BTB)	230
16	Aug. 72	84	Flubless C/Sing	233
16	Aug. 72-1	84-1	Flubless C/Sing in Missions (BTB)	235
13	Sept. 72	85	Catastrophes From and Repair of “No Interest” Items	236
20	Jan. 73R	86RD	The Red Tag Line (BTB)	237
15	Oct. 73	87	Nulling and F/Ning Prepared Lists	240
22	Oct. 73R	88R	Tech Degrades (BTB)	241
20	Nov. 73	89	F/N What You Ask or Program	243
6	Dec. 73	90	The Primary Failure	244
17	Feb. 74	91	Mutual Out Ruds	246
8	July 74R	92R	Word Clearing Errors	247
31	Aug. 74	93	New Grade Chart	248

25	Sept. 74	94	Reduction of Refunds—C/Ses and Overload	252
26	Oct. 75	95	“Failed” Cases	254
24	Oct. 76	96	Delivery Repair Lists	256
26	Oct. 76	97	Auditing Reports, Falsifying of	261
28	Oct. 76	98	Auditing Folders, Omissions in Completeness	262
25	Apr. 71R		The Dianetic Case Supervisor’s Index (BTB)	265

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 23 AUGUST 1971

Remimeo

All Auditors

Acad Level IV

(HCO B 24 May 1970 Revised)

Class VIIIs

HGCs

Class VIII Checksheet

C/S Series 1

Class VI Checksheet

Class III Checksheet

C/S Course Checksheet

HSST

AUDITOR'S RIGHTS

Internes

(Revised to update and delete the O/R list
and add Auditing Over Out Ruds.
All changes are in this type style.)

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.

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 unread 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.

Pc Critical = W/H = pull the W/H.

Pc Antagonistic = BPC = assess proper list (such as L1 C) 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 2 things to repair where we only had 1 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 prepchecks 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 VGI’s always present at such moments, end off.

I know of one case who had a huge cog about Interiorization on Flow I 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 VGI’s 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 HCO B 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.

LRH:nt jh
Copyright ©1970, 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

[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).]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 12 JUNE 1970

Remimeo

C/S Series 2

(C/S Series 1 is "Auditor's Rights",
HCO B 24 May 1970, not so marked.)

PROGRAMMING OF CASES

Every action taken on a Case by a CASE SUPERVISOR (or an auditor doing his own C/S actions) should be part of a definite outlined PROGRAM for that case.

PROGRAM Definition—A program is defined as the sequence of actions session by session to be undertaken on a case by the C/S in his directions to the auditor or auditors auditing the case.

The master program for every case is given on the Classification and Gradation Chart issued from time to time. The earliest of these Charts was 1965 followed by 1st December 1966 followed by 1st January 1968 followed by 1st December 1969. The reissues of the Chart are done to improve the communication of the data on the Chart. The program factor has not much changed since its earliest issue. Tapes about this Chart were made for the SHSBC at its first issue and of course remain valid. The processes called for on the Chart are all part of the SHSBC or for upper levels part of the SH and AO Confidential materials. From time to time they are reissued but they remain standard and have been so since the first issue of the Chart.

The Chart and its materials have now and again been neglected or disregarded and THE NEGLECT HAS RESULTED IN FIELD FLAPS AND DOWN STATS.

Omitting this gradient of processes not only stalls cases but results in a case manifesting out-grade phenomena.

A pc must attain the full ability noted on the Chart before going up to the next level of the Chart.

Telling the pc he has made it is of course evaluation.

The outnesses which have occurred surrounding this Chart are hard to believe. They consist of total abandonment of the Chart, degrading and losing all its lower grade processes, feeding a pc at Dianetic level data at Class VI and telling him, who has not made Dianetics yet, he is now Clear, cutting down all processes from the Chart bottom up to IV to be able to do them in 2 1/2 minutes, neglecting all levels up to OT V and then trying to put in a few lower grades and sending on to OT VI, having the pc after one trivial session attest all abilities at once and many other errors.

This is crazy driving. If a bus were driven along a road this way it would soon be wrecked and back where it started but in an ash heap.

Genius in C/Sing is normally required only when some former driver wrecked the thing instead of driving it right in the first place.

To Case Supervise one has to accept the following facts:

1. Dianetics and Scientology work.
2. The subjects are serious subjects not experimental toys.

3. The basics and fundamentals are stated early in the period of development and have not changed.
4. The “newest and latest” is usually a recovery of basics and better statements of them.
5. The purpose of the subject has not altered and continues to be the attainment of ability and freedom for the individual.
6. That things which were true early in the subjects are still true.
7. That the mind responds on a gradient of improvement not suddenly like a bomb explosion.
8. That the Classification and Gradation Chart and *all* its processes and steps IS the basic program of *any* case.
9. That all other programs are efforts to get the pc or pre-OT back on the basic program.
10. That there is no hidden data line and that the materials and procedures are refined mainly to facilitate use and communication of them.
11. That auditing is for the pc, not the org or the auditor.
12. That major processes are done to improve the case.
13. That repair is undertaken to eradicate errors made in auditing or the environment which impede the use of major processes.
14. That a case has to be programmed by the C/S to get it advancing as it should have been in the first place on the Classification and Gradation Chart.
15. That a C/S is not being called upon to develop a new Chart for the case but only to get the case back on the basic Chart and get it done.

3 PROGRAMS

There are then 3 types of Programs:

1. THE program laid out in the Classification and Gradation Chart. (Called The Basic Program.)
2. Repair Programs to eradicate case mishandling by current life or auditing errors. (Called a Set-Up Program.)
3. Major actions to be undertaken to get the case back on the Class Chart from wherever he has erroneously gotten to on it. (Called a Return Program.)

It has been a very common C/S action to disperse away from a program laid out. This has been happening ever since the first issue of the Class Chart and has been a principal source of trouble for C/Ses.

This happens in several ways:

1. Not knowing the importance of the Class Chart.

2. Not knowing basics.
3. Falling for SP propaganda that “we don’t use that now”, “the material is old”, “it’s only background data”, etc, that deteriorates what one *does* know and could use.
4. Failure of auditors to give good sessions and do the Usual required in a session.
5. Abandonment of the C/S’s own Repair or Return Program—usually because of false auditor reports or operating on insufficient data from the pc.

The correct way to go about all this is to:

- A. Repair the case thoroughly with minor actions like GFs, prepared lists, ruds, two-way comm.
- B. Acquire adequate data on the pc.
- C. Complete any C/S Return Program begun.
- D. Get the pc back on the Class Chart without any processes of the grade skipped.
- E. Run the case on the Class Chart.
- F. Repair any departures or errors made in life or auditing.
- G. Get the pc back on the Class Chart.

DISPERSAL

Not following any program is a complete exercise in non-sequitur (means one step does not follow the last but is different and unrelated).

In giving a pc process after process that are not related to each other and follow no Repair Program or Return Program is non-sequitur in the extreme.

If processes were remarks one would get a sequence of processes given the pc sounding like this. “The submarine just went by so we will order a hundred tons of bread. There wasn’t any beer so birds are seldom seen. The dance was very fast so we fixed the carburetor. He has very long hair so we decorated his father’s tomb.”

“Give pc Scn Triples then do his Dianetics then fix up his hidden standard,” would be a series of crazy non-sequitur C/Ses. Nothing is connected to or proceeds from anything. That would be a dispersed program for sure.

It actually happens horribly enough. Study a Class Chart and then look through some old folders. At once, the sequence of processes ordered sounds like “The submarine just went by so order a hundred tons of bread.”

Such C/Sing has no cause and effect in it. A person totally ignorant of basic cause and effect gets “Pc nattery. Run Dianetics.” “Pc’s case not advancing. Do Grade 0.” The cause of the pc condition is not understood. A nattery pc has withholds. A case not advancing has problems. That’s real actual basic tech (see Auditor’s Rights HCO B for the table). This data is over 15 years old at this writing, is part of proper Academy courses and the SHSBC and is even in Class VIII materials. The reasons for the pc’s behavior or trouble are not mysterious reasons never revealed. They are all very well given in course materials.

Here is an actual case, a folder I examined of a pc who is now in trouble and needing a Repair and Return Program.

Pc was an accident prone (person who is apparently dedicated to having accidents). Very low aptitude score (about 30). Had been skipped over almost the entire Class Chart and given Power.

To handle accident proneness was given CCHs. This cured it.

Had Exteriorized so was given Interiorization Rundown without a 2-way comm session.

Pc subsequently developed bad somatics. (Dianetics was never flattened or completed.)

A quarter of an inch of Examiner's reports wherein the pc was asking for help or medicine to get rid of somatics was then put one by one into the folder.

Despite this the "C/S" saw "Va" on the pc's folder and ordered R6EW.

More Examiner's calls collected.

The pc ran one item, making one mark on a worksheet and attested R6EW.

More Examiner's reports collected, pc reporting self ill.

"C/S" seeing R6EW attested ordered pc to Clearing Course.

Pc did one brief session attested Clear.

More Examiner's reports into folder, pc in pain and now in Ethics trouble.

"C/S" ordered pc to OT I.

Pc spent 35 minutes on OT 1 in terror of it, hastily attested, had 5 accidents in 3 days.

Folder sent to me as a "baffling case".

So the correct actions now have to be taken.

1. Repair pc with every list known to Man or Beast to get off BPC collected in these overwhelming levels.
2. Repair pc in errors in current life.
3. Return Program the pc by running simple things, 2-way comm, to give pc some wins in actual case gain by maybe handling by 2-way comm minor this life or childhood upsets with family, maybe putting in ruds on some early subject that turns up.
4. Put pc back on the Class Chart TO COMPLETE THE INCOMPLETE GRADE (Dianetics) to its full end phenomena as per Class Chart.
5. Bring the pc on up the Class Chart using all processes for each grade and honestly attesting each grade in turn.

It's all a shame because the pc had a lose on *status*. She wanted to be Clear and OT, was actually on it and never walked up the stairs to get to it.

PROGRAM NECESSITY

One can see from all this the NECESSITY of working by program on a case.

Even when one starts an honest program for the case one can get thrown off of it and begin to do something else.

If the pc goes exterior, of course, one has to handle by Interiorization Rundown before the case can be audited at all. But that's no reason to then skip all the grades! A pc can go exterior at any point. Thus it must be handled when it occurs. But that does not mean anything happened to one's program or the Class Chart. Exterior or Interior, a pc unflat on Dianetics (not attained the ability marked on the Class Chart) is unflat on Dianetics!

And a pc who is unflat on Dianetics will have out lower grades.

Jumping processes on the Class Chart set the pc up to fall on his head later. An "OT VI with problems" is really just an unflat Grade I. And until Grade I is flattened to permanent Ability Attained on the Class Chart, he remains an unflat Grade I.

A C/S who gets wound up in this sort of skipped everything and made nothing, of course has an awful mess on his hands. He can feel as lost as Hansel or Gretel. But waiting to get covered up by leaves is for the birds.

If one finds the pc off the road, the thing to do is return the pc to the road at the point he didn't walk it AND THERE ARE NO SHORTCUTS FOR THE MIND.

The utter despair and insane barbarism psychiatry descended into was patient lost, psychiatrist lost, patient crazy, psychiatrist into insane sadism.

So maybe the first lesson a C/S really has to learn is:

THERE IS A KNOWN ROAD OUT.

There is no shortcut, it has to be walked every inch of it.

And therefore the greatest enemy of the C/S is the SP who says "that's all old" "we don't use that now" "that's just background data" and thereby obscures the actual road.

And another enemy is the pc who screamingly demands to be put up to Clear at once so he won't have this awful headache!

STEADY ON

Thus the measures a C/S takes to hold a steady course will profit him greatly in the end with good solid gains for the pc.

As the pc should no longer be a total humanoid by Class IV the lower grade gains are the most important of all.

A C/S who puts a Class Chart into every folder he handles is doing a wise thing. Even if it's big, clumsy, hard to handle, it is at least thorough.

If on it he marks in red things the pc has gotten to falsely and if in green things the pc made from the bottom walking an honest road, he knows where he is at! Seeing the whole training cycle half of the Chart continue blank means that much more ignorance and trouble for the pc in making his gains stably.

If the C/S put his Repair Program on a *Red* sheet in the folder and dated it out session by session to be audited until it was **DONE** and all flubs made in doing it also marked in and repaired, the C/S wouldn't lose his place in the book. For a red sheet stands out in amongst other folder papers. A red sheet with a "folder error summary" on one side of it and the C/S's Repair Pgm on the other keeps the pc's progress located. When that Red sheet is done it should be signed by the C/S as **DONE** which retires all errors to that point.

A bright *blue* sheet giving the C/S RETURN PGM properly dated also gives one a chance to not get steered off. A new Red Repair Pgm sheet fixing up errors occurring in doing the Blue sheet can be pushed into the folder but the Blue sheet can be resumed again.

The Blue sheet completed should find the pc back on the Class Chart.

A list of processes run tallied up by the auditor each session keeps the C/S from repeating a process and gives him the Dn items used singly to be done triple.

While all this Admin may seem time consuming, lack of it mounts up into valuable AUDITOR TIME being thrown away.

C/Sing is a road. It has milestones. When the pc didn't pass one honestly he got lost.

There's no reason for pc, auditor and C/S to *all* get lost.

The C/S has an exact road to hold to, return to and repairs to get done so the pc can get moving on the Return Pgm and the Class Chart which IS the road.

It took too many trillions to find this road for it to be neglected. For if the C/S neglects it people won't arrive anywhere but get lost as well.

The right idea is the road.

LRH:kjm.rd
Copyright ©1970
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 13 JUNE 1970

Remimeo

C/S Series 3

**SESSION PRIORITIES
REPAIR PGMS
AND THEIR PRIORITY**

When a pc has had an incorrectly run session, one that did not wind up with F/N Cog VGIs, it is often harmful to delay the repair session.

Most cases of pcs becoming ill or having accidents stem from

- A. Major Errors in Programming the case.
- B. Delay in Repairing a goofed session.

There have been several examples recently of pcs ending session with an unflat process after which the repair session was delayed for several days or even weeks and the pc came down with a cold or had some minor accident or got in Ethics trouble.

Thus Repair has priority.

PROGRAM ERRORS

Under A. a major error in programming lays the case open to having goofed sessions and exposes the auditor to some risk of making errors. The reason for this is that the pc gets overwhelmed or bogged simply by not coming up through all the processes of each level on the Class Chart.

Let us say the pc is trying to make it on R6EW Solo Study but keeps having *Problems* with it and can't get on with it.

The uninformed C/S orders a Student Rescue Intensive. This is all right as far as it goes. But a more searching look into the records is likely to find that this pc had exactly 10 minutes on the whole of Grade I!

The Out-Program is far more likely to play havoc with this pc than just problems. He is possibly in doubt as to case gains and his reality is poor and yet he is being exposed to the highly restimulative materials of an upper level to which he has never climbed.

A direct effort now to put in problems Grade I also puts an auditor at risk.

Instead of merely being able to run problems as he would have been able to earlier, the pc is in some sort of overwhelm and is nervous or scared or believes *he is* at fault some way. He will look everywhere but in the right direction.

The answer to an incorrectly programmed case is, of course, a repair program and the sooner the better.

Such repair programs must be very light. Prepared lists to find charge, 2 way comm on various subjects, take a walk. And such a repair program MUST NOT

- (a) Let the pc dive into rough heavy charge, or
- (b) Be overdone to total boredom.

SELF AUDITING

Some pcs “self audit”, which is different than Solo auditing since it has no meter or session and is just wandering about the bank (some overwhelmed pcs self audit in Solo wandering all over the place).

This is a symptom of session or study or life overwhelm.

It requires a Repair Program.

EP OF REPAIR

The End Phenomena of a Repair Program is the pc feeling great and feeling he can get Case Gain.

A good, clever Repair Program produces what badly programmed cases would consider total recovery.

It is a good idea to have the pc attest to

“I have had definite gains from the recent sessions and feel great.” Or with a hearty “Yes” to “Does Scientology really work for you.”

Oh, you say, how could *that* much gain come from just repair?

Well, Repair is almost always being done on a pc who was overwhelmed by life or auditing in the first place.

Life we know has a way of overwhelming people.

When a person is overwhelmed by life, an auditing error is more likely to occur.

When Incorrect Programming occurs, then any auditing on it can add up to more overwhelm which adds up to more errors.

CONSISTENT COMPLAINT

The pc whose Examiner forms routinely have a sour note in them should not be continued on the Class Chart or any Return Program.

He is a Repair pc and nothing else.

If you get the idea that any lower level can produce large changes in a person you will see that lower level processes are being mis-programmed if they are producing only the gains of Repair actions.

The sign of mis-programming is most often seen in Examiner reports where the pc's comments or demands are "for more auditing" or "Got to have a session" or "wasn't really handled" or sour comments or cracks.

When you examine some folders you will see some pc has more than his share of this.

That's a sign to LIGHTLY DO IT.

The wrong way to go is plunge!

I have seen a C/S order 2 major actions in one session after a bad session on a pc in a DESPERATE effort to reach the case!

The exact reverse is required.

Repair the case by:

- I. Patch the session goof.
- II. Use prepared lists for locating session charge in past sessions.
- III. Use prepared lists and two way comm on items found.
- IV. Get ruds in on periods of the pc's life.
- V. Get ruds in on parts of the pc's body that are ailing.

This is not a model Repair Program but only a sample of one. It isn't a model because the pcs have different things wrong with them.

But you could blindly do all of the above and still wind up with case gain and a win for a staggering pc.

Then you would do a Return Pgm to get the pc back on the Class Chart. But not until then.

I have seen a pc stagger along for years getting auditing (of a sort) while still retaining a set characteristic or somatic who when handled with *very* mild processes had a case gain and then returned to the Class Chart HAVE A COMPLETE CHANGE OF THE CHARACTERISTIC.

EFFECT SCALE

A C/S can get into the lower end of the effect scale and feel that desperate that he begins to throw away every major process he can order on the pc, even 2 or 3 per session! But the direction of win was LIGHTER not heavier action.

Sort of like “this sparrow keeps getting bowled out with rocks. Let’s try real artillery on him!”

If one is trying to make a better sparrow he should lay off the rocks and lighten it up, not step up the barrage! Some cotton tufts might do wonders! Might even make the sparrow reach!

The basic trouble with ALL past efforts at “psychotherapy” and “religious uplift” and “self betterment” and healing was:

The more desperate the situation the more desperate was the remedy used.

The right answer is:

THE WORSE THE CONDITION THE LIGHTER THE REMEDY REQUIRED.

Dealing with psychotics in an institution you would find that “Hello” pleasantly said would do more for cases than all the drug firms and electric shock machines and brain icepicks have ever done in all their existence.

Well if it applies to psychotics, it applies surely to people that aren’t.

Simple interest and listening can crack an awful lot of overwhelmed cases that would only bog further if not first repaired.

BPC

The exact BPC of the last session handled is always the first action in Repair Programming.

This is the exact BPC. An unfinished Dianetic Chain is BPC. So get it handled. The wrong list item is heavy BPC so get it handled.

And get this BPC off now! Now! Don’t wait 2 days or a week. Repair it on priority.

OVERWHELM

Don’t always blame the auditor. He may goof and he shouldn’t. But if his procedure and TRs were reasonably correct, how come the pc got a tangled session.

If the auditor has a usually good record and you get a goofed session, then realize the pc is a bit troublesome and was not running standardly.

Of course this doesn't excuse student goofs or plain lousy auditing. But when the auditor does all right, then the case must be in an overwhelm of some sort.

So we have 2 variables here for C/S decision.

x1-Auditor fault?

or

x2-Pc in an overwhelm?

There is a decision here to be made by the C/S. It's resolved by folder inspection and knowledge of the auditor.

All right—Auditor usually okay. That eliminates x1. So we have a pc in overwhelm? Look over past record of pc. Runs okay. That cancels x2.

So we repair that *one* session and its goof and continue with the Return Pgm or the Class Pgm whichever the pc was on.

What if x1 showed lots of bad sessions by the auditor and x2 showed pc usually okay. Investigate auditor's auditing and send to Cramming for TRs, etc.

What if x1 Auditor okay and x2 pc has lots of trouble?

NOW we get to an overwhelmed pc.

You see how it's sorted out by the C/S?

From inspecting two things only the C/S can decide what's to be done now. If the decision isn't clear-cut get the auditor looked into and the pc asked about the auditor's actions *and* his own case. If his "case has lots of trouble" skip worrying the auditor further unless that discloses other errors on other cases.

Okay. So the pc is running badly. So he's in an overwhelm.

Inspection will reveal one or more of three things.

1. Case didn't come up the Class Chart right.
2. Case being run in a temporary Life overwhelm.
3. Former errors not repaired.

1 and 3 may both exist.

The correct C/S action is a Repair Program in any case. If 3 is true you engage in that first.

If 2 is true you use Repair actions on life as the second part of your Repair Program.

If 1 is true you will also have a Repair Program to lay out first in any event and just include it in.

Write it all up on a red sheet and follow the sheet session by session as you C/S.

You will now have handled the overwhelm if your Repair Pgm is good and fully done and not brushed off at the first sign of VGIs in the pc at Examiner.

If 1 is true you now do a Return Pgm. This of course is what processes you're going to get run to fill in the processes that haven't been run to get the Class Chart all done and the pc back up to where he was. He has run *some* after all.

INGENUITY

The genius and bright ideas of a C/S are not exerted with major processes ever. Only the Interiorization Rundown after the pc exteriorized or when it is discovered he has and possibly a Student Rescue or a sickness assist are the exceptions to this.

One doesn't Repair with major processes! That's like "The engine wouldn't run so he hit it with a sledge hammer."

Ingenuity is required of a C/S only in the area of repair.

Locating BPC is rather standard in repair action.

But fishing up the case by 2 way comm and little prepchecks and getting in ruds on things or times require a certain flair in a C/S.

I recall one pc who was staggering on engrams, couldn't talk to people and was a general mess. The wrong action would be to run a major grade like Comm on the pc. The pc had to be handled with 2 way comm of *some* sort. Yet she couldn't talk auditing or anything else fluently enough about anything to clear anything up. I asked her what would it be awful to say and she went scarlet, hemmed and hawed and blurted out "Swearing!" So we 2 way commed about it! What a torrent! Recovered completely. Recovered so well she thought that was all there was to auditing and was immensely gratified!

Another pc had lost his job and couldn't face any part of it. I 2 way commed what his job had consisted of. He promptly went out and got another.

Sometimes it takes a lot of sessions and a lot of reading worksheets to find subjects.

BUT IF YOU CAN PERSUADE AUDITORS TO MARK EVERY FALL AND BD IN 2 WAY COMM SESSIONS you will find exactly where the pc is hung up and ordering 2 way comm on that and related things does wonders.

But all repair isn't two way comm. Touching things is a very good way to handle repairs. Cars, typewriters, airplanes, or book pictures thereof or anything or any picture of anything also works.

The “touch assist” is a little fragment of a whole array of “touch”.

Cases sometimes flinch at remembering anything at all. The answer is touch things and “Reach and withdraw” is part of this and is used in repair.

TRs (all of them 0 to IX) are so good in repair action that they actually cure 50% or more drug addicts when run for weeks in groups such as on the HAS Course. It is even reported that when run on people still on drugs over periods of weeks they come off the drugs of their own volition. TRs are a fine unlimited repair action.

Prepared lists run on all sorts of things can repair a whole life.

“Look at me. Who am I?” is used in a Repair Session when a pc goes too wild to audit. (An exception is list errors when the only remedy is a fast L4A.)

Mimicry is actually too high for Repair.

Repair is its own subject.

The only demand in Programming it is to give priority to recent auditing errors or recent life catastrophes.

Many cases obviously have to begin processing with a Repair. Life overwhelm is the reason. And an S & D can be far too steep.

Next to skimping lower grades, Repair is too little used.

And it is needed. And the urgency is to not let things go too long unrepaired.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1970
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 14 JUNE 1970

Remimeo

C/S Series 4

THE RETURN PROGRAM

When a case has been repaired, there is always a Return Program made up by the C/S.

It is handwritten on a blue sheet of paper that is easily spotted in a folder.

When the Repair Pgm has been concluded, the case is considered to be "set up" for a Return Pgm.

The exact point where a Repair Program is changed into a Return Program is when the case has had some wins and is in far better shape than he was when he first began to be audited (which means his first ever auditing).

The point is also identifiable as the point where the person feels more outflowing and less overwhelmed if at all.

This is obviously a point of case change.

The common and incorrect practice of looking for case change as the only benefit from processing should be relegated to Repair End Phenomena.

Processing is actually measured by the gradual increase in ability. Step by step these increases in ability walk up the Class Chart and ability is the measure of progress.

The C/S who is looking for THE solution to a case, the one shattering bang of total effect on the pc, has set himself for continuous losses in C/Sing. For there is no one action that totally changes a case from bottom to top in one fell swoop. The C/S who thinks there is continually fiddles hopefully. A case has MANY things to be handled, not one.

There is no one single wrongness or out-point in a case. A case is a collection of out-points. He hurts, he can't talk, he has problems, he is ARC Broken, he has service facts, he is stuck in incidents, etc, to just mention a few such out-points.

A radio receiver that has been many times broken and is a heap of twisted parts, is not going to get repaired, much less improved by a radio repairman finding one huge error in it and correcting that. He'll have to correct a lot of minor errors in it before any major error even shows up.

The “One-shot clear” idea of the uninformed of 1950 is impossible. When a person goes onto the Clearing Course after missing the lower grades he just doesn’t make it at all. He often can’t even get reads.

It takes many miles of road, past many “case changes” to get up the gradient scale to top ability.

A Repair Program takes the case from where it has falsely gotten to on the Class Chart and gets off the overwhelm with light processes.

The Return Program begins when the case is no longer so overwhelmed and is getting wins from the Repair Program.

THE RETURN PROGRAM CONSISTS SIMPLY OF WRITING DOWN IN SEQUENCE EVERY NEEDFUL STEP AND PROCESS MISSED ON THE CLASS CHART BY THE CASE WHICH ARE NOW TO BE DONE.

Example:

A case has falsely gotten to R6EW Solo and isn’t making it well.

The C/S writes up a light process but extensive Repair Program (first on auditing, then on life).

The case achieves the EP of repair in case changes and less overwhelm.

The C/S now examines the 2-way comm sessions and Examiner’s reports to establish what levels are out. No change = Level 1. Lots of ARC Brks = Level 2.

The C/S lists all the Level 1 and Level 2 processes the pc did not get done and this is the Return Program.

When these are done and the pc has made it, the C/S has the pc honestly back at R6EW on the Class Chart and continues to follow the Class Chart.

Needful repairs also sometimes have to be done in getting the Return Pgm done. In each case a new Repair Program is done. The old Return Program looked over but probably just continued.

Example of a case at OT 1 now completely repaired:

Case has somatics = Dn Level Unflat

Makes others guilty = Level IV Unflat

Dramatizes = R6EW Unflat.

The Return Program consists of completing Dn, rehabbing comm, *all* Level IV processes, Redo R6EW, rehab Clear, return to OT I.

That completes the Return Program.

In other words, when the case, found in trouble at a level, is fully repaired and winning, the C/S studies the current data on the case to establish the major levels that are out (each Level has an error and an ability) and then gets these into a Program which then session by session is followed.

The program which can be completed in one session will never be written as there is no such program.

A program is the consecutive layout of what has to be done in the next many sessions.

The basic program is the Class and Grade Chart.

The Return Program is the return to the false point reached by getting honestly done all the points missed on the road.

The pc who can't attest a grade ability at any point has to have:

1. A Repair Pgm.
2. A Return Pgm.

It is a truism that the grade he can't seem to make is not the grade. An earlier grade is out if the processes of any one grade, properly run, do not achieve that grade.

The earliest error is of course a failure to achieve the lowest grade there is. What is out here is that the case needed to be *started* on a Repair Pgm for life. Now, that skipped, one has to do a Repair on both auditing and life.

The Return Pgm is easy in this instance as it just puts the pc back on what he was on, the first level. But this is the *only* instance where a pc is restored by the C/S to the level he was on without an extensive Return Program.

So a Return Pgm always follows the Repair Pgm.

And a Return Program consists of putting the pc over road sections he missed on the road up.

A Return Pgm is concluded and retired when the pc is back on the grade he falsely had reached before the Repair and Return were done, and is now making that grade.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1970
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 15 JUNE 1970

Remimeo

C/S Series 5

REPAIR EXAMPLE

Pc X was rushed through lower grades in 20 minutes, given Power to no result, was fed cognitions on upper level material and when run on Dianetics was found "stuck in present time". After two bogged sessions this pc, who had come from a far place, came to Flag where I took over (not very pleased).

The actual rundown outlined as a Repair Program (see C/S Series 3) was as follows on 2 8½" x 13" red cards to be kept in pc's folder.

PC X
REPAIR PGM

- I LAST ERROR REPAIRED 27.5.70
- II. BOGGED SESSION 6/6/70
 Repaired 11/6/70 (too long a wait but done).
- III. Two Way Comm on what did you experience in Power Processing Successful 1/6/70 (Revealed all Lower Grades out, Clear Cog fed him, unable to really run Dn.)
- IV. L4A assessed on each list run on him, one list at a time as he recalls it.
- V. Auditor Auditing Prepcheck.
- VI. Gains Prepcheck.
- VII. An assessed GF done to get each charge found off.
- VIII. 2 Way Comm How Do You Feel About Auditing Now? Completes auditing cycle. Repair.
- IX. 2 way comm on life before Scn. (Note all Falls and BDs.) To C/S.
- X. C/S to pick up items out of IX and Prepcheck each one that still reads when called off (one to be called then run, no assessment).
- XI. Two way comm on rough areas When have you had a rough time? Note all Falls and BDs. To C/S.

- XII. C/S to list all F or BD items. Prepcheck each one.
- XIII. 2 way comm What possessions have you had? To C/S.
- XIV. C/S to list all F—BD Items and Prepcheck.
- XV. L1B in auditing and 2 way comm on gains.
- XVI. C/S Note what period of his life pc hung up in. Auditor to put in ruds on it.
- XVII. Find out what body part or area hurts. Put in Ruds on it.

(Pgm can be extended to be sure pc has had wins and is in better condition than was in before auditing and no longer overwhelmed or can be cut if this occurs before then.)

(Return Pgm begins with TRs 0-9, on up the Class Chart as needed to get his abilities and ends off with a full repair of Power, rehabbing Pr Pr 4 and 5 and running 6 to EP and checking lists. He will then be back on Class Chart properly.)

This is not a Repair Pgm to be copied particularly. It is given as an extent of Repair which would then be done session by session and ticked off by the C/S as he ordered each new step.

The No. IV L4A prepared list would be wholly assessed for each specific list.

The V and VI are a whole list of things not given here, common to such a step, but containing no dynamite-type things like “SPs” or “Overwhelm” or other things like the names of major processes.

Note that everything from I to VIII are strictly auditing repairs.

IX to XVII handle life areas.

This case should have been *started* in auditing with a Life Repair Pgm such as given from IX to XVII. Had he been on drugs as a habit (or just shaky about life) TRs 0 to 9 could have begun his auditing followed by Life Repair IX to XVII.

NEW DEVELOPMENT

These actions of Repair before level auditing are a new development as such but 2 way comm and these actions are all from the early ‘60s SHSBC.

POSSIBLE FAULTS

Evaluation, Q and A and an inability to listen resulting in the auditor chopping comm would be the chief reasons any errors would creep into the sessions given in the Repair Program. As these might not show up in the auditing reports, if the Repair Pgm sessions did not result in gain the C/S would have the auditor’s auditing checked for

these points of Evaluation, Q and A and comm chop. The sessions are actually very easy to run and could be done by an Academy Class III or better by a Class VI.

NOTE ON VIII AUDITING

VIII Auditing presumed, when developed, that lower grades were still being delivered.

VIII Auditing and Training are fully valid. They are, as the Class infers, a high level of auditing and remain so.

The sequence of recent development has been:

VIII Auditing to Standard

Dianetic HDC-HDG auditing to Standard Dianetics

C/Sing for all levels

C/Sing below levels

C/Sing to handle the neglect of lower grades and SHSBC data which are being gotten back in rapidly.

The C/S is therefore confronted with cases without lower grades and the earliest and reissued Class Chart neglected.

The mania for Quickie Lower Grades and the acts by a few who fed upper "cognitions" and other evaluation to pcs wrecked for a while a part of the bridge and made it impassable.

Much of the current C/S work should take this into consideration. The Repair Pgm given above is not as long as it could be and certainly would be no shorter.

The IX to XVII are a brief layout of how new cases could be handled BEFORE any actual level auditing as a guarantee of real gains. This is a whole zone of action (pre-Level, pre-Dianetics) becoming increasingly necessary by the decline of the culture as visible in pcs now beginning processing as different from those even up to 1962.

These IX to XVII steps would also work on institutional cases but one should take it even easier.

I repeat, this Repair Pgm I to XVII is an EXAMPLE and its numbers are not useful as different Repair Pgms would be designed by the C/S for the pc. Many other things could be done, none of them heavy or desperate.

The C/S should caution any Registrar NOT to sell with the name "Repair Pgm". This is entirely technical and not PR or Sales. It is just *Auditing* as far as the Registrar is concerned.

Had Pc X been processed on all earlier grades in a scramble before 1962, one would list and then rehab every process run as part of the *Return* Pgm. Such a step

would be done as the *last* step however of the Return Program as a prelude to straightening out the highest grade falsely attained before Repair. The rehab would not be a substitute for running all the processes of the levels not previously run. Rehab is no part of Repair.

TECH ACTION

We have fallen into a belief that any repair is done in Review. Review is now the place the pc goes when the C/S gives up.

Repair is a Tech Div Action and counts as hours of auditing delivered. Auditing is auditing. Obviously 2 25 hour intensives could be consumed in a Life Repair before a new pc ever came near even an assessment of the minus scale of the first Class Chart much less a level!

In Academies, students may get anxious to “get their grades practiced” and so may skip repair actions needful. Thus upper level students should audit lower level students.

DIANETICS

Pcs audited only on Dianetics in franchises and centers will make some astonishing physical and even mental improvements. The larger percentage will do so.

However, a C/S will find some have had physical gains “without finding out about it”. The reality factor has not increased to any degree.

Such pcs of course get a long Repair Program and are then given a Return Program to Dianetics, their highest level.

The sample Repair Pgm above fits such pcs as well as one that attained higher levels before it was found that lower grades were out.

There are no variables in what the pgms are:

1. Pc bogs or not gaining.
2. Repair Pgm outlined and concluded.
3. Return Pgm outlined and concluded.

What the C/S puts in the Repair Pgm and what he puts in the Return Pgm can be very variable indeed.

C/S Q AND A

The only fault I've seen in a C/S trying to outline 2 way comm could be called a “C/S Q and A”.

The pc has a big win about “Frogs”. A huge cog F/N VGIs changes his life.

The Q and A C/S is to order “Frogs two way commed”.

The system one uses is not to use pc wins as items to further handle. That stifles (overruns) the win. It's an ability gained.

One should be able to write off win items as gains and let the pc have them. And use items pc mentions that read (shows he has Reality on them) to push up to new wins.

The C/S in looking into 2 way comm for things to handle finds *his* prizes in subjects that read but haven't F/Ned.

The cycle is find an item that reads, push it to F/N cog GIs. Leave that. Find another that reads. Push it to F/N cog VGIs. Leave that. Find another. etc.

2 way comm with the auditor marking F, LF, LLF, BDs, etc gives the C/S worksheets to pick new items out of. The C/S looks to see if any of these were the subject of any F/N. If so he crosses them off. He orders prepchecks or two way comm on the items that read and haven't F/Ned.

That's the way the C/S gets his Instructions to Auditor for the exact actions of the Repair Pgm steps he has already outlined.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.kjm.rd
Copyright © 1970
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 16 JUNE 1970

Remimeo

(Reissued & corrected 3 Oct. 71. Only change—
[page 79] word “arrived” corrected to “aimed”.
Correction in this type style.)

C/S Series 6

WHAT THE C/S IS DOING

In *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* considerable stress is placed on the words and phrases in engrams. This is still functional. However as I did further research I found that (a) many pcs were unable to get the words in the engram and (b) the apparent force of the words was derived wholly from the pain, emotion, effort contained in the engram. In Standard Dianetics the words in an engram play no major role in the auditing.

The use of the words to de-aberrate and concentration on phrases in engrams is valid but *junior* in force to the pain, misemotion, etc in the engram. Thus if you run out the *force* the words drop into insignificance. This is often how the pc gets cognitions: the words and meaning concealed in the engram are changing value and devaluating. The pc can then think clearly again on a subject previously pinned down by the *force*. Get the *force* out and the words take care of themselves and need no special handling.

The *meaning* of things plays a secondary role in processing to forces.

Thetans find counter-forces objectionable. Almost all chronic (continual) somatics have their root in force of one kind or another.

In that the handling of things with bodies involves force to greater or lesser degree, incapability and derangement of mental values is proportional to the thetan's objection to force.

This objection descends down to a wish to stop things. It goes below that into overwhelmedness in which propitiation and obsessive agreement manifest themselves.

LOW TAs

The low TA is a symptom of an overwhelmed being.

When a pc's TA goes low he is being overwhelmed by too heavy a process, too steep a gradient in applying processes or by rough TRs or invalidative auditing or auditing errors.

A low TA means that the thetan has gone past a desire to stop things and is likely to behave in life as though unable to resist real or imaginary forces.

HIGH TA

Chronically high TAs mean the person can still stop things and is trying to do so.

However, all one has to do is restimulate and leave unflat an engram chain to have a high TA. High TA is reflecting the force contained in the chain.

An “over-run” means doing something too long that has engrams connected with it which means an engram chain with too many engrams on it being restimulated by life or auditing. Hence Over-run.

If this overrun persisted unhandled eventually the pc would be overwhelmed and one, in theory, would have a low TA.

MENTAL MASSES

Mental masses, forces, energy are the items being handled by the C/S on any pc.

If the C/S loses sight of this he can wander off the road and go into the thickets of significance.

Engrams, secondaries, locks all add up to mental masses, forces, energies, time, which express themselves in countless different ways such as pain, misemotion, feelings, old perceptions and a billion billion thought combinations buried in the masses as significances.

A thetan can postulate or say or reason anything. Thus there is an infinity of significances.

A thetan is natively capable of logical thought. This becomes muddled by out-points held in by mental forces such as pictures of heavy experiences.

As the masses and forces accumulated and copied from living build up, the logic potential becomes reduced and illogical results occur.

PC SEARCH

The pc is continually searching for the *significance* of a mass or force—what is it, why is it.

The C/S is easily led astray by this.

All forces in the bank contain significances.

All forces can be unburdened and lightened up by the various procedures of auditing.

The search of the pc is for significance.

The action of the C/S is reduction of forces.

THE E-METER

The E-Meter records what force is being discharged in every slash, fall and blowdown. The amount of TA per session is the C/S's index of gain.

Note that a discharged process no longer gives TA and gives case gain.

The amount of significance recovered or realized by the pc only shows up as cognitions.

As the TA works off the case, then one has two indicators:

1. There is needle and TA action.
2. The pc cognites.

One shows that force is coming off. Two shows that thought is releasing from force.

BACKWARDS C/Sing

If a C/S processes toward significance only he will get cases that do not progress. The needle action detects not so much significance as where the force is.

Diving toward significance the C/S winds up shortening grades, looking for "magic one-shot buttons" and overwhelming cases by shooting them up the grades while levels remain *loaded* with force.

RELIABLE INDICATORS

When a pc gets no more TA action on Level I he will have made Level I and will *know* it. He will therefore attest to "No problems".

The reliable indicators are TA action and cognitions while a level is still charged.

Diminished TA action and cognitions mean the purpose of the level has been reached.

A feeling of freedom and expansion on a subject is expressed in a normal TA and a loose needle.

The pc will now attest to an ability regained.

F/N ABUSE

To process only to F/N and even chop off the cognitions on a process abuses the indicator of the F/N.

You can find many pcs who bitterly resent F/N indications. They have been:

- A. Not run on all the processes of a level;
- B. Still have force on the subject;

C. Were chopped off before they could cognite.

The ARC Break in this is UNFINISHED CYCLE OF ACTION.

The proper End Phenomena for a process is F/N Cognition VGIs. Now look at that carefully. That is the proper end phenomena of a PROCESS. It is not the end phenomena of a LEVEL or even of a TYPE of process.

Let us say there are 15 possible Scientology processes for orienting a pc in his present location.

To run *one* of these 15 and say, “F/N that’s it. You’re complete,” is a Quickie impatient action that rebounds on the pc eventually. If there are 15, run 15 !

Possibly the pc on no. 12 will cognite he’s really right where he is. Only then could you cease to work at it.

An F/N Cog VGIs tells you a *process is* finished, not a whole class of actions!

Thus 21/2 minutes from 0 to IV is not only impossible, it is murderous. It will result in an overwhelm, a low TA or a high TA eventually.

Level I says, amongst other things, “Problems Processes”. There are certainly half a dozen. Each would be run to F/N Cog VGIs. When these and the *other* processes of the Level are run, the pc will come to have no further reaction to problems and will be able to handle them.

A cognition in lower levels is not necessarily an ability regained. Thirty or forty cognitions on one lower level might add up to (and probably would) the realization that one is free of the whole subject of the level.

It is safe to run more processes. It is unsafe to run too few.

PC ABILITIES

It is not enough for the pc to have only negative gains of deleting force. Sooner or later he will have to begin to confront force.

This comes along naturally and is sometimes aided by processes directly *aimed* at further confront. “What problem *could you have?*” sooner or later is needed in one form or another.

What force can the pc now handle?

All auditing in a body—and any living in a body—makes a being vulnerable. Bodies break, suffer, intensify pain.

Sooner or later a pc will go Exterior. The Interiorization Rundown must be ordered as the next action or you will have a pc with a high TA. 2-way comm Ext-Int must be given in a following session (not the same one) so the full cognitions will occur.

After this the pc is less subject to the body and his ability to confront force will improve.

Do not be too worried or surprised if after this the pc has some minor accident with the body. Exterior he forgets its frailty. However, such things are minor. He is “learning how to walk” a new way and will run into chairs! He gets this figured out after a while.

Pcs sometimes improve their ability to handle force while interior so as to have mysterious headaches or new body pressures. Inevitably they *have been exterior* and need Interiorization run. They were just using too much force while still inside !

Thus force is the thing, significance very secondary.

Force of course is made up of time, matter, energy, flows, particles, masses, solids, liquids, gasses, space and locations. All this gets inherently handled in processes published long since.

The pc tends to dive for the *thought* imbedded in the force. He will tell you he's being processed to find out who his parents were or why he is sterile or who did him in, etc, etc. The C/S who chases after this is a deerhound illegally chasing mice!

C/S PURPOSE

The C/S is there to make certain that the pc makes gains and attains the actual abilities of the level.

The C/S is for the pc.

C/S auditor control exists only to keep the auditing standard, the TRs good, the processes ordered done and to End Phenomena each one.

No other reasons for C/Sing exist.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH: nt.rd
Copyright © 1970, 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 19 JUNE 1970

Remimeo

C/S Series 7

C/S Q AND A

Just as an auditor can Q and A so can a C/S.

As you know Q and A is the incorrect 2-way comm action of wandering off the question by feeding the pc what the pc said as a Question, the Answer is taken as the next auditor's Question. Many various outlines of what Q and A is already exist and this is just to refresh the subject. Example: Student Auditor is ordered "2-way comm on cities," by the C/S which is okay. But it can be Q and Aed like this: Student: "Tell me what you think about cities." Pc: "They're cold." Student: "What about cold?" Pc: "I don't like it." Student: "What else don't you like?" Pc: "Well old men." Student: "What about old men?" Pc: "They're obnoxious." Student: "What else is obnoxious?" Pc: "....." Well you remember all about that. It's maddening and shows *no* auditor control and certainly doesn't handle the original C/S subject of "cities".

There are three main ways in which a C/S can Q and A in C/Sing.

PC C/S

Pc goes to Examiner on own volition and says, "I am ill. I need my ruds flown."

A C/S Q and A would be "Fly ruds."

Pc on his own goes to Examiner and says, "I am upset about my job."

C/S writes "L1B on job."

You get the idea. The first one is therefore Q and Aing with Exam statement of pc.

This is varied by taking a pc's note or letter or report and accepting what the pc says is wrong. Like "I'm PTS to my husband." And then C/Sing "2-way comm on husband."

Naturally the ancient law applies here. If the pc knew what it was it would not be wrong and would as-is. Pc coming up to Exam saying, "It's my husband!" with F/N Cog VGIs would be what would happen if it *was* the husband. And that would be great but of no real value to C/S except pc has had a win and not to now use "husband".

Give you an actual example: Pc in Solo ruds found she hated George. It F/Ned. Next audited session pc was saying she hated George. Wrote a note about George. C/S did not notice the outness. Ordered LIB on George and in a 2-way comm got little or no

TA, continued to be ill. The fact is it wasn't George at all and not even a terminal. Pc had gone up one grade too many, hit an overwhelm, the earlier 6 grades were out! Correct action was to have done a general repair the moment a pc suddenly and mysteriously caved in and got ill on a new level! The pc never should have been going on up grades for the last 6 grades!

The tendency to toss it all off with a Q and A not only didn't handle but obscured the real situation.

C/Sing A WIN

The second Q and A is to C/S a pc win.

Pc in 2-way comm mentions cats and more cats and cats and finally at the end of session has a big F/N Cog VGIs on cats.

The C/S sees all this "cat" mention and orders "Prepcheck cats."

That is a very cruel sort of Q and A.

Another version of it of course is to see a pc reach a full End Phenomena on a series of processes like an unmistakable pc-volunteered valence shift and keep on going into an inval. Correction is to rehab of course.

Yet another version is to pull a w/h and then keep pulling it so the pc doesn't think it's gone. Correction is to rehab of course.

The TA often goes high or low on these Q and A actions and Inval-Eval actions are ordered and the release point rehabbed.

NEXT GRADE PLEASE!

The third Q and A a C/S can pull is to agree to the pc's demands for the next grade despite all contrary indicators.

"I'm ready for Clear now!" says the pc full of somatics whose R6EW wasn't really done and who can't talk.

The Registrar, execs and others push on this also.

The D of P and C/S have total authority on this. They should be diplomatic. "He can have the grade of course but I will have to prepare him for it," is the best answer. "Please make arrangements for Clear preparation—25 hours."

If the C/S doesn't hold the fort on this the pc put into the next grade who isn't ready will fall on his head.

If this pressure from the pc (in any version) continues, have him sign a waiver "I will not hold the org or any principals responsible and waive any refund if I am put on next grade." That either gets home or he says okay and signs. So put him on the grade and hope he doesn't fall on his head—and if he does, *now* demand he get the hours needed to get fixed up so he can really make it.

A D of P or C/S often have other pressures exerted on them that are not technical in nature such as economics, ambition, status symbols (of having a high grade regardless of a headache) and have to cope with these diplomatically. But any but tech considerations are dangerous to entertain.

SUMMATION

Of these 3, 2 are concerned with letting someone else C/S. Like an engineer letting someone else plan the railroad.

And the third is also slightly in that nature, consisting of not noticing the pc's wins and using them with which to C/S.

CAUTION

This doesn't mean the pc is always wrong. He is generally right when he says he's overwhelmed or upset. He's almost always wrong when he says *what* overwhelmed him or what BPC was out WHEN SIMPLY SAYING IT DOES NOT CORRECT THE CASE OR PRODUCE F/N VGIs.

You always *use* the pc's data one way or another in that you are paralleling what the MIND does. That's reads. Not what the pc says.

Remember that what's really wrong lies in the field of mass, energy, space, time, form and location. As these are eased up (by Standard Dianetics and 18 years of Scientology actions and processes) thoughts come to view. So if you Q and A with thoughts already in full view, you never really ease up the bank. That's why Q and A with significance is not done.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1970
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 19 JUNE 1970
Issue II

Remimeo

C/S Series 8

CHART OF HUMAN EVALUATION

Science of Survival's Chart of Human Evaluation is a study for C/Ses and is of great use.

When you find the pc on one of its columns you can see if the pc stays there or falls back there.

Standard Dianetics opened this chart to full use for C/Ses. 18 years of Scientology processes and know-how are to a large degree evolved from this chart.

IF A PC IS STAYING AT A LEVEL OF THE CHART OR FALLS ON IT you know he is running *above* his level.

Processing Changes Conditions.

If it doesn't improve them (or the pc's behavior) then the pc's Reality is not being reached. It can be plus or minus, above or below. It is seldom that the pc's reality is higher than the processes used and really only occurs when a grade honestly run is rerun. Then you get pc protest as he's *made* that.

Pcs who get sick suddenly are being run far too high on the Class Chart. Pcs who don't change are also being run too high.

Behavior, mannerisms are the index. DO THESE CHANGE? If they do the pc is improving. If they drop lower on the Human Evaluation Chart the pc is in overwhelm.

PICKING THOUGHTS OUT OF FORCES IN THE BANK BRINGS A NO CHANGE.

In other words you can park a pc by continuing nothing but think processes which address only significance.

SELF AUDITING

Self auditing is the manifestation of being overwhelmed by masses etc and pulling only think out of the bank. Pulling out think then pulls *in* more force which gives more self audit.

Not all self audit is bad. The pc eventually realizes it's forces! After a few tens of thousands of hours! If he knows all the answers.

A good push against a wall is worth a hundred hours of self auditing. And it's force.

HUMAN EVALUATION

This famous chart (in use by the way by an airline and several other areas, and which had to be printed as desk blotters for personnel people at one time) could easily be expanded in numbers of vertical columns to include all behavior.

The C/S is at a disadvantage as he doesn't see pcs. But he can have a mannerism item filled in on a Summary Report. "Mannerisms _____" "Mannerism changes _____"

This serves.

It also serves to look at the psychosomatic column of the chart and a pc's Health Form.

CHANGING THE PC

The pc will change in ideas when he changes his relationship to forces.

Tons of processes do this.

Objective Processes have to be run in on a pc now and then.

Somatics passing through in a session are a definite clue to force change. The no-somatic pc is either high as an angel or being run too high.

You don't have to run directly at force for forces to change in the pc.

One 2 way comm I did with a pc released his hold on a huge bundle of forces!

The body responds badly to forces.

The conflict between protecting or using a body and being as a thetan able to withstand large forces gets so mixed up in a pc he can wind up as a force-shy thetan !

STANDARD PROCESSES

Standard processes such as those in use for 18 years handle this when fitted into their levels.

What the C/S has to realize is that he is (a) producing an optimum rate of change in the pc if he is C/Sing well and (b) changing the pc's position upward on the Chart of Human Evaluation.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1970
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 21 JUNE 1970

Remimeo

C/S Series 9

SUPERFICIAL ACTIONS

One of the reasons Scientology tended toward disuse in the late 1960's was not its workability. It was a growing cultural disinclination to do things thoroughly.

"Fast, quick results" was interpreted as seconds or minutes. In old psychotherapy as practiced in the 19th Century it required ONE YEAR of weekly consultation to see if anything could be done about a case and FOUR MORE YEARS to produce a meager superficial result. Compared to that two or three hundred hours of processing was nothing.

As we began to dominate this field in terms of persons handled and results obtained, psychiatry invented "instant psychiatry" by which no result was gotten in no time.

SPEED became the primary consideration of the culture. Jet planes, fast cars "saved time". But an old Chinese, when told by a driver that he had saved 4 minutes in speeding back from town asked, "What are you going to do with the 4 minutes?"

Time itself is a basis of aberration. Dropping time out is the consideration of factory managers of production lines as "the faster something can be made the more you have of it". But look at this again. Something can be done so fast it isn't done at all! The difference between a very fine camera and a cheap one is speed of manufacture. Cheap cameras don't get their parts carefully machined or matched—they don't fit together—they break, cease to work. A fine gun can be told by the lack of tool marks on the hidden places. A cheap gun's inner bolt is a mess of scars. It isn't smooth in operation. It didn't take much time to make but it also jams and freezes up when you try to use it. Maybe you've heard of "hotter than a 2 dollar pistol". A 2 dollar pistol is "hot" because it's so quickie made it usually blows up and blows off a hand.

There is a point where SPEED is simply a cover for a cheap worthless product.

Let us take a filthy room. A lazy housekeeper comes in and sweeps a few bits of dust under the carpet, leaves soot all over the windows and garbage on the mantle and says it's clean. Somebody else not afraid of work spends an hour at it and leaves a really clean room.

SHORT PGMS

A short pc program is economically and efficiently for the birds.

In the first place a C/S has to know the extent of his tech well to be able to think up light processes in quantity.

If one heard a C/S say, "But I don't have time to spend an hour doing a long program for the pc," one is listening to something peculiar. If one spent an hour or two doing up a real long 20 action program to repair the pc, then for the next 20 C/Ses it takes only a few minutes to look over the session and order the next action on the list. If one had no program one would have to study the *folder* each time. One actually saves C/S time by doing *long* programs both to repair and to get the pc back on the Class Chart where he'd gotten to.

Further, auditing is sold by the hour and it WASTES money and income and pcs to short program them.

"Yes but we sell result! If we can get 200 pcs done in 100 auditing minutes we would make £18,233 clear profit .. "

Well the cruel answer to that was when orgs began to do that on lower grades they didn't attain the result on the pc and stats went DOWN!

Power was once priced against the fact of 50 to 100 hours of auditing. It retained the price and by cutting out all End Phenomena or real gain it was at last being given in 20 minutes. And after just so many years of this economic dishonesty, SHs crashed! They had sold out the real value of the product for a quick buck. The "field" became "ARC Broken" and few takers came to an SH. It is a very long hard road back. And it is a very costly one.

"Quickie Grades", instead of making fortunes for one and all, crashed the whole Scientology network.

BECAUSE QUICKIE RESULTS ARE LAZY AND DISHONEST.

Let's just face up to the facts of life!

Selling out the integrity of the subject for a buck wrecks the subject.

SUCCESS

The real stat of an org is Success Stories.

Honest grades and time spent in C/Sing and in auditing to obtain them add up to success for the individual, the org, its field, the country and the planet.

The *time* it takes to process somebody is how long it takes to get *each* single result available. It is not how slowly or quickly it is done. A book is not a good book if it takes 7 years to write. And a bad book isn't always written in 2 weeks. It takes as long to write a good book as you get a good book. The *result* is the result and TIME IS JUST AN ENTERED ARBITRARY.

A person who overwhelms at Grade IV is an easily overwhelmed person. It might take 50 hours just to repair the case and the person's life. That might be 20 or 30 steps on the program.

If the C/S can't dream up 8 or 9 ways to repair past auditing and 15 or 20 ways to repair a life, then it's time to go back and read *The Original Thesis, Evolution of a Science, DMSMH, 8-80, 8-8008* and listen to a hundred or so SHSBC tapes.

"Yes, but I have no time to . ." Well, that's also saying "It can't be done well."

But there is time. If anyone looked over his area he would be able to throw out the time-wasting actions if it comes to that.

"Look. I'm the C/S, the D of P and have to audit 3....."

That's a statement that the job has already been done so badly that no persons show up to take over the extra hats! And the no-result programs cripple the economics and that becomes no help.

I have seen Mary Sue take over an HGC that had tons of unsolved cases and too few auditors and have watched her solve one case at a time and within 2 weeks have 35 auditors and no backlogs and in six weeks no unsolved cases! She was using the "old", "historical", "background", "we don't use them anymore" processes!

So it not only can be done, it is the thing to do.

That org's stats soared. It became solvent. It ran at a high run and was a happy org.

SICK PCs

When there are sick people on a list one doesn't just "give a Dianetic Assist" and send to a doctor and write them off.

If one knows his tech, there was a *reason* the person got sick. One also knows a sick person goes into overwhelm easily.

One can do a touch assist, a contact assist, two-way comm, ruds on the accident, ruds before the accident, Dianetic Assist, medical treatment, life ruds, HCO B 24 July '69, two-way comm on suppression, 3 S & Ds, assessment for area of illness, prepcheck on area, ruds on area, hello and okay with the affected area, reach and withdraw from area, two-way comm, recall on persons similarly ill, location of the postulate that caused it with itsa earlier itsa, prepcheck on the body or its part, more HCO B 24 July '69, more ruds, assessment of failed purposes, two-way comm on the sickness.

That's not a program. It's just a helter-skelter list of a *lot* of things to do. It would not greatly matter what order they were done in but lighter actions should be the earlier. And in a program auditing repair comes before life repair.

EXPECTANCY

Now if a C/S or an auditor has a magical complex, he expects ONE process to run a person from wog to OT VI and in ONE minute.

The missing knowledge is "gradient scales". Stairs and ladders have steps and rungs. It takes TIME to climb a tower.

The magical complex thinks of processes as incantations or charms. A person C/Sing would always be trying to find THE process the pc should be run on. The think is that THE process, once discovered, would take no time at all and the pc would magically become well!

Pardon me, but that's pure goofiness.

And it would set the C/S up for constant FAILURE.

One sees such a person scrambling through processes, trying to guess "which one which one which one. Oh there's one! Now we run it for 3 minutes on the pc. Oh dear. It didn't work. He isn't well. Let's see what's here still. Scramble scramble. Oh, here's one. This green paper is probably the right color. Auditor! Run this on the pc. Oh dear, it didn't work. He isn't well yet. So! We will take these 5 major processes and run them all in one session and add six grades. Do that! Do it! It's a desperate situation. Oh dear, the pc blew. Well I guess the subject doesn't work or I'm a failure ..."

That is NOT how one should C/S.

If a workman was supposed to cure an ox hide and was told salt would do it and he had a magical complex, what would he do. Well, he might take a small salt shaker and sprinkle the corner of the hide (thinking the right thought) and find that the hide rotted in a few days. He could then conclude salt didn't cure ox hides. If someone kept hammering at him to cure ox hides with salt and he kept sprinkling the corner (knowing it wouldn't work) he'd get a very odd idea about his orders! But who would suspect that this workman thought it was magic! An honest rubbing of salt all over and into the ox hide is the meaning of "salt will cure ox hides"!

But that would take work. It would take TIME! It would have to be honestly and thoroughly done. But one would have cured ox hides and gotten shoes and a profit and pay and everything for one had a *product*.

Magical thought in auditing isn't likely to give anyone a product of really able people!

SHORT-CUTTING PROCESSES

Processes can be short-cut as well as programs.

Take an early (means basic, useful, usable) version of Rising Scale. There are 18 pairs. Each *pair* should be run to F/N, Cog, VGIs.

An auditor told to run Rising Scale can run along the 18 pairs until one F/Ns. And leave it.

The process has been short-cut. And with that shortcut went its ability to restore fertility!

So one hears Rising Scale will sometimes restore fertility or change eyesight. Orders it done. It is done to 1 F/N. No real result occurs.

Or take Dianetics. Dianetics can be chopped “to save TIME”. First feeble flutter of an F/N, no Cog, no VGIs, auditor barking “Did it erase? Did it erase?” Final result, no real gain. There goes the subject. Half an hour to run the chain, no extra 30 seconds for the real F/N, the Cog, the VGIs.

SO ONE WASTES A RESULT FOR THE SAKE OF SAVED TIME.

THE AGE

It is a symptom of the age that there is no time. But in the Data Series PLs one finds that “omitted time” is a basic insanity.

That a body lives only about 70 years puts an awful limit on Man.

Man’s Empires endure at most only about 300 years if that.

70 years is not enough time to make a real career and 300 years is not enough time to even groove in a civil service.

Man pays for it with poor lives and rotten governments.

But it doesn’t take 70 years or 300 years to process a pc. A year maybe up to homo novis. A few years to OT. Even traveling it casually slow.

25 hours to repair someone’s life and 50 to 100 hours to get him up to no somatics with Dianetics is pretty satisfactorily fast.

What’s this take? A week to repair. 2 to 4 weeks for full Dianetics. At 25 hours a week. That’s very little.

And it’s enough to tell him to get trained so he can have all he wants.

SPEED LIABILITY

When speed is the consideration, not results, you get a very cheap camera or car. And you can expect it to fall apart very soon. You also get a cheap reputation.

We are in the Leica and Cadillac and Rolls Royce product class without trying.

Why settle for “Quickie Grades”?

You get no students that way and *that’s* the heavy org income. You get no expanding field. And you won’t ever get a cleared planet.

We’ve learned all this the hard way. So let’s not let it go unheeded.

The place to handle the situation is with C/Sing.

And to gain the co-operation of C/Ses to make results real results by insisting that speed is the fast road to poverty in the long run.

If the C/S burden is too heavy, start pushing training. Then you’ll get help.

Honest C/Sing gives an honest result.

It takes as long to correct a case as it takes. It takes as long to make a person well as it takes. It takes as long to get a real lasting grade result as it takes.

And that's a lot longer than the time spent on it in the late 60's.

ALL pcs "have to be OT tomorrow". Why let them C/S their case by demanding it only take 2 minutes?

Self C/Sing is no more effective than self auditing.

Registrars as well as pcs try to grab the C/S hat. "I will sell you a marital intensive because you have such a bad cold." And Execs, "Run this staff member on money....."

Well, a C/S's hat is the C/S's. And he should wear it for honest results. And damn others trying to C/S and wreck his job.

THERE ARE NO CONSIDERATIONS WHICH FORGIVE ANY RESULT THAT IS NOT THOROUGH AND HONEST FOR EVERY PROGRAM OR GRADE.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:dz.rd
Copyright © 1970
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

LRH TAPE LECTURE
21 June 1970

7006C21 SPEC LECT Expanded Grades and Training

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 24 JUNE 1970

Remimeo

C/S Series 10

REPAIRING A REPAIR

When a pc is on a Repair cycle it is quite horrible to have a bad (goofed) session occur.

Why?

Well the pc is on a Repair cycle because he is overwhelmable. A goofed session is more overwhelm. AND it was goofed on a process type which was already what you would use for Repair. So NOW what do you do?

The answer of course is to sort out the real error. If you can't find it readily in the worksheet have the Examiner ask the pc what the auditor did.

Then having found the actual goof, you have it repaired by rehab of the BP F/N or an L1B using "Method 3" in assessing the prepared list.

The goofs are fortunately few in type.

There HAS to have been a basic goof for a Repair session to have gone wrong.

So when one goes wrong, you really search the worksheet until you find it and if it isn't visible get the pc asked.

These goofs are pretty elementary. The auditor possibly doesn't know that a TA can go DOWN by overwhelming by overrun or way up by overrun. So a usual goof in Repair is overrun of an F/N or an item that F/Ned or a list that F/Ned.

Example: In a Repair Pgm a GF is called for. Auditor clears a couple items, suddenly hits a hot one, pc gets F/N, Cog, VGIs. Auditor (told to get all the charge off the GF overlooks senior data—let pc have a win, GFs often raise hob with the TA if run further than THE item) goes on down the GF list past the F/N VGIs hunting for new charge. Pc's TA goes to 1.6 ! Pc cogs he has a stuck picture. TA 1.6. "End of sess."

Now what do we do. Well, a new factor now enters in.

C/S WANDER

The pc was on a precise Repair Pgm, is only at VI out of XVIII steps.

But the pc is rough. Rough running. Diverges, critical, boggy.

And now he is stuck into a goofed session and we have to repair a repair!

A C/S at this point can wander. He can Q and A. The WHOLE REPAIR PGM CAN GET DEPARTED FROM AND THE PC REALLY BOGGED.

When faced with Repairing a Repair Pgm session watch it! Don't wander!

The C/S procedure is this:

1. Find in the W/S or from the pc the exact goof.
2. Repair that goof by rehab, indicating BPC or two way comm, depending on the error.
3. DO NOT ORDER A NEW DIFFERENT NON-PGM ACTION.
4. Continue the PGM.

It is here a C/S can go adrift. New actions crossing the original program can soon have C/S, pc and Auditor chasing over hill and dale. It is a fatal pursuit.

About the only time you change a Repair Pgm once outlined is to extend it or lighten it. But in that case do a whole new Pgm.

You will find 2 way comm is lighter than a Prepcheck.

Let us say pc was doing great on 2 way comm. Gets into a Prepcheck session and goes out the bottom.

In such a case the Prepcheck is repaired of any goof noted in it and 2 way comm that session—and it comes out all right. If no goof can be located, 2 way comm it and it will be okay.

An Auditor can throw a list not ordered into a Repair Pgm by finding the TA high at session start and doing an O/R list and goofing the list. It would already be dicey to *list* a pc who is on a Repair Pgm. To then goof ordinary laws of listing and nulling can get grim.

The first C/S action to repair the repair is of course to get the list corrected with an L4A. You can often spot the listing goof as a C/S. It's usually an O/R of an O/R list or an incomplete list or an "unnecessary list". It's poison to list a pc on a Repair Pgm, however. 2 way comm it.

If a check for Exteriorization reveals it, you have no choice but to do an Interiorization Rundown. That's a common reason. But if the pc is already flinching at engrams, limit the Interiorization to 3 way Recall and note it clearly that he's only 3 way Recall of Int.

AUDITOR FLUBS

Student or new Auditors produce the most flubs. It is therefore good to keep them off repair actions or Repair Pgms.

The commonest flubs are failing to trim the meter and ignoring the F/N at "3.1", yet sitting right there running the pc up to 4.0 without ever asking, "Have we by-passed a release point?"

Poor TRs, not having 2 way comm down, neglecting pc origin or chopping comm are probably next in order of frequency.

REPAIR PCs

Remember that pcs who need lots of repair are DELICATE cases. Feather touch is the watchword.

They are not all that easy to audit. They can cause Auditors and C/Ses to disperse.

Such pcs are afraid of force and easily get engulfed if pushed hard into the bank.

So lightly, lightly.

And exact repair of any flub.

And get back to the program! Mid program is no time to become inventive.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH: sb .rd
Copyright © 1970
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 25 JUNE 1970

Remimeo

C/S SERIES 11

The following HCO Bs have been combined in this issue:

HCO B 31	Aug '68	"Written C/S Instructions"
HCO B 1	Sept '68	"Points on Case Supervision"
HCO B 11	Sept '68	"Case Supervisor Data"
HCO B 17	Sept '68	"Gross Case Supervision Errors"
HCO B 17	Sept '68	"Out Admin—Liability"
HCO B 22	Sept '68	"Auditors must always"
HCO B 8	Oct '68	"Case Supervisor—Folder Handling"
HCO B 15	Mar '70	"Double Folder Danger"
HCO B 29	Mar '70	"Auditing and Ethics"

and reference to LRH ED 101 Int "Popular Names of Developments".

C/S DATA

Case Supervision instructions are *always* written. A Case Supervisor always writes his C/S instructions on a separate sheet of paper for the pc folder.

Repair Programs (now called Progress Programs) are on red sheets.

Return Programs (now called Advance Programs) are on bright blue sheets.

All C/Ses are written in duplicate (a carbon copy is made). The C/S keeps the carbon copy for reference in case the original ever gets lost.

HIGH CRIME

It is a High Crime for a Case Supervisor not to *WRITE* in a preclear's folder what the case supervised instructions are and a High Crime for an auditor to accept verbal C/S instructions.

To commit this crime causes:

1. Extreme difficulty when doing a folder error summary as there is no background of what was ordered and why.
2. Gives the auditor leave to do anything he likes as not in writing.

3. Is open to misduplication and can cause squirrel processes to be run and so mess up a preclear with Non-standard Tech.

Any C/Supervisor found guilty of this from this date is to be removed as this could only be considered a deliberate attempt to mess up preclears.

POINTS ON CASE SUPERVISION

1. Check your orders to find out if auditor did them.
2. Check to see if commands correct and if pc's reaction was expected reaction for those commands.
3. Check any list and find out if there was mislisting.
4. Advise against a background of Standard Tech.
5. Order any errors corrected or get the case on further up the grades.
6. Beware of over-correction.
7. Beware of false, pessimistic or over-enthusiastic auditor reports. They are detected by whether the case responded to usual actions as they all do.
8. Beware of talking to the auditor or the pc.
9. Have implicit confidence in Standard Tech. If it is reported not working the auditor's report is false or the application terrible but not reported.
10. Above all else hold a standard and NEVER listen to or use unusual solutions.

DOUBLE FOLDER DANGER

When a preOT has a Solo and an Auditing folder, both, there is a great danger if the Case Supervisor does not look at BOTH before C/Sing.

There has been an instance of a preOT running strange C/Ses on himself. Another ran C/Ses out of other folders on himself. In both cases the consequences were hard to repair when finally found.

In another case in the Solo folder the preOT had gone exterior with full perception. But the Non-Solo Auditing folder was being C/Sed. The TA shot up for 2 months without any C/S except myself calling for *all* folders.

PreOTs unfortunately run on a Solo folder and an audited folder. Unless both are to hand when C/Sing wild errors can be made by the C/S.

There is *also* the case of a person having two audited folders, being C/Sed at the same time. This is an Admin error.

The firm rule is C/S ONLY WITH ALL FOLDERS TO HAND.

The embarrassing situation where one can't get a folder from another org or field auditor or where the old folder is lost has to be made up for somehow. It mustn't halt auditing totally.

CASE SUPERVISOR—FOLDER HANDLING

Analyzing Folders

Go back in the folder to the session where the preclear was running well and come forward from it doing a folder error summary.

Reviewing Folders

In reviewing a folder, the first thing to do is to look at the C/S to see if it was done.

Use the Summary Sheet to get the Auditor's attitude and pc mannerism changes.

Use the Auditor's Report Form to get the time of processes.

Read and take all your data from Worksheets and compare it to and see that C/S was complied with and ensure Standard Tech was applied.

If you can't read the reports, send it back to have the Auditor over-print illegible words. Never try to case supervise (C/S) an illegible worksheet as you'll only run into headaches.

The After Session Examiner's Report gives you the first clue of how suspicious you should be in examining the folder and whether or not auditing reports contain falsities.

Standard Tech

You're never led by anything into departing from Standard Tech. The *only* reason it doesn't work is that it hasn't been applied.

The main question of a Case Supervisor is:

WAS IT APPLIED?

If you follow this exactly, you'll never miss.

CASE SUPERVISOR DATA

A Case Supervisor should watch for Ethics record of pcs who have been C/Sed.

If they fall on their head, get into low conditions, the folder should be reviewed.

Most probably the auditor did not do what was ordered and, if folder looks okay, chances are the auditing report is false as *something is wrong* or pc would not be in trouble.

AUDITING AND ETHICS

Cases undergoing Ethics actions, Comm Evs, amends projects or low conditions should not be audited until the Ethics matter is cleared up and complete. It only louses up their cases to audit them when under such stress.

ADMIN

Auditors must always put the pc's grade or OT level very prominently on the Auditing Report.

A Case Supervisor cannot properly C/S a case without having this data.

To not do this is out admin.

OUT ADMIN—LIABILITY

Much has been said about the importance of admin in auditing but auditors just aren't getting it—so it now becomes a LIABILITY to have out admin in pcs' folders.

Folders are to be submitted with the latest session on top. Auditor's report form is stapled to Worksheets which are dated, numbered and in order, latest on top. Summary Report is then attached to the auditing report and W/Ss with a *paper clip*. This of course is as well as the usual admin such as legible writing, re-writing illegible words, marking reads and F/Ns, and all End Phenomena, etc.

The C/S instructions for that session go *under* that session, so you get C/S 4/6/68, Auditing Session 4/6/68, C/S 5/6/68, Auditing Session 5/6/68, C/S 7/6/68, etc, etc.

As the whole purpose of Class VIII is to minimize the time in auditing, by doing perfect Standard Tech, this cannot be done if it takes 15 minutes to put the folder in order, so it can then be case supervised, so it can then be audited.

GROSS CASE SUPERVISION ERRORS

1. FAILING TO USE PROGRESS AND ADVANCE PROGRAMS WHEN NEEDED.
2. Ordering unnecessary repairs.
3. Trying to use repair processes to get case gain instead of getting the pc onto the next grade.
4. Not writing down C/S instructions, but giving them to an auditor verbally.

5. Talking to the auditor re the case.
6. Talking to pc re his case.
7. Failing to send pc to examiner if you're unsure why his folder has been sent up for C/S.
8. Being reasonable.
9. Not having enough Ethics presence to get his orders followed.
10. Issuing involved repair orders.
11. BIGGEST GROSS CASE SUPERVISION ERROR for C/S is not to read through the pc folder.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.rd
Copyright © 1970
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 25 JUNE 1970
Issue II

Remimeo

C/S Series 12

GLOSSARY OF C/S TERMS

RECOVERY PROGRAM: The pack of

LRH EDs	100 Int	10 May '70	Lower Grades Upgraded
	102 Int	20 May '70	The Ideal Org
	103 Int	21 May '70	Fast Flow Grades Cancelled
	104 Int	2 Jun '70	Auditing Sales and Delivery Pgm No. 1
	106 Int	3 Jun '70	What Was Wrong
	107 Int	3 Jun '70	Orders to Divisions for Immediate Compliance
	10 SH	6 Jun '70	SH Pcs
	108 Int	11 Jun '70	Auditing Mystery Solved
	101 Int	21 Jun '70	Popular Names of Developments

comprising the program to recover full use and results of EXPANDED LOWER GRADES.

PROGRESS PROGRAM:

What is called a “Repair Program” on the first issue of the C/S Series HCOB just being issued is re-named a PROGRESS PROGRAM. It has been found that case gain which has not been earlier achieved can be consolidated by a PROGRESS PROGRAM. It takes 25 hours, can be done by a Class I or above as long as it is C/Sed by an VIII who has starred on the new C/S Series. This is quite a technical development in itself. It is the answer to a pc who had “Quickie Grades” and didn’t actually reach full abilities in earlier Scientology auditing. It is followed by an Advance Program which follows below.

ADVANCE PROGRAM:

This is what was called a “Return Program” in the C/S Series. The name is being changed from “Return” to “Advance” as more appropriate. It gets the pc really up to where he should be. It may take 50 hours or more.

EXPANDED LOWER GRADES:

Pcs won’t like being told they “have to have their lower grades rerun”. Actually that’s not a factual statement anyway. The lower grades harmonic into the OT Levels. They can be run again with full 1950-1960 to 1970 processes as given on the SH Courses all through the 1960s. These are now regrouped and sorted out and are called

EXPANDED LOWER GRADES. Only this route will now be sold. There are no Dianetic or Scientology single—triple or “Quickie Lower Grades” any more.

DIANETIC CLEAR:

There is such a state. It is not however attained by feeding people Scientology cognitions as was done in L.A. Only about 25% go actually Clear on Dianetics. A Dianetic Clear or any other Dianetic pc now goes on up through the grades of Scientology and onto the proper Clearing Course. The Dianetic Clear of Book I was clear of somatics. The Book I definition is correct. This is the End Phenomena of Dianetics as per the Class Chart and Book 1. 25%, no more, make Dianetic Clear

accidentally. They still need Expanded Lower Grades to make Scientology Clear. Becoming a Dianetic Clear does not stop them from getting Power Processing. Modern Power is to its total End Phenomena.

CLASSIFICATION CHART:

This chart “Classification and Gradation Chart” has been reissued many times. All issues are more or less valid. To save print, the processes run column appears in “Processes Taught” on the Auditor side of the Chart. All these processes and more are used in Expanded Lower Grades. The chart is *Valid*.

QUICKIE GRADES:

Persons were too demanding to be done quickly. On many cases these grades as given were valid but a large number of cases needed Expanded Lower Grades. 20 minutes from Grade 0 to IV and 5 minutes Power was far more than many could stand up to. These need a PROGRESS PGM and an ADVANCE PGM. This is true of persons at Va or R6EW or on CC or OT Levels. All these who haven’t fully made it need a PROGRESS PGM and an ADVANCE PGM “to pick up all the latent gain they missed”.

DIANETIC PCS:

Dianetic pcs should be audited on Dianetics until no somatics, then go up through Expanded Lower Grades to Power, R6EW, Clearing Course and OT Levels.

TRAINING:

Any pc who has trouble needs training and the amount of time required in Expanded Lower Grades and so on makes it cheaper to be trained.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH: sb .rd
Copyright © 1970
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 30 JUNE 1970R

(Revised 6 March 73. Changes on following three pages
in this type style.)

Remimeo

C/S Series 13R

VIII ACTIONS

(GF 40, IV Rundown, VIII
Case Supervision.)

Inevitably, when any new approach or process is released, some will instantly assume that all “older” (actually more *basic*) data has been cancelled. There is no statement to that effect. It is not guessed that this will be assumed and so we *could* lose an entire subject.

We did in fact lose Dianetics for a decade and all but lost Scientology in the following ten years.

A subject can be reorganized and made more workable. That was done in 1969 for Dianetics. BUT IT HAD NEVER BEEN UNWORKABLE!

The 1969 Dianetics Reorganization *refined* the 1962-63 discoveries of R-3-R. A better *communication* was made to the user and the preclear.

Amazingly, the reissue of Dianetics as Standard Dianetics caused about a dozen people (even in high places unfortunately) to at once assume that Dianetics wiped out any need for Power, Scientology Clearing or anything else! Even an unauthorized Policy Letter (not signed by me) and an HCO B (also not signed by me) gave this impression. They were of course cancelled the instant they were discovered to have been sent out.

This idea that the “old” is always cancelled by anything “new” has its root in the idea that a later order cancels earlier orders, which is true. But orders are one thing and Tech basics another.

What if, in the science of physics, a book by Professor Glumph came out, omitting the three laws of motion and gravity. It is assumed then that Newton’s laws are no longer valid. Because they are *old*. (Newton lived between 1642 and 1727.) So some young student engineer is baffled because bridges have *weight* and can’t work out gravity or motion! And he and his fellows begin to build without knowing these laws and there goes the whole of engineering and the culture itself!

This is no fantasy. As a college student in upper math I was utterly baffled by “calculus”. I couldn’t find out what it was for. Then I discovered it had been developed by Sir Isaac Newton, examined the basics and got the idea. My college text omitted *all* the basic explanations and even the authorship of the subject! Calculus today is really not enough used because it isn’t understood.

Anyway, here's the main surprise: Until 1970 the whole of Scientology was never in use in processing! Students had ridden along with the research line up into the OT sections, discarding the ladder behind them. For nearly 3 years an increasing proportion of preclears were not actually making it. The gradient to get them onto the bridge had been neglected as "old" when in fact they were not "old" but BASIC.

The amazement of auditors (and their delight) when the HCO B on Auditor's Rights (C/S Series 1) was released indicated that they had become "process oriented" with all the WHY gone.

VIII AUDITING

The 1968 VIII Standardization aimed actually at good TRs, auditing presence, and basics in auditor performance. VIII auditing was developed to handle the OT band.

It is entirely valid. Its only omission was detailed actions now developed as to how to handle a pc or Pre OT who had been pulled up the line and had fallen on his head.

Out Grades was spotted and discussed in detail in VIII auditing.

Giving lower grades fast was the only error. It was not realized in 1968 that End Phenomena of lower grades was not being required.

The re-release of the entire band of Academy and Saint Hill materials in 1970 is a re-emphasis on the *validity* and *necessity* of using it ALL on pcs! And in understanding the mind and life! And all this is quite welcome and very successful. Not noticed is that this whole band was never before presented for full *use* on *all* pcs. As I say, 1950-1969 auditors had been riding with the "newest and latest" because it was "popular". Only a few wise old-timers continued to use the most basic actions.

But just as VIII auditing was an unauthorized signal to suppress all that had been known before, so now, with the full release for use of Expanded Lower Grades, a few began to say that VIII auditing was now "old"!

One assumes then that some like to be able to say that something is now "old". Has a superior sort of ring to it, I guess. Anyway we'd better disregard this tendency to retire basics. It is more amusing than otherwise. So let's get on with the job.

RESISTIVE CASES

The RESISTIVE CASE rundown is an VIII development TO HANDLE THOSE WHO CANNOT MAKE THE GRADES.

It was put into the Green Form as GF 40 so as to preserve it.

To it could now be added "Overwhelmed". This would indicate need of Repair (Progress) and Return (Advance) Programs. But many other indicators exist already.

So when do you use a GF 40?

Let us say the pc has been run on Grade Zero. And at the Examiner cannot or does not attest.

One would first look for simple auditing errors in recent sessions. These would get reviewed and corrected.

One would then look for lower actions than Grade Zero that had been missed.

If it still seemed hard to figure out, one would use a GF 40, Resistive Cases.

In essence, if one adds “Overwhelm” to the GF 40 list you have on it all the reasons a pc won’t advance IF he has been run on all processes up to that point.

Overwhelm would indicate need of a Repair and Return.

Grade I, Problems, is the usual ordinary reason for no case advance.

Problems shows up as an out-rud in GF 40 and is simply put in as a rud not as a grade.

But if a Grade *II* or above has a Problem??? That means Grade I is out.

GF 40 remains even more plainly as a “When all else fails”.

It is used that way.

When a pc doesn’t attest, and all has been done for him otherwise, you use a GF 40.

This was its proper use in the first place.

All such materials except Rapid or Quickie Grades are valid.

And (joke) these remarks on GF 40 Resistive Cases do not wipe out “Repair and Return Programs”.

IV RUNDOWN

The so-called IV Rundown as taught on the VII Course is of course quite valid.

Originally developed to catch cases that had somehow gotten up to OT III and were falling on their heads, it is a collection of actions. It salvaged many cases.

The missing datum was that in recent times these cases were falsely reported to have had their lower grades. THEY, the cases themselves, said they had “had lower grades”. This made a mystery. The fact is, with multiple declare (declaring 0 to IV to the Examiner all at one time mostly without any mention of End Phenomena of the grade) these cases were OUT GRADE in the extreme.

The IV Rundown was an effort to catch it all up to make a real OT.

“Out Grades” didn’t read as it didn’t mean anything to the pc and besides “they’d all been rehabbed a dozen times anyway”. But nobody mentioned never having attained

any End Phenomena and the Class Chart was never really gotten IN IN IN in the first place.

You will find many pcs have had various parts of the “IV Rundown” run earlier.

For a while it was the fashion to use the IV Rundown or a part of it on any balky case at any level. At OT IV (which was an audited step and none of it really confidential) the C/S simply ordered run whatever was left of it not already run.

Somewhere on the case all of the IV Rundown still should be run. But of course that would now be on a Return (Advance) Program and well up the line.

If Repair-Return doesn’t get a grade made this is the time to do a IV Rundown. On (3) Valence Shifter—LX1, LX2, LX3 lists can be done in triple, recall, secondary, engram. Earlier Practices, Former Therapy can also be triple, recall, secondary, engram.

This is on Page 28 (not 23) of the original VIII Case Supervisor Manual and part of it is also now GF 40.

If a case really needs this he won’t be making a lower grade really so the GF 40 or its slightly wider OT IV Rundown can be used.

To both, “Overwhelmed by auditing” should be added in any future issue to indicate a needed repair action.

CASE SUPERVISOR ACTIONS

HCO B 10 Dec 1968, “Case Supervisor Actions” Confidential, VIIIs only, is still valid. It remains Confidential as it mentions some OT phenomena that would spin a *Grade Va*. However, some VIII C/S is going to be told that “Expanded Lower Grades changes all that”. It doesn’t.

Listen: In the next to last paragraph of the cover page of this manual (HCO B 10 Dec 68) it says:

“Standard Grades are not part of this set-up AS IT IS UNDERSTOOD THAT THE AUDITOR KNOWS THESE. Directions to do Standard Grades are written on a blank sheet.” (I have added the block letters for emphasis here.)

At the time this was written I had not discovered that Lower Grades were gone out of use and I let be published Triple Grades which seemed to condense all lower grades. The Major Process or Major Grade Process is definitely not enough to make a pc make a lower grade. I am sorry I gave any support at all to such an idea by not examining the whole scene when it began to show up. */ did find it and did correct it however when auditing statistics over the world showed the fault. (28 hours was the total weekly delivery of orgs!)*

If you add the dozens and dozens of Lower Grade Processes as given in Expanded Lower Grades to the VIII C/S HCO B of 10 Dec 68 and included this C/S Series and its new development of Repair (Progress) and Return (Advance) programs you would have the whole package of C/Sing.

So the VIII actions are *all* valid.

Auditor classes below VIII have this C/S Series. The AO C/S Course adds in the VIII actions as well.

Any C/S who does not know well *The Original Thesis, Dianetics: The Evolution of a Science, Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health, Scientology 8-80* and *Scientology 8-8008* will go badly astray. It is vital to know these books and others in this area, to know *what* one is trying to handle.

Class VI (SHSBC) tapes and bulletins are all valid and vital to Lower Grade auditing and C/Sing.

I trust this gives the C/S some idea of what is still “in”.

It all is.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH: dz.nt.rd
Copyright © 1970, 1973
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 3 JULY 1970

Remimeo

C/S Series 14

C/Sing 2 WAY COMM

The C/S is liable to make most of his C/S errors in C/Sing 2 Way Comm.

The reasons for this are

1. 2 way comm IS auditing.
2. The errors that can be made in any auditing can be made in 2 way comm;
3. Untrained or poorly trained auditors do not always respect 2 way comm as auditing.
4. Errors in 2 way comm become masked since the procedure is loose.
5. Earlier C/Ses on the case may have missed the easily missed 2 way comm errors.

RULES OF C/Sing 2 WAY COMM

- A. The C/S must recognize that 2 way comm *is* auditing. Therefore it follows all the rules of auditing.
- B. Any error that occurs in other auditing can occur in 2 way comm auditing. Errors in a 2 way comm session must be carefully looked for as they easily can be masked in the worksheet.
- C. Auditors must be persuaded by the C/S to make notation of *auditing* essentials in 2 way comm as of senior importance to pc's text (which is also made note of in the W/S).
- D. The questions asked in 2 way comm can be very incorrect just as rote processes can be.
- E. An auditor must be trained as a 2 way comm auditor (Class II). Otherwise he will Evaluate, Q and A and commit other faults.
- F. If an ARC Break occurs early in a 2 way comm session and is not handled as such the rest of the session is audited over an ARC Break and can put a pc into a sad effect.

- G. A pc with a PT problem not being handled in the 2 way comm will get no gain.
 - H. A pc with a W/H in a 2 way comm session will become critical, nattery and/or get a dirty needle.
 - I. Two way comm processes must be flattened to F/N. If an F/N doesn't occur then the subject didn't read in the first place or the auditor Qed and Aed or evaluated or changed the subject or the TRs were out or the pc's ruds were out.
 - J. A two way comm subject chosen must be tested for read in that session before being used for 2 way comm.
 - K. Improper 2 way comm questions can plunge the pc into an out rud situation not then handled. "Is anything upsetting you?" or any mention of upsets by the auditor is the same as asking for an ARC Break. "Has anything been troubling—worrying you lately?" is the same as asking for a PTP. "Who aren't you talking to?" is asking for W/Hs.
 - L. The subject of major processes should be kept out of 2 way comm C/Ses, auditors' questions and 2 way comm assessment lists (ARC Brks, Problems, overts, changes or any major auditing subject, as they are too heavy, being the buttons of the bank).
 - M. The C/S should only let Class II or above auditors do 2 way comm sessions.
 - N. A rud going out in a two way comm session must be put in by the auditor.
 - O. A 2 way comm session should end in an F/N.
 - P. Auditors whose 2 way comm sessions do not end in F/N must be taught to check the subject for read before using, not to Q and A, not to Evaluate and given a refresher on 2 way comm tapes and HCO Bs.
 - Q. In a 2 way comm session that flubs the C/S must be careful to isolate the errors just as in any other auditing session that flubs and put them right.
 - R. A 2 way comm subject that reads on test and doesn't F/N on 2 way comm must be checked for O/R (if TA went up) and rehabbed by the 1965 Rehab method, or Prepchecked or just continued.
-

The whole point to all of this is that a 2 way comm session IS auditing. It is delivered by the auditor, C/Sed and remedied like any other session.

Also it is usually being run on a delicate pc who is more affected by errors than pcs being given other processes.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH: sb.rd
Copyright © 1970
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[This HCO B is amended by BTB 10 July 1970, *2-Way Comm-A Class III Action*, which is based on LRH C/Ses. It says, “Rules E and M are changed from ‘Class II’ to ‘Class III’.”]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 16 AUGUST 1970
(Corrected and re-issued 3 Nov 1970)

Remimeo
Dn Checksheet
Class III
Class VI
C/S Checksheet

C/S Series 15

**GETTING THE F/N TO EXAMINER
(High, Low TAs and Chronic Somatics)**

If after an F/N session end the pc's TA goes up, as at the Examiner's in an org, the pc is afflicted with unflat Engram Chains.

All High TAs depend on unflat or restimulated engram chains.

TAs go high on Overrun because the overrun restimulates engram chains not yet run.

Engram (or secondary or lock) chains can be keyed out. This does not mean they stay out. In a few minutes or hours or days or years they can key back in.

A pc will also de-stimulate in from 3 to 10 days usually. This means he "settles out". Thus a pc can be overrun into new engram chains (by life or an auditor), TA goes up, 3 to 10 days later the TA comes down.

When a pc is audited to F/N VGIs and then a few minutes later has a high TA the usual reasons are

1. Has had his comm chopped or full Dianetic or Scientology End Phenomena not reached or
2. Has been run on an unread item or subject or
3. Is overwhelmed or
4. Has a lot of engrams keying in or
5. Has been run in the past without full erasure of engrams or attaining End Phenomena.
6. Lists badly done or other misauditing cause a pc to feel bad and key in chains also.
7. A pc can be audited when too tired or too late at night.

The solution to any of these is easy—on (1) always see that the pc attains full EP, particularly on engram chains. On (2) make auditors check for read even in two-way comm subjects, list questions or Dianetic items before running them. On (3) see also (2)

and get the pc a proper Progress (Repair) Program. On (4) Repair or isolate pc so his PT isn't so ferocious looking (meaning Repair [Progress] Pgm him well or let him change his environment and then audit him) or (5) look into his folder to see who audited him on so many chains when, with no real erasure or EP. (6) You use Repair lists (like L4A, LIB, etc) and other usual action. On (7) you make the pc get some rest and if he can't, make him go for a walk away until he is tired and *then* walk back and get some sleep.

All these really add up to keyed in or unflat engram chains. Whether the pc can handle them depends on Repair and the usual.

Of all these the past auditing without attaining EP on engram chains (whether done in Dianetics or Scientology) is a usual reason for a much audited pc to have a high TA.

The answers to any high TA that won't come down and to any pc who continually arrives at Examiner after an F/N VGI session end with his TA UP are

- A. Faulty auditing not letting pc go to Full Dn EP when running engrams.
- B. A false auditing report (PR type report meaning promoting instead of auditing).
- C. Too many engram chains in past restim by life or auditing.

Any correct Standard Dianetic Auditing will eventually handle. But it is usual to do a PICTURE REMEDY (see HCO B 5 June 1969).

A pc who has a *chronic somatic* would get programmed like this:

- I Repair (Progress) Pgm until pc feeling better.
- II Picture Remedy with all reading and interest items Dn triple full Dn EP.
- III Health Form—with all reading and interest items Dn triple full Dn EP.
- IV Somatics of the area with all reading and interest items Dn triple full Dn EP.
- V Run the engram chain of the incident (operation, accident, etc) he believes caused it. R3R triple.
- VI HF to F/N on the HF itself and attest full Dianetic result as per Class Chart.

That's maybe 50 hours, all done in Dianetic triples, of course, in steps II to VI.

IF the Dianetic Auditing is standard and to Dianetic EP (F/N Cog VGIs) you will see this pattern at the Examiner or a few minutes after session.

First few sessions

TA 4.0 or more at Exam. Doubtful GIs.

Next few

TA 3.75 and blowing down to 3.25 at Exam. GIs.

Next few

TA 3.75 BD to F/N at Exam. GIs to VGIs.

Next two or three

TA 3.5 BD to F/N at Exams VGIs.

Finally

TA 2.5 F/N VGIs at the Examiner.

Another pass at the HF finds it F/N and pc can and will attest Dianetics.

That's what you would expect to see if the Auditing was standard, if the case was straightened out of past flubs in the Repair step. Errors such as running unreadings items or firefights caused by out TRs or false auditing reports or Dn EP not reached at session end or pc needing ruds put in at session starts would prevent this pattern from happening at the Examiner's. So if the pattern doesn't happen you know the auditing is goofy or something is out which had better be found. One pc for instance had a huge w/h of having a disease and was audited over it for 2 years = auditing over a w/h and PTP = no case gain. Silly pc. But also a very dull C/S not to alert to some outness there and find it. Another pc had a high TA and the fault was just that she never got any auditing at all! So they kept operating on her! Somebody didn't know Dianetics and auditing was for USE.

HIGH TA AND ILLNESS

Pcs with high TAs feel ill and get ill.

No use to elaborate on that. It's just a fact and is THE fact about pcs who get ill. So maybe you see why this HCOB is important!

LOW TA AT EXAM

Pcs with low TAs are more or less in apathy.

If it F/N VGIs at session end and is low at Exam (like 1.9) (OR if it went low in session and didn't F/N), then the pc is

- (a) overwhelmed and needs auditing and life repair
- (b) can have been run on a flat or unreadings item that invalidated his former win.

Example: Pc listed on an unreadings list few sessions later worrying about it and coming to Exam with low TA. Repair is the answer. Low TA pcs need a Life Repair also.

Note: The new Hubbard Consultant Assessment List is now under test at this writing and may become essential as a pre-repair function and if so would be before repair in the chronic somatic list of actions as a pgm.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 21 AUGUST 1970

Remimeo
C/S Checksheets
Checksheets
Dn Checksheet

C/S Series 16

**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 Misunderstands of tech.
2. Cleaning up willingness to audit.
3. Cleaning up overts on people and pcs.
4. Examination by inspection of TRs.
5. Starrating 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 misunderstandings 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 done and the very well done 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

LRH:rr.rd
Copyright © 1970
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 26 AUGUST 1970

Remimeo
C/S Book
Class VIII Checksheet
Class VIII

C/S Series 17

INCOMPLETE CASES

OVERSHOOTING and UNDERSHOOTING are two very defeating errors in C/Sing.

OVERSHOOTING would be defined as going beyond a completion or completing a completion.

In such a circumstance the pc for instance reaches an F/N VGI point in Review and *then* the C/S decides to handle the case in Review.

Example: 2 or 3 sessions have been goofed. Review patches them all up to F/N VGIs all okay. Then a C/S C/Ses to Review the case to repair the errors. The case feels invalidated, caves in, needs further repair.

I have seen more than one folder where this cycle has been done three times! In one of these an action had to be taken to patch up a goof so the pc could go back onto a grade. The goof was patched up to F/N VGIs. The correct action would have been to put the pc back on the incomplete grade. But no, a *new* Review cycle was laid out, audited, pc caved in. A *new* cycle to repair this was entered in upon. It was successful. The pc got F/N VGIs at Exam. The C/S ordered a *new* Review of the case, the case caved in, was then patched up and finally got an F/N VGIs. And was ordered to be reviewed

.....

Studying what was wrong with the cases I found the above. I ordered an assessment of a list, got “unnecessary actions” and got the cases back onto *the incomplete cycle of the grade* and they did fine.

This can be done with a grade. It was the fault of early Power.

UNDERSHOOTING would be to leave a cycle incomplete and go off to something else.

Example: Case sent to Review or given a Review session to repair goofs. One goof is handled but there are three to handle. Case returned to the grade before being set up.

This can be so bad that the case never made *any* grade at all.

The modern Repair (Progress) Pgm as outlined in this C/S series takes care of this.

QUICKIE GRADES AND ACTIONS

Quickie grades left us with a totality of incomplete cases.

You look over a folder and you see the pc at “OT IV”. The folder is *thick*. He has had lots of auditing. He has aches and pains, problems, makes people wrong.

Probably he could be audited for another thousand hours without ever coming right! Unless there was an orderly program to complete his case level by level on the Class and Grade Chart.

It would take a Repair (Progress) Pgm and then an Advance Pgm that included each grade to completion.

He would have to have his ruds put in, any flubs at once handled session to session, just to complete Dianetics. Finally, his chronic somatics gone, he would F/N on the Health Form and that would complete his Dianetics with his attestation.

And so on right on up the Grades, each one done fully to the voluntary declare for that grade as per the Grade and Class Chart.

In doing Dianetics, Grades, etc you still have to get in ruds and handle the case so it is set up for each major action and repair the flubs at once when they occur.

While completing an action you have to keep the case running, not audit over ARC Brks, PTPs, W/Hs and flubs.

The best answer is NO FLUBS. But when they occur they must be repaired in 24 hours.

When repaired (and not re-repaired and re-re-repaired with overshoots) you get the case back on the same cycle that was incomplete.

COMPLETE CASES

A case is not complete unless the lowest incomplete Grade Chart action is complete and then each completed in turn on up.

As you look over current folders who have had years of auditing, some of them you generally don't find *any* completed actions and you do find overshoots on Reviews.

It is not the least bit hard to handle these cases. This C/S series shows you how. Auditing and Life Repairs (Progress), Advance Pgm completing fully each incomplete grade.

The C/S is blessed who follows these two rules:

RECOGNIZE A COMPLETION OF AN ACTION AND END IT OFF.

RECOGNIZE AN INCOMPLETE ACTION AND COMPLETE IT.

Don't overshoot, don't undershoot.

Follow the rules.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:rr.rd
Copyright © 1970
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 11 SEPTEMBER 1970

Remimeo
Dn Checksheet

Class III

Class VI

Class VIII

C/S Checksheet

C/S Series 18

**CHRONIC SOMATIC,
DIANETIC HANDLING OF**

The full Dianetic handling of the pc who has a chronic somatic is given in the HCO B C/S Series No. 15, of 16 August 1970, "*Getting the F/N to Examiner*".

This HCO B calls the fact to attention. It could get overlooked or be hard to find again as the title of HCO B 16 August does not indicate it directly.

LRH: sb.rd
Copyright © 1970
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 6 OCTOBER 1970

Remimeo
C/S Hats
C/S checksheet

C/S Series 19

FOLDER ERROR SUMMARIES

A folder error summary, (FES) is usually done by a student especially an interne well taught, learning his practical tech or by an auditor especially hired to do FESs.

It requires many hours to put a folder in sequence and then to list all errors in it.

It should NEVER be done by a working C/S who is responsible for an org's delivery flow.

COST

It is costly to do an FES and where possible the cost, duly consulting the pc, should be borne by the pc as a special service.

It can be directly paid for or simply deducted from auditing hours purchased.

NECESSITY

A good C/S looking over a folder usually goes back to the last time the pc was doing really well and notes actions necessary from that point.

Programs of a lengthily audited case (fat folder) usually cover LIB, L3A, L4A lists and usually take up 2-way comm on earliest sessions and earliest auditing ever given (for auditors). Thus an FES is not vital in all cases.

I like to have an FES done so I can compare areas covered by the pc in 2-way comm and be sure they come up in subsequent repair sessions.

Also where I can see a lot of bad lists existed, I want to be able to assure they get handled.

Thus an FES is *useful*.

On Flag, an FES is carefully done so as to detect areas of out tech in the world. This is called "the Flub Catch System".

Auditors and C/Ses so detected are sent to cramming in their areas to smooth out their tech knowledge or TRs, all to improve delivery of tech.

Flub Catch makes an FES vital on Flag.

Higher orgs have a similar interest in an FES.

HALTING DELIVERY

To halt delivery because of a missing folder or to do a long time-consuming FES is of course contrary to the need to deliver auditing and can result in a no-auditing situation worse than a Blind Repair.

BLIND REPAIR

When no FES is done, one is doing a Blind Repair. The Progress Pgm and Advance Pgm may have holes in them.

However there are only five areas of danger:

1. Flubbed lists.
2. A bad series of evaluative sessions should be detected and directly handled.
3. Flubbed Power.
4. Extended or flubbed Interiorization.
5. Missed grades.

If a C/S doesn't know about these it may be that the case will not properly repair and he also does not know what Advance Program to do.

But as these *are* specific areas they can be done on a Blind Repair by making them into a list and getting them meter checked.

Example: Pc has lost his folder. Has been audited for several years on and off. One can clear the idea of lists "Someone written down items you say to a question" and see if it gets a read and if so do L4A Method Three "On Lists". One can ask if any auditor ever told the pc what to think and if that reads 2-way comm or prepcheck those sessions by that auditor. Power can be checked by rehab unless the person has gone Clear on the Clearing Course since at which time Power will not need repair. The commands of Interiorization Rundown can be checked with 2-way comm or rehabbed. What won't rehab you run. Missed Grades can be checked, rehabbed or run including any Expanded Grades. The pc usually recognizes the process if it has been run.

Thus one can wander through a Blind Repair without fouling up the case and add to it the inevitable actions common to all Progress Pgms.

SUMMARY

An FES has value. It is valuable to the pc to get one done. It is a long and extensive action. It can be sold directly or removed from hours bought. It is of vast

interest in training auditors and should be done by already trained internes or specially hired auditors. It is NOT done by a C/S and it is NOT used to halt all delivery of auditing and jam up the C/S lines. A lost or delayed folder is not a barrier to a *very* well trained C/S who has starrated a C/S Course. An FES is very useful and tends to eradicate any mystery for a C/S.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH: sb.td
Copyright ©1970
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 8 OCTOBER 1970

Remimeo
C/Ses
All Auditors
Level 0
HGC Checksheet

C/S Series 20

PERSISTENT F/N

A FLOATING NEEDLE can *persist*.

This fact tells you at once why you cannot do three major actions in a row in the same ten minutes.

This was the bug behind “Quickie Grades” (0 to IV in one session. This also occurred in Power when it was run all in one day). The auditor would attain a bona fide full dial F/N. The pc was still cogniting, still in a big win. The auditor would “clear the next process command”, he would see an F/N. He would “clear the next process command”, and see an F/N.

BUT IT WAS THE SAME F/N!

Result was that processes 2 and 3 WERE NEVER RUN ON THE CASE.

This is really what is meant by “Quickie Grades”.

In 1958 we got real Releases. You could not kill the F/N for *days, weeks*.

Several processes had this effect. Today’s real Clear also goes this way. You couldn’t kill the F/N with an axe.

By running a lot of Level Zero processes, for instance, you can get a real swinging unkillable F/N.

It not only gets to the Examiner, it comes in at the start of the next day’s session!

Now if in one session you ran all of Level Zero and went on up to Level One, you would just be *auditing a persistent F/N*. The pc would get no benefit at all from Level One. He’s still going “Wow” on Level Zero.

If you ran Level Zero with one process that got a big wide floating F/N and then “ran” Level I, II, III and IV, you would have just a Level Zero Release. The pc’s bank was nowhere to be found. So next week he has problems (Level I) or a Service Fac (Level IV) and he is only a Grade Zero yet it says right there in Certs and Awards log he’s a Grade IV. So now we have a “Grade IV” who has Level I, II, III and IV troubles!

A session that tries to go beyond a big dial-wide drifting floating F/N only distracts the pc from his win. BIG WIN.

Any *big win* (F/N dial-wide, Cog, VGIs) gives you this kind of persistent F/N.

You at least have to let it go until tomorrow and let the pc have his win.

That is what is meant by letting the pc *have* his win. When you get one of these dial-wide F/Ns, Cog, VGIs WOW you may as well pack it up for the day.

GRADUAL WIDENING

In running a Dianetic chain to basic in triple you will sometimes see in one session a half dial on Flow 1, 3/4 of a dial on Flow 2, a full dial on Flow 3.

Or you may have 4 subjects to two-way comm or prepcheck in one session. First action 1/3 dial F/N. Then no F/N, TA up. Second action 1/2 dial F/N. Then no F/N. Third action 3/4 dial F/N. Fourth action full dial-wide floating swinging idling F/N.

You will also notice in the same session-long time for 1st action, shorter, shorter, shorter for the next three actions.

Now you have an F/N that anything you try to clear and run will just F/N WITHOUT AFFECTING THE CASE AT ALL.

If you audit past that you are wasting your time and processes.

You have hit an “unkillable F/N”, properly called a persistent F/N. It’s persistent at least for that day. Do any more and it’s wasted.

If an auditor has never seen this he had better get his TR0 bullbait flat for 2 hours at one unflunked go and his other TRs in and drill out his flubs. For that’s what’s supposed to happen.

F/Ns on pcs audited up to (for that session) a persistent F/N always get to the Examiner.

If you only have a “small F/N” it won’t get to the Examiner. However, on some pcs maybe that’s good enough. May take him several sessions, each one getting a final session F/N a bit wider. Then he gets an F/N that gets to the Examiner. After that, well audited on a continuing basis, the F/N lasts longer and longer.

One day the pc comes into session with a dial-wide floating swinging F/N and anything you say or do does nothing whatever to disturb that F/N.

It’s a real Release man. It may last weeks, months, years.

Tell him to come back when he feels he needs some auditing and chalk up the remaining hours (if sold by the hour) as undelivered. Or if sold by result, chalk up the result.

If the F/N is truly persistent he will have no objections. If it isn't, he *will* object. So have him come back tomorrow and carry on whatever you were doing.

SUMMARY

The technical bug back of Quickie Grades or Quickie Power was the Persistent F/N.

This is not to be confused with a Stage 4 (sweep, stick, sweep, stick) or an ARC Broke needle (pc Bad Indicators while F/Ning).

This is not to be used to refuse all further auditing to a pc.

It is to be used to determine when to end a series of major actions in a session.

LRH: rr.rd
Copyright © 1970
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 10 NOVEMBER 1970

Remimeo
All Class VIIIs
C/S Checksheet
ADD TO CKSHTS

*IMPORTANT
URGENT*

C/S Series 21

C/S RESPONSIBILITY FOR TRAINING

The C/S is fully and entirely responsible for the ability of his auditors to audit. This has been true for 20 years but it gets neglected. This neglect gives us (a) Flubby Auditing (b) Fad tech.

If auditing is flubby it is the C/S who is responsible. In the first place he permitted bad course training without screaming. In the second place he does not persuade or force auditors to correct their tech in cramming after flubs.

Since flubby auditing is the primary reason for no results, an area where tech is bad tends to ride fads or grab “the newest and latest” and hope it will crack cases whereas doing the usual without flubs is what cracks the cases.

If I find an auditor whose sessions I am C/Sing has failed to flatten a chain, I assume not that the pc is difficult but that the auditor does not know about (1) Only running items that read, (2) Multiple somatics, (3) Narrative chains and that his TRs are bad. I spot what it is from the session worksheet and say what it is and order the auditor to cramming (or to be crammed if there is no cramming) on the materials *and* on TRs always.

I cannot C/S with flubby auditors. The pile of C/S folders grows. Any review has to be reviewed and my C/Ses just aren’t getting done. If auditors I am C/Sing for are green I can count on a 4+ times increase in my C/Sing time. If my auditors are flubby C/Sing that should require 1½ hours takes 6½ hours. This is by actual timing.

I have no objection to working with green or newly trained auditors. BUT IF I DO I RETRAIN THEM.

The C/S who accepts an auditor from any course as a trained auditor is an optimist.

There are three *training* stages.

- A. Course Study, theory and practical.
- B. Student Auditing.

C. Professional Auditing.

The C/S has to do with C. When A and B are very poor the job at C is much harder so the C/S should call it forcefully to attention of Course Supervisors. And *then* get a fast retrain going under himself.

Retraining is an inevitable part of a C/S's job. No matter how good the course may have been the actual practice of auditing gives the new auditor different importance values. Also his hat has changed from a student hat to a real auditor's hat.

As a C/S works with an auditor he trains him. He also may order the new auditor audited.

Essentially the C/S has to shift the new auditor's hat from a "what's it say?" to a "Now I do."

With a whole green crew of auditors I give as a C/S a daily auditors' conference. I make sure my Tech Services is on the ball so auditors get in 5 or 6 hours in 5 or 6 hours, not in 10 or 12 hours while they wait for pcs or go find them. That gives them auditor admin and study time. Then I can have a conference. This conference does not violate any ivory tower as I don't C/S on their data of pcs. I find their questions and get them answered and I give them the reasons behind certain C/Ses.

Then daily daily daily I meet any flub with an order to cramming on the material flubbed and on TRs. And I keep their overts pulled.

A green auditor with me as a C/S has a very arduous time of it. There is no invalidation. Quite the contrary. The message is YOU CAN AUDIT. YOU CAN GET RESULTS. GET WISED UP AND GET ON WITH IT.

One flub, one retrain in cramming.

A lot of auditors are around who learned to audit with me as a C/S after their training. In the majority of cases they became fantastic auditors. In some few cases they went elsewhere before they could be fully trained.

The magic of it all is simply: 1 flub, 1 retrain in cramming on that point.

Mostly I didn't even pull them off the pc.

The fuzzy muzzy state of most graduated students needs handling. It is handled by the C/S.

The object of a C/S is to handle and improve cases. He can't do that with flubby auditors. So he has to make auditors out of students. If he does he can then achieve his object.

If the C/S wears this part of his hat he really wins. He seldom has to unravel anything tough. He just C/Ses and the auditors audit EVENTUALLY. But every new auditor he gets is certain to lengthen the C/S's working day and lessen his results unless the C/S realizes that there is ON THE JOB TRAINING and gets it done.

Training includes the auditor's *staff* hat and his knowledge of Tech and Qual Divisions. This would be true even in a Franchise or the field. They might not have the divisions but they have all the functions!

Recently a C/S had to get about 60 people audited fast. She had seven auditors assigned. She did not assure that these auditors were knowledgeable on the courses they had had and she did not wear the training hat of a C/S. She wound up with herself and one auditor doing the whole 60. The excuse was, the other auditors "couldn't audit".

It would have been far faster in terms of audited pc-hours to have rapidly crash-programmed the seven auditors through a refresher, cleaned up their misunderstandings and overts in a co-audit and then, using them, to shove them into cramming on the materials of any flub and TRs for each goof. She would have made seven auditors into stars and she would have gotten the 60 pcs fully audited completely and rapidly with minimal flubs. She would have had 60 Dianetic and Expanded Grade completions, 60 terrific beings AND IN LESS TIME.

Morale goes to pot only when auditors do not get results.

Her basic error was assuming auditors should be able to audit. This isn't true of any auditor who has not served an apprenticeship under a competent C/S.

An auditor who has been auditing 10 years, when he starts to audit for me the first time, I put on my C/S training hat and no matter how good or how poor he was when he began I make him a better auditor.

A C/S who doesn't do this is letting the team down and badly.

A C/S who doesn't do this will spend hours daily trying to puzzle out the solution to messes made.

A C/S who doesn't do this fills up a field with flubbed cases regardless of his own skill in C/Sing. He is liable to sink into doubt, then treason and blow.

The C/S who wears his training hat and does do this leads a smooth life, is respected by his auditors and is valuable beyond gold.

To do this a C/S must himself be able to audit and to know his materials well enough to state which ones have to be crammed and never introduce strange ideas.

Such a C/S will never have a revolt and will never have to dream something up or ride new fads because he is getting excellent results straight along for a happy org and public.

I trust a C/S to do this.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.rd
Copyright © 1970
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 28 NOVEMBER 1970

Remimeo
Class VIIIs
Class VIII Chksheet

C/S Series 22

PSYCHOSIS

Through a slight change of procedure on certain preclears I have been able to view the underlying motives and mechanisms of psychosis.

Very possibly this is the first time the mechanisms which bring about insanity have been fully viewed. I must say that it requires a bit of confronting.

The alleviation of the condition of insanity has also been accomplished now and the footnote in *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* concerning future research into this field can be considered fulfilled.

The things a C/S should know about insanity are as follows:

HIGHER PERCENT

About 15% to 20% of the human race apparently is insane or certainly a much higher percent than was estimated.

The truly insane do not necessarily act insane visibly. They are not the psychiatric obvious cases who go rigid for years or scream for days. This is observed only in the last stages or during temporary stress.

Under apparent social behavior the continual crimes knowingly committed by the insane are much more vicious than ever has been catalogued in psychiatric texts.

The actions of the insane are not "unconscious". They are completely aware of what they are doing.

All insane actions are entirely justified and seem wholly rational to them. As they have no reality on the harmful and irrational nature of their conduct it does not often register on an E-Meter.

The product of their post duties is destructive but is excused as ignorance or errors.

As cases in normal processing they roller coaster continually.

They nearly always have a fixed emotional tone. It does not vary in nearly all insane people. In a very few it is cyclic, high then low.

All characteristics classified as those of the “suppressive person” are in fact those of an insane person.

The easiest ways for a C/S to detect the insane are:

1. Pretending to do a post or duties, the real consistent result is destructive to the group in terms of breakage, lost items, injured business, etc.
2. The case is no case gain or roller coaster and is covered under “PTS symptoms”.
3. They are usually chronically physically ill.
4. They have a deep but carefully masked hatred of anyone who seeks to help them.
5. The result of their “help” is actually injurious.
6. They often seek transfers or wish to leave.
7. They are involved in warfare with conflicts around them which are invisible to others. One wonders how they can be so involved or get so involved in so much hostility.

TYPES

The German psychiatric 1500 or so “different types of insanity” are just different symptoms of the same cause. There is only one insanity and from it springs different manifestations. Psychiatry erred in calling these different types and trying to invent different treatments.

DEFINITION

Insanity can now be precisely defined.

The definition is:

INSANITY IS THE OVERT OR COVERT BUT ALWAYS COMPLEX AND CONTINUOUS DETERMINATION TO HARM OR DESTROY.

Possibly the only frightening thing about it is the cleverness with which it can be hidden.

Whereas a sane person can become angry or upset and a bit destructive for short periods, he or she recovers. The insane mask it, are misemotional continuously and do not recover. (Except by modern processing.)

THE NATURE OF MAN

Man is basically good. This is obvious. For when he begins to do evil he seeks to destroy his memory in order to change and seeks to destroy his body. He seeks to check his evil impulses by inhibiting his own skill and strength.

He can act in a very evil fashion but his basic nature then makes it mandatory that he lessens himself in many ways.

The towering “strength” of a madman is a rarity and is compensated by efforts at self-destruction.

Man’s mortality, his “one life” fixation, all stem from his efforts to check himself, obliterate his memory in a fruitless effort to change his conduct and his self-destructive habits and impulses and losses of skills and abilities.

As this rationale proves out completely in processing and fits all cases observed, we have for the first time proof of his actual nature.

As only around 20% are insane, and as those who previously worked in the mental field were themselves mainly insane, Man as a whole has been assigned an evil repute. Governments, where such personalities exist, listen to the opinion of the insane and apply the characteristic of 20% to the entire hundred percent.

This gives an 80% wrong diagnosis. Which is why mental science itself was destructive when used by states.

TECHNIQUES

The only technique available at this writing which will benefit the insane is contained in all the overt-motivator sequences and Grade II technology.

At Flag at this writing new improvement on this exists but it is so powerful that slight errors in use can cause a psychotic break in the insane. It therefore will only be exported for use by specially trained persons and this programming will require quite a while.

MEANWHILE it helps the C/S to know and use these firm rules:

ALWAYS RUN DIANETIC TRIPLES.

Never run Singles. The overt side (Flow 2) is vital. If you only run Flow 1 Motivators, the pc will not recover fully. Further running Flow 1 (Motivator only) any psychotic being processed will not recover but may even trigger into a psychotic break. If one never ran anything but motivators, psychotic manifestations would not erase.

DEPEND ON EXPANDED GRADE II TECHNOLOGY TO EASE OFF OR HANDLE THE INSANE.

Don’t keep asking what’s been done to him as he’ll trigger.

A new discovery on this is that when you run out the motivator the person gets a higher reality on his overts. If you ran out all his motivators he would have no reason for his overts. If these are not then run out he might cave himself in.

PATTERN OF BEHAVIOR

The APPARENT pattern of insane behavior is to come in (ask for processing, go on staff, etc) with the advertised intention of being helped or helping, then mess up either as a pc or on post, then state how bad it all is and leave. It looks obvious enough. He came, found it bad, left.

That is only the APPARENT behavior. APPARENT REASONS.

Based on numerous cases, this is the real cycle. Hearing of something good that might help these hateful awful rotten nasty people, the psycho comes in, wrecks this, upsets that, caves in this one, chops up that one and WHEN SOMEBODY SAYS "NO!" the psychotic either

- (a) Caves himself in physically or
- (b) Runs away.

The psychotic is motivated by intent to harm.

If he realizes he is harming things he shouldn't, he caves himself in. If he is afraid he will be found out, he runs.

In the psychotic the impulse is quite conscious.

CONCLUSION

None of this is very nice. It is hard to confront. Even I find it so.

Freud thought all men had a hidden monster in them for he dealt mainly with the psychotic and their behavior was what he saw.

All men are not like this. The percentage that are is greater than I supposed but is a long way from all men.

Sometimes one only becomes aware of these when things are getting worked on and improved. They stay on as long as it can be made bad or there is hope it can be destroyed. Then when attention is given to improvement they blow.

Artists, writers often have these types hanging around them as there is someone or something there to be destroyed. When success or failure to destroy or possible detection appears on the scene they blow, often as destructively as possible.

Orgs are subjected to a lot of this. A psychotic sometimes succeeds in blowing off good staff. And then sooner or later realizes how evil he is acting and sickens or leaves.

The society is not geared to any of this at all. The insane walk around wrecking the place and decent people think it's "human nature" or "inevitable" or a "bad childhood".

As of this writing the insane can be handled. The proof of any pudding is the processing. And this is successful. It is also rather swift. But, as I say, it is so swift the special technique has to be done by the specially trained flubless auditor.

For a long while I've realized that we would have to be able to handle insane people as the psychiatrist is fading. I have had opportunity to work on the problem. And have it handled. Until it is fully released, the C/S will benefit greatly from knowing the above as these come on his lines far more often than he has suspected.

The insane can be helped. They are not hopeless.

I trust this data will be of use.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH: rr.rd
Copyright © 1970
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[Referred to by HCO B 10 May 1972, *Robotism*, Volume VIII, page 127.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

Remimeo
Int RD
Checksheet

HCO BULLETIN OF 17 DECEMBER 1971R
(HCO B 2 December 1970 Revised)
(Revised 30 March 1974)

C/S Series 23RA

INTERIORIZATION SUMMARY

(Revised and updated to include 1971 Int HCO Bs)

All changes are in this type style.

INTERIORIZATION CAN BE BADLY MISRUN.

The following HCO Bs cover Interiorization Rundowns.

HCO B 5 Mar 1971	“Exteriorization and High TA”
HCO B 11 Apr 1970	“Auditing Past Exterior”
HCO B 6 May 1970	“Blows—Auditing Past Exterior”
HCO B 30 May 1970	“Interiorization Intensive—2-Way Comm”
HCO B 20 Aug 1970	“Exteriorization Rundown Musts”
HCO B 24 Sept 1971	“Urgent—Interiorization Rundown”
HCO B 29 Oct 1971	“Int Rundown Correction List Revised”
HCO B 16 Dec 1971	C/S Series 35R (Revised) “Interiorization Errors”
HCO B 17 Dec 1971R	C/S Series 23RA (this HCO B)

The examination of Interiorization Rundowns done in the field discloses that some auditors engaged in running it have not been fully checked out on it. HCO PL 26 Aug 1965 gives the correct way to do a starrate checkout. Clay demos must also be correctly done. These are covered in HCO B 11 Oct 1967 and HCO B 30 Oct 1970. These HCO Bs on Int Rundown, Starrates and Clay Demos plus HCO PL 20 July 1970, Issue III, 2-WC as below, make the necessary pack for checking out an auditor before letting him near an Int Rundown. And all Interiorization materials as above MUST BE CHECKED OUT STARRATE AND IN CLAY before a C/S permits one of his auditors to run it on a pc.

QUADS CANCELLED

“The disadvantages of Quad Dianetics outweigh any advantages in actual practice.

“Flow Zero is therefore cancelled as part of Dianetics and Lower Grades. (LRH HCO B 15 July 71, “Quads Cancelled”.)

UNNECESSARY

“The words ‘went in’ and ‘go in’ MUST be said to the pc and cleared on the meter. If there is needle action, one runs an Int RD as per the Int Rundown Pack.

“If there aren’t any reads one does NOT do an Int Rundown on the pc as it is unnecessary and classifies as ‘running an unreadable item’.

“When this test is omitted you get an unnecessary Int RD being done on a pc.

“This will eventually have to be repaired.

“FLUBBED R3R

“When the auditor does not do flubless auditing errors occur in the auditing itself. These will hang up an Int RD.

“OVERRUN

“It *usually* happens that an Int RD is overrun. It goes flat on Secondary F2, let us say. The auditor keeps on going past the win.

“This will hang up the Rundown.

“One of the ways an overrun occurs is the pc goes exterior during it. Yet the auditor keeps on.

“Another way is pc has a big Cog, big win. Auditor keeps going on with the RD.” —LRH
(HCO B 24 Sept 71, “*Urgent—Interiorization Rundown*”)

REPAIR OF INT

“If even years after an Int RD the pc has a high TA or a low TA, then Int trouble is at once suspected and the original Int RD and any repair of it is suspected and must *be handled*. —LRH (From the LRH original HCO B C/S Series 35R, Revised 16 Dec 71, “*Interiorization Errors*”) (Handle it by HCO B 29 Oct 71, “Int Rundown Correction List Revised”.)

TWO-WAY COMM

There is a two-way comm step that follows a day or so after an Interiorization Rundown .

An auditor doing this step, preferably the same auditor, MUST BE CHECKED OUT ON TWO-WAY COMM.

No C/S should permit any auditor to do any 2-way comm until the auditor has been checked out on HCO PL 20 July 1970, Issue III, “Two-Way Comm Checksheets”. One can obtain these tapes easily from Pubs (as the Sea Org has recently forced in this line and quality and delivery). Pending such tapes one can certainly get the rest of the materials on the checksheet done by the auditor and let him do 2-way comm while being very watchful as a C/S.

C/SING INT

The correcting of an Interiorization Rundown is far harder than making sure that auditors can do the usual in the first place.

Nearly all a C/S’s hard work comes from auditors not well trained on courses (indifferent courses) and failing to check auditors out well on the materials *before* permitting them to deliver a new rundown.

The correction of Int is hard since until it is complete, other auditing is inadvisable. One, however, gets the Int Rundown done.

“INT IS A REMEDY

“The Int RD is not understood as a REMEDY. It is not something you do on all pcs.

“Pc goes Exterior in auditing.

“Later his TA goes high.

“*Then you* do an Int RD.

“You test Int for read as above. If it BDs you do an Int RD.

“You just don’t do one because a pc goes exterior.

“One reason unnecessary Int RDs get done is that the Registrar sells one. That makes the Reg a C/S. So the C/S and auditor run it.

“Maybe it wasn’t needed.

“So if it wasn’t needed it will eventually have to be repaired.”—*LRH (HCO B 2 Sept 71, “Urgent—Interiorization Rundown”)* (Repair with an Int RD Correction List Revised, HCO B 29 Oct 1971.)

The Interiorization Rundown is a REMEDY designed to permit the pc to be further audited after he has gone exterior.

The Int Rundown is NOT meant to be sold or passed off as a method of exteriorizing a pc. This is very important.

It is general auditing on usual Dianetics and Scientology actions that brings about Exteriorization.

When the pc goes or is found to be exterior one then orders the Interiorization Rundown. Otherwise the TA will misbehave.

THE RUNDOWN IS A REMEDY USED AFTER EXTERIORIZATION HAS OCCURRED BY REASON OF GENERAL AUDITING.

Anxiety to get exterior will prompt a pc to buy and a Registrar to sell an Interiorization Rundown. It is in effect just more auditing as far as the Registrar is concerned. When a pc has gone exterior the Registrar can insist on his buying enough hours for the remedy.

The Int Rundown stabilizes the exteriorization and makes it possible to audit the pc further.

DISABILITY

If an auditor can’t smoothly audit a rundown as simple as an Int Rundown, then he is exposed as being unable to run Standard Dianetics and should be cleared of his misunderstandings and overts and retrained.

The only real trouble one gets into on an Int Rundown stems from the inability of the auditor to run a smooth, good TRed R3R session. Pcs are not hard to run on it.

C/S WINS

A C/S cannot win at all if he is continually having to make up for flabby auditing by the auditor.

Therefore the C/S must be very sure his auditors are fully checked out on things they are to run before running them.

If there is no Qual Staff Training Officer or no Cramming, a C/S can fully afford to do the training and cramming himself. Otherwise he will lose far more than that time in C/Sing for auditors not checked out.

By the skill of his auditors you know the C/S. Not by his unusual solutions after flubs.

The Int Rundown is too easy to do to have any trouble—the trouble comes when the auditors are not checked out beforehand, starrate and in clay on new things the are to run.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:MH:ntm.rd
Copyright © 1970, 1971, 1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

(Updated with recent
LRH data by order of
L. Ron Hubbard by
Training & Services

[HCO PL 20 July 1970, Issue III, *Two-Way Comm Checksheet*, Bureau) mentioned above was revised on 25 November 1974 as a BPL.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 28 FEBRUARY 1971

Remimeo
HGC Auditor
Checksheet
Academy Level 0
Checksheet
Dn Cse Checksheet

C/S Series 24

IMPORTANT

METERING READING ITEMS

(NOTE: Observation I have recently done while handling a C/S line has resulted in a necessary clarification of the subject of "a reading item or question" which improves older definitions and saves some cases.)

It can occasionally happen that an auditor misses a read on an item or question and does not run it as it "has not read". This can hang up a pc badly if the item was in fact a reading item or question. It does not get handled and exists in records as "No read" when in fact it DID read.

THEREFORE ALL DIANETIC AUDITORS WHOSE ITEMS OCCASIONALLY "DON'T READ" AND ALL SCIENTOLOGY AUDITORS WHO GET LIST QUESTIONS THAT DON'T READ MUST BE CHECKED OUT ON THIS HCO B IN QUAL OR BY THE C/S OR SUPERVISOR.

These errors come under the heading of Gross Auditing Errors as they affect metering.

1. An Item or Question is said to "Read" when the needle falls. Not when it stops or slows on a rise. A tick is always noted and in some cases becomes a wide read.
2. The read is taken when the pc first says it or when the question is cleared. THIS is the valid time of read. It is duly marked (plus any blow down). THIS reading defines *what* is a *reading item or question*. CALLING IT BACK TO SEE IF IT READ IS NOT A VALID TEST as the surface charge may be gone but the item or question will still run or list.
3. Regardless of any earlier statements or material on READING ITEMS, an item does not have to read when the auditor calls it to be a valid item for running engrams or listing. The test is did it read when the pc first said it on originating it or in Clearing it?
4. That an item or question is marked as having read is sufficient reason to run it or use it or list it. Pc Interest, in Dianetics, is also necessary to run it, but that it did not read *again* is no reason to not use it.
5. When listing items the auditor must have an eye on the meter NOT necessarily the pc and must note on the list he is making the extent of read and any BD and how much. THIS is enough to make it a "reading item" or "reading question".

6. In Clearing a listing Question the auditor watches the meter, NOT necessarily the pc and notes any read while clearing the question.
7. An additional calling of the item or question to see if it read is unnecessary and not a valid action if the item or question read on origination or Clearing.
8. That an item is marked as having read on an earlier Dianetic list is enough (also checking interest) to run it with no further read test.
9. To miss seeing a read on an origin or clearing is a Gross Auditing Error.
10. Failing to mark on the list or worksheet the read and any BD seen during pc origination or clearing the question is a Gross Auditing Error.

EYESIGHT

Auditors who miss reads or have poor eyesight should be tested and should wear the proper glasses while auditing.

GLASSES

The rims of some glasses could obstruct seeing the meter while the auditor is looking at the worksheet or pc.

If this is the case the glasses should be changed to another type with broader vision.

WIDE VISION

A good auditor is expected to see his meter, pc and worksheet all at one time. No matter what he is doing he should always notice any meter movement if the meter needle moves.

If he cannot do this he should use an Azimuth Meter and *not* put paper over its glass but should do his worksheet looking through the glass at his pen and the paper—the original design purpose of the Azimuth Meter. Then even while writing he sees the meter needle move as it is in his line of vision.

CONFUSIONS

Any and all confusions as to what is a “reading item” or “reading question” should be fully cleaned up on any auditor as such omissions or confusions can be responsible for case hang-ups and needless repairs.

NO READ

Any comment that an item or question “did not read” should be at once suspected by a C/S and checked with this HCO B on the auditor.

Actually non-Reads, a non-reading item or question means one that did *not* read when originated or cleared and also did not read when called.

One can still call an item or question to get a read. That it now reads is fine. But if it has never read at all, the item will not run and such a list will produce no item on it.

It is not forbidden to call an item or question to test it for read. But it is a useless action if the item or question read on origination by the pc or clearing it with him.

IMPORTANT

The data in this HCO B, if not known, can cost case failures. Thus it must be checked out on auditors.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 5 MARCH 1971

Remimeo

C/S Series 25

THE FANTASTIC NEW HGC LINE

(A marvelous new C/S Auditor line has just
been piloted in for HGCs.)

In the new C/S line the Auditor, in his Admin time at the end of the day, or when he has no preclears, does Folder Error Summaries or Progress and Advance Programs for his pcs and does the C/S form for the Tech C/S as well as adds the day's process and the length of the session and amount of Admin time on that folder to the inside front cover of the folder, with the process run and result.

If his programs and C/Ses are acceptable to the Tech C/S, the Auditor gets full Well Done Auditing Hour credit on his stat.

The Auditor logs his sessions for the day in the general HGC Auditor's log and his Admin time is also logged.

This Admin time is subtracted from the bought hours of the pc where auditing is sold by the hour.

Where Auditors are so engaged and the new folder routing line is in use, this C/S form is used:

Full blank page.

Pc's Name (Red)

Date

Auditor's Name (Red)

Class of Auditor required next sess.

(Session Grade) left blank

Auditor's comment (Red) or think about the case if he wishes.

The next C/S

1. _____ Blue

2. _____ Blue

3. _____ Blue

4. _____ Blue

Auditor Signature (Red)

The Auditor does not grade his own session. He leaves this blank.

The correctly Admined folder is then given to Tech Services which routes it (usually with the Auditor's other folders for the day) to the C/S.

The C/S looks it over (it is HIS final responsibility for the case being run right).

The C/S looks to see if the Examiner form taken by the Examiner at session end F/Ned. If it did not he leaves the grade line blank as it is a No Grade session (see F/N and well done hours) as the Auditor gets no hour credit for the session. If the C/S and other Admin is ok he writes OK with his initial in the session grade space. If none of it is okay he leaves it blank and does the C/S form or programs completely new. In this last case he enters a subtract figure in his log for the auditing time for the week against that Auditor's name.

If the Exam form F/Ned, but the Admin is not okay and the session actions were not okay the C/S writes "Well Done by Exam" on his own new C/S in its proper place and ignores the form and subtracts the Admin time in his book to subtract the Admin from the Auditor's week's stat.

If the session was not okay with no F/N at Exams yet the Admin and next C/S are ok, the Auditor loses the session time in the C/S but gets the Admin time credited to his week's stat. The C/S subtracts the session time in his book, not the Admin time.

Of course, as we hope is usually the case, if the Auditor did the C/S, did a correct session, got an F/N at Exam and did the Admin and next C/S is correct, then the C/S marks "Very well done" in the blank space for session grade with his initial. After inspection, this would be the sole action of the C/S regarding that folder.

By the C/S writing in the session grade (Very well done, well done, okay, flunk, to cramming) the Auditor is receiving acknowledgement for his work and is not just acking himself.

THE NEW LINE

The Ideal Folder-C/S line can shift the number of well done hours from a ceiling of 250-300 to 600-800 with one C/S. No matter how many Auditors an org has, older lines put a 250-300 top ceiling on the org's well done hours.

When hours could go above 600 due to the available Auditors (20 or 30), a new parallel line has to be manned by a new C/S, new D of P and another Examiner and more Tech Services personnel.

Despite how hard the C/S and anyone else in tech works, a line not so run will ceiling at about 250 hours, no matter how many Auditors are hired.

A C/S using the old lines can C/S for about 5 working Auditors only with the line running any old way. And even so will work himself half to death.

In trying to get pcs handled, Auditors will be added. The C/S will not be able to handle his job. The line, being faulty, gets pegged at about 250 hours no matter how hard the C/S and Admin people work.

With the same C/S and Tech Services people, and a correct new line, 24 to 30 Auditors will be kept busy at their 5 hours a day (given auditing rooms) and the stat will be able to rise to 600 to 800.

NEW SEQUENCE

1. Auditor picks up his pc folders and his pc schedule list at Tech Services at the start of his day from the LEAVING rack.
2. Tech Services (having a duplicate list) begins sending pcs to him (using Tech Pages).
3. The Auditor gives the session.
4. The Auditor leaves the folder in the Auditing room at session end and takes the pc to the Examiner.
5. The Examiner simply does the Exam form on a meter with no folder. He sends the Exam form (hand route) to Tech Services.
6. The Auditor returns at once to his auditing room and a Tech Page has a pc there waiting for him.
7. Having done all his pcs for the day, the Auditor carries his folders to the Auditor Admin Room.
8. Tech Services has placed the Exam forms in the Auditor Admin Room and sees they get into the Auditor's basket *and* the folder.
9. The Auditor does the complete Admin of the session.
10. The Auditor does any program needed for future sessions.
11. The Auditor C/Ses the folder for the next session.
12. The Auditor marks in a box (2 columns) on a sheet stapled to the inside front cover the process, the Exam result, the session time and the Admin time he has just put in.
13. The Auditor hands his completed folders in to Tech Services.
14. Tech Services gets the folders to the C/S using a Folder Page who comes on late and works the C/S's hours.
15. Fed the folders rapidly by the Folder Page who is standing in the C/S area, the C/S does his C/S work. If the Folder Page is fast, removing folders and putting the new one in, chasing up data and other bits for the C/S, the time of C/Sing even when done very carefully will be found to average 3 to 5 minutes a folder even when some require full programming (but not FESing). This makes a ceiling of about 100 folders (sessions) a day for the C/S, an output of 30 Auditors. Needless to say the C/S and the Auditors have to know their business and Qual Cramming is used extensively both for new material and for flubs both in auditing and C/Sing by Auditors.
16. The Folder Page gets the folders over to the D of P office preserving the piles per Auditor as much as possible.

The C/S posts the data he wants Auditors to know or do on the AUDITORS' BOARD of the Auditors' Admin Room. He turns in his Cramming Orders into the D of P basket. This finishes his actions.

Where there is a senior Review C/S there is a hot spur line from the C/S to the senior C/S and back to the C/S. This is not necessarily an instant line. It can be a 12 hour lag line. In orgs where a C/O or Exec Dir or Product Officer or Org Officer is also a very skilled C/S this hot line would probably be in. New tech in use, fantastic completions and utter dog

cases nobody can make anything out of go on this senior C/S hot spur line. There are very few of these, only two or three a day in a very busy org. The senior C/S “does” these and sends them back to the C/S. They are then sent on as usual to the D of P.

17. The Director of Processing comes on duty very early. The C/Sed folders will all be there. The D of P has assignment master sheets that are kept up by the D of P.

The D of P does the day’s schedules, a list for each Auditor. The lists preferably have a few too many pcs on them.

The D of P can tell what Class of Auditor is required for the next session because the Auditor has marked it in the upper right-hand corner of the C/S for the next session.

When the D of P has the lists done the folders are placed in the “leaving” rack of Tech Services and Tech Services, now up and about, is given the lists and gets to work on the scheduling board, moving the names about to agree with the lists.

Tech Services does any room shifts or handlings at this time.

18. The D of P now goes to the Auditor Admin Room and begins to muster Auditors from her muster list as they come in and gets them over to Tech Services.
19. A Cramming personnel will be in there trying to get any crammings scheduled.
20. Tech Services hands out folders (which are in neat piles for each Auditor) and schedules to the Auditors as they turn up and handles any arguments or shifts in sequence.
21. Tech Pages are on phones or running to round up pcs and get them going to sessions, which work continues all day.
22. The D of P interviews any hung-up or curious pcs or as requested by the C/S or gets new Auditors or keeps up Admin. This goes on until the C/S comes in when the DofP is off.
23. The Auditor picking up his folders begins the cycle all over again at (1) above.

ABOVE 600

When the well done hours go above 600 a week, A WHOLE NEW HGC is put in duplicating the first, with its own C/S, D of P, T/S, auditing rooms and Auditor Admin Room. It would be HGC Section Two or HGC2 with the original being HGC1 .

A special second Cramming would have to be provided in Qual for it.

At first they would share new hours and build up independently. More HGCs are added to the Department at each multiple 600 wd hours.

SENIORS

The two chief seniors in the area are the C/S (for tech) and the D of P (for Auditors and bodies).

It is the D of P who must see that Auditors exist and are on post.

It is Tech Services who sees pcs are rounded up and audited. The D of T/S is actually in charge of pcs and all folder files and all board keep-up work.

The D of P should have some tech training. The D of T/S need not have any. The C/S of course is the Tech Expert and should be an HSST.

If there are no Auditors it is the D of P's neck.

If there are no C/Ses it is the C/S's neck.

If there are no folders it is the D of T/S's neck.

And if there are no auditing rooms it is the D of T/S's neck.

If signed-up scheduled pcs don't get to session it is the D of T/S's neck.

If there are no NEW pcs it is the D of P's neck who should begin to shoot Dissem Secs and Registrars and procure new pcs on a by-pass for the org.

From this a table of seniors and duties can be made.

CRAMMING

You will notice no pcs are sent to Review on this new line. Review actions are done in Tech as a patch-up in Tech. The Qual Sec is responsible for overall tech quality BUT DOES IT BY CRAMMING C/Ses or Auditors.

Thus Cramming is a busy street.

Cramming must be good, check-outs excellent.

If an Auditor doesn't grasp a C/S he has received he gets help from Cramming.

Auditors new to the HGC are given a fast hard grooving in in Cramming or a Qual Interne Course. (New Auditors never audit until grooved in.)

Tech will be as good as the Cramming Officer can cram.

This line is grooved in by the HAS and kept in by Qual. Or if there is no Qual, it is kept in by the HAS who will find no Qual very embarrassing.

DUMMY RUN

The line should be dummy run by folders, "pcs" and Auditors until they understand it.

People are often totally unaware of lines and get very sloppy.

Thus this line has to be drilled hard on old and new tech personnel. *All* must know this exact line.

It is a good line.

Fully in, it raises the well done hours stat from 250 per week maximum at total overload to an easy 600 to 800.

Auditors must audit five hours a day, 25 minimum per week of well done hours for any bonus to be paid at all. In the SO they get no pay at all much less bonuses if short on their 25.

Tech Services and an unenergetic D of P or a bad Dissem Sec and Registrar set-up can cause a no pc situation. And often do unless pushed.

But counting FESes and Admin in on an Auditor's wd time helps slack periods to even out. And one Auditor can FES and program folders for others or from files if he is left adrift and short-timed by the D of P or D of T/S or until the Tech Division forces the Dissem Div and Distribution Div to really get on the ball and wear their hats on pc flow.

PROCUREMENT

The D of P has always had new pc procurement responsibility when all else failed or even when it didn't.

Old folders, for example, are a marvelous source of new auditing repairs and intensives. An FES done on an old folder and a letter to "come in and get audited before you fall apart" is excellent pc procurement, usually neglected by Registrars. Any procurement by a D of P is legitimate.

Auditors who have no pcs can write procurement letters and have for 20 years.

SUMMARY

This is a beautiful line. It has been piloted hard.

It will serve as well as it is checked out, drilled in and used.

This line is the key to affluence from pcs alone.

(But if the org isn't training Auditors heavily, you'll soon have no Auditors to be on it and the org will not gain its high income low cost cushion from training.)

This line is the answer to really getting auditing done in an area.

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 6 MARCH 1971
Issue I

Remimeo

C/S Series 26

NEW USES FOR THE GREEN FORM

The Green Form comes into its own with a new method of use.

A lot of cases have been cracked lately using the GF in a new way.

Designed as *the Qual* tool in 1965 it came into disrepute by getting assessed item by item to an F/N. This made it F/N on a rud.

Thus the whole battery of tricks in the GF never get used on a pc.

There is another assessment Method. Method 5. It is “once through marking the length and BD of all reads”.

One can then C/S “Assess GF once through”.

Actually one usually says,

“GF + 40 Method 5”.

This means the auditor (usually on a case that is messy or just as a routine part of a Progress Program) just rat-a-tat-tat assesses the lot, marks the reads’ length and BDs.

The C/S action that follows—the “Handle” consists of putting a red half swirl around each that read and then doing the C/S for it.

List outness is always handled first. Then ruds like ARC Brks, W/Hs and PTPs. Then more or less by the longest reads.

It makes a long, long C/S in cases that are boggy.

One uses engram running on it whenever he gets a chance as in “drugs”.

Hidden standards are listed on a “Who/what would have _____ (the symptom)?” and “O/W on the item found”.

A lot of old processes get a chance on these GF reads. It isn’t all “2-way comm on _____”.

Foreign Language cases who do not have English as a native tongue and people who don’t understand a lot have to have the GF items cleared. One takes the reads while clearing the Question, of course.

Designed as a Case Cracker, this new use of the Green Form restores it to a mighty weapon.

Since I redeveloped ways to assess and began to really use this Green Form, I've seen several very rough ridgy cases fall apart.

So it is a very cheerful re-discovery. And it is highly urged.

LRH:mes.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 6 MARCH 1971
Issue II

Remimeo

C/S Series 27

LONG C/Ses

A long C/S is far more desirable than a short C/S in all but the most sickly and feeble cases.

In doing a long C/S, the auditor can also end it off where an F/N goes *3i4* to a dial wide and looks like it will persist. The pc has a win.

A long C/S also permits an auditor to adjust his own length of session.

If the C/S isn't complete on that day, one simply adds (1) "Fly a rud" and (2) "Continue C/S of (yesterday)."

By having a whole Progress Program (repair) laid out on a red sheet and clipped with its green Advance Pgm (grade chart) inside the front cover, over the session summary, the guidance for the case is right there. This gets checked off as done.

The C/S could consist of half the program or even (in shorter programs) all of it.

Handling

One speeds a line by taking repeated handlings out of it.

Less sessions mean less handling.

Thus the session is more economical if long.

Getting the pc and folder rounded up 5 times when it means the same number of hours to do it 2 times saves wear and tear.

This is the benefit of very long C/Ses.

Dianetic C/Ses

Dianetic sessions often go 5 or even 8 hours.

One tries to do all the flows of an item in one session.

Length of Pgms

When auditing the public, not staff, you long program.

In a Progress (repair) Program you try to throw the whole bag of tricks at them.

These are not only repairs, when you do a Progress Program. You throw in a lot of other bits like 2-way comms on BD items.

You now have a Hi-Lo TA List to assess and an Expanded Green Form.

Advance Programs

All Advance (gradesheet) Programs start *lower* than the pc was if the pc got in trouble *where* he was.

Often a grade is obviously out below where he is graded.

Let us say he is a bogged “Grade IV”. Well, he couldn’t be a Grade IV. So the Advance Program (green paper) that you do picks him up at Grade 0 or even Dianetics.

A bogged “OT I” the other day began to win when

- (a) given a long long Progress Program, and
- (b) shoved back to Grade III on the Advance Program and brought on up *all* the way including OT I before going on to OT II!

Thorough C/Ses

Thus you can have long C/Ses only when you have long programs already done and pinned to the inside of the front cover, a pink one for Progress (non grade) and a green one for Advance (back up the grades).

Don’t try to save auditing time. Save instead repeated handlings.

This does not go into “over-repair”. A Progress Pgm contains all sorts of bits like 2-wc on “What do you feel you owe your family” (as the pc is always getting off about his family in Ruds).

The advance of a case is the amount of charge you get off it.

Long C/Ses ease your Admin lines greatly.

They also give less chance of having ruds go out between sessions.

Short sessioning has its uses—small children, sick people, psychos.

But long sessions save time in the long run and get the job done.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:mes.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 7 MARCH 1971RA

Remimeo
HGC Auditors
Dn & Scn
Checklists
C/Ses

Revised 6 April 1974

C/S Series 28RA

USE OF DIANETICS

Revised per HCO B 15 July 71, Issue I, "Quads Cancelled"
(Revisions in this type style)

Where a case has only been run on single flow Dianetics (Flow 1) one goes back to the first Dianetic item ever run of which record can be found and does F1, F2, F3 in that order.

To C/S a case for *Triple* Dianetics it is best to first lay out a Scientology repair, making sure the case is flying, then list out the items already run on Single and Triple. Then get them run so that all *three* flows are complete on each item in sequence from first to last.

This includes any LX items, former practice, drugs or any other engram running. These, like Dianetic items, are listed in their correct sequence of former running.

Then the missing flows are run.

A rehab step of the flows already run is not necessary. This rehab of a flow already run to EP is usually used only when there is question about its having gone to F/N Cog VGIs. In C/Sing for *Triples* one COMPLETES any flow of an item found that did not F/N. This is indicated on the Item list.

DOING THE LIST

The Item list is done by the auditor in his admin time for well done time credits.

All former Dianetic items ever run are listed and what flows have been run on them and to what end phenomena.

Example:	Engram List	
3 Sept 69	Sadness (exact wording that was used)	F1
4 Sept 69	A Bored Feeling	F1 Bogged
6 Sept 69	An Apathetic Outlook	F1 Bogged
6 Nov 69	LX Agonized	F1 F2 F3
7 Nov 69	Former Therapy	F1 F2 F3
		F2 Bogged
9 Nov 69	Earlier Practices	F1 Bogged
10 Nov 69	A Horrible Sadness	F1 Bogged
5 July 70	Int RD	F1 F2 F3

6 July 71

An Awful Pressure

F3 Bogged

F1 Bogged

Such a list is then handled from the earliest forward by:

- (a) Completing the bogged flow and
- (b) Completing the missing flow.

INT-EXT RD

This is handled in its proper sequence on the list if the TA is not high or very low.

If the TA on the pc is currently high, Int is handled before any other action is done and all *three* flows are run on it.

A drug chain also makes a high TA if in existence or unflat.

FLUBS

If any auditor has a poor record of getting Dianetic Results, of bogged flows, etc, he needs an HDC Retread. His drills and TRs are out or he is committing Gross Auditing Errors.

Dianetics gives remarkable results only when flawlessly done.

The commands must be precisely given and all commands 1-9 A-D are used. It is NEVER shorted “because the pc did it”.

C/Sing

It should be realized Dianetics is its own field of C/Sing. This remains the same in *Triple* Dianetics.

RESULTS

Triple Dianetics, including the rerun actions, produces some very startling new

Well done Dianetics always has produced fine results.

Triple Dianetics almost doubles the gain.

REMEDIES

Any and all Dianetic Remedies and general technology remain in full use. They are not changed at all. Only *Triple* Flows are added in each case.

Good Luck.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:mes.ntm.rd
Copyright © 1971, 1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 7 MARCH 1971
REISSUED 13 JANUARY 1975

Remimeo
HGC Auditors
Dn & Scn
Checklists
C/Ses

C/S Series 28RA-1

USE OF QUADRUPLE DIANETICS

With the introduction of QUADRUPLE DIANETICS the problems of how to C/S it arise.

This rule is followed:

IN ALL BUT HCO B 24 July 69 DIANETIC ASSISTS WHERE IT CAN BE USED AT ONCE, THE FOURTH FLOW—O—MUST BE RUN ON ALL ITEMS FORWARD FROM THE FIRST DIANETIC ITEM EVER RUN ON THE CASE *IF THE PC IS QUAD AND THE FLOW O READS.*

Where a case has already had Flows 2 and 3 run on Singles, one goes back and runs Flow 0 on those items *if it reads.*

Where a case has only been run on Single Flow Dianetics (Flow 1) one goes back to the first Dianetic Item ever run of which record can be found and does F 2, F 3, F 0 in that order *checking the command for read before running it, and then verifying the F 1.*

To C/S a case for Quad Dianetics it is best to first lay out a Scientology repair, making sure the case is flying, then list out the items already run on Single and Triple. Then get them run so that all four flows are complete on each item in sequence from first to last.

This includes any LX items, former practice, drugs or any other engram running. These, like Dianetic items, are listed in their correct sequence of former running.

Then the missing flows are run *if they read.*

A rehab step of the flows already run is not necessary. This rehab of a flow already run to EP is usually used only when there is question about its having gone to F/N Cog VGIs.

In C/Sing for Quadruple one COMPLETES any flow of an item found that did not F/N. This is indicated on the item list.

DOING THE LIST

The item list is done by the Auditor in his admin time for well done time credits.

All former Dianetic items ever run are listed and what flows have been run on them and to what end phenomena.

Example:

Engram List

3 Sept 69	Sadness (exact wording that was used)	F 1
4 Sept 69	A Bored Feeling	F 1 Bogged
6 Sept 69	An Apathetic Outlook	F 1 Bogged
6 Nov 69	LX Agonized	F 1 F 2 F 3
7 Nov 69	Former Therapy	F 1 F 2 F 3
		F 2 Bogged
9 Nov 69	Earlier Practices	F 1 Bogged
10 Nov 69	A Horrible Sadness	F 1 Bogged
5 July 70	Int RD	F 1 F 2 F 3
		F 3 Bogged
6 July 71	An Awful Pressure	F 1 Bogged

Such a list is then handled from the earliest forward by:

- (a) Completing the bogged flow and
- (b) Completing the missing flow, *if it reads.*

INT-EXT RD

This is handled in its proper sequence on the list if the TA is not high or very low.

If the TA on the pc is currently high, Int is handled before any other action is done and all four flows are run on it *with the understanding that a pc run Triple on Int must have the Flow 0 checked for read before running it.*

A drug chain also makes a high TA if in existence or unflat.

AUDITOR CHECKOUT

BEFORE RUNNING ANY DIANETICS QUADRUPLE EVER Y AUDITOR HDC, VI, VII, VIII AND C/Ses MUST BE CHECKED OUT THOROUGHLY ON THE QUAD DIANETICS CHECKLIST:

<i>BTB 6 May 69R</i>	<i>“Routine 3 R Revised” issue ll</i>
<i>HCO B 4 Jan 71</i>	<i>“Exteriorization and High TA”</i>
<i>HCO B 23 Jan 71</i>	<i>“Exteriorization”</i>
<i>BTB 1 Dec 70R ‘</i>	<i>“Dianetics Triple Flow Action”</i>
<i>BTB 20 May 70 ‘</i>	<i>TR 103, 104 Rundown”</i>
<i>HCO B 7 Mar 71</i>	<i>“Use of Quadruple Dianetics”</i>
<i>Reissued 13.1.75</i>	<i>C/S Series 28RA-1</i>
<i>HCO B 4 Apr 71</i>	<i>“Use of Quad Dianetics”</i>
<i>Reissued 13.1.75</i>	<i>C/S Series 32RA- 1</i>
<i>HCO B 5 Apr 71</i>	<i>“Triple and Quad ReRuns”</i>
<i>Reissued 13.1.75</i>	<i>C/S Series 33RA- 1</i>
<i>HCO B 21 Apr 71</i>	<i>“Quadruple Dianetics—Dangers Of”</i>
<i>Reissued 13.1.75</i>	<i>C/S Series 36RB- 1</i>

Any other HCO B of subsequent issue on this subject.

THERE IS A PACK ON THIS SUBJECT AVAILABLE FROM FLAG.

FLUBS

If any Auditor has a poor record of getting Dianetics Results, of bogged flows, etc, he needs an HDC Retread. His drills and TRs are out or he is committing Gross Auditing Errors.

Dianetics gives remarkable results only when flawlessly done.

The commands must be precisely given and *all* commands 1-9 A-D are used. It is NEVER shorted "because the pc did it".

THUS ANY HDC TO AUDIT QUAD DIANETICS MUST:

- (A) HAVE A RECORD OF GOOD FLUBLESS DIANETIC AUDITING or
- (B) MUST HAVE A RETREAD UNDER A COMPETENT SUPERVISOR and
- (C) MUST BE STARRATED (for true, not just checked) ON THE ABOVE CHECKSHEET OR THE FULL QUAD PACK.

C/Sing

Quad Dianetics, with the above, otherwise C/Ses the same as general DIANETICS.

It should be realized Dianetics is its own field of C/Sing. This remains the same in Quad Dianetics.

PROMOTION

Quad Dianetics should be promoted only when you have Dianetic Auditors, the Auditors checked out and okayed to audit as above and when you CAN DELIVER.

IVs or VIs should be available to do the Progress Pgms and steps.

UPPER LEVELS

When the IVs VIs VIIIs VIIIIs or IXs are checked out as above, they should use Quad Dianetics to handle any and all Engram steps called for in general auditing.

That they are upper level Auditors does not make it less necessary to do the above.

RESULTS

Quad Dianetics, including the rerun actions, produces some very startling new gains.

Well done Dianetics always has produced fine results.

Quad Dianetics almost doubles the gain.

REMEDIES

Any and all Dianetic Remedies and general technology remain in full use. They are not changed at all. Only the zero flow is added in each case.

Good Luck.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ntjh
Copyright ©1971, 1975
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 8 MARCH 1971

Remimeo

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 misunderstands 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

LRH:mes.rd
copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 19 MARCH 1971

Remimeo
C/S Checksheet
All Auditors' Hats

C/S Series 30

C/Sing AUDITOR-C/Ses

When auditors do their own C/Sing, the Org C/S has the additional duty of making certain their C/Ses are correct as well as their sessions.

Therefore the Org C/S (which post is now even more vital) has the duty of

1. Seeing that all auditor flubs are handled in a cramming action on the flubbed action.
2. Seeing that all auditor-as-a-C/S errors are handled in a cramming action on the C/S Series.

Normally a C/S handles his post on the Fantastic New HGC Line, HCO B 5 Mar 71, C/S Series 25, on a fast flow basis. But he is looking for

- (a) "Dog cases"—pcs not running well
- (b) Auditor errors
- (c) Auditor Program errors
- (d) Auditor C/S errors.

Those that are F/Ning VGIs at Examiner he lets go through fast verifying the exam report and the next C/S.

The moment he sees a contrary exam report (F/N with natter or BIs, high TA or low TA with any statement or no statement) he has to decide

- (a) Dog Case?
- (b) Auditor Error?
- (c) Program Error?
- (d) Auditor C/S Error?

In any of the above the Org C/S takes over and handles what he finds. He must also require a cramming action on any (b) auditor error (c) program error or (d) auditor C/S error.

The Org C/S then does it right himself.

In any event it is the Org C/S who is fully responsible for all the cases.

That the Org C/S finds a program or C/S wrong does not then cause the auditor-as-a-C/S to cease to C/S. Quite the contrary. Even if every program or C/S he writes is wrong and has to be rewritten he still takes all the actions of the auditor-as-a-C/S.

DOG CASES

Category (a) is the case who just isn't running well.

The wrong answer to a dog case is to go on auditing and wasting hours hopefully.

The RIGHT answer is to STUDY the case carefully. The Folder Error Summary, the Folder session summary, the sessions, all have to be studied.

The standard C/S action of going back to when the pc was running well and coming forward for the error is very much in use.

Such a case is the result of a FLUB always. Example: High TA case on Power run on and on with TA in the sky. A *careful* FES and study of folders revealed that 2 years before, Power had been completed! Every current action was a brutal overrun! Yet the same C/S and *ten* separate auditors failed to see it! Indicating it and 2wc on the *earlier* Power handled the O/R. Example: Case RD not running well at all, TA going high. A *careful* study of the folder session summary at length discovered that the pc had not F/Ned on 2 way comm Int-Ext. 2wc on this point discovered a total mess of command clearing on the Int RD. This opened the door. Pc thereafter ran beautifully. Example: Pc a total nattery mess every session. *Careful* study found a tiny remark on the white form about going to a psychiatrist. 2wc on it and the antagonism toward auditing and the withhold of having once gone crazy vanished. Case ran well.

Careful study is the clue. The Auditor as a C/S may not put in the time needed to really sort the case out.

A *current* FES of recent auditing can also be ordered. This often reveals a lot of oddball goofs which when handled make the case run well.

The Org C/S is supposed to be the old master on solving these dog cases by careful study.

Heavy laurels to the auditor-as-a-C/S who spots the knot that is tangling the case up.

AUDITOR ERRORS

The errors of auditors can be so various one only looks to see if the actions of the auditor are standard when the Org C/S has to intervene.

Then the outnesses show up.

Example: Pc's TA shooting up at session end. Examine the previous C/S. Calls for L1B. Examine session. Auditor is found to be ITSAING ARC Breaks, no ARCU CDEI, no earlier similar.

Action ordered, pick up the BD ARC Brk and do ARCU CDEI and carry it E/S to F/N.

Action ordered. Auditor to Cramming to do Pattern of Bank, why earlier? and how to fly ruds.

Always find and handle auditor goofs by Cramming. You'll never have an HGC unless you do.

PROGRAM ERRORS

When an auditor-as-a-C/S program is poor, the Org C/S redoes it, sends the Auditor to Cramming on the relevant parts of the C/S Series or tech materials.

C/S ERRORS

When an auditor-as-a-C/S is found to have written a bad C/S that got by but didn't work or when the next C/S is wrong, the Org C/S sends the auditor-as-a-C/S to Cramming to do the relevant part of the C/S Series or the tech that applies.

CRAMMING

An org that has no sharp, hot Cramming Section in the Qual Div—well God help it.

That org's tech will always be shaky if not outright criminal.

Students need a Cramming or they never really learn not to goof. Where there's no insistence they do not learn.

HGC Auditors need a Cramming. They go stale. New HCO Bs aren't understood unless energetically checked out. The C/S in the Tech Div is at total risk where he is not backed up by Cramming.

The new HCO B 5 Mar 71, C/S Series 25, the new line, demands a Cramming as no auditor is likely to learn to C/S.

You can't risk fast flow with no Cramming to fall back on.

And an org's tech will never improve unless it has a Cramming for HGC auditors and course students.

Qual has to have a library of HCO Bs and course packs and books to really stay on the ball. Then its Cramming is hot, on the point, specializing mainly in finding what the auditor has neglected or misunderstood and getting it done.

Cramming and use of it is the key to a fully satisfied field and an expanding org.

The big plus points of the new HGC line are huge increases in delivery volume, very cocky never-blow auditors who get wins, an enthusiastic field, and last but not least, newly trained and competent C/Ses who guard tech by knowing a correct C/S!

The new line increases speed.

At the same time it requires greater technical safeguards.

The new HGC line won't work unless you have a competent Qual Cramming and an Org C/S who knows his business and detects and pitchforks all flubs in auditing and C/Sing into the fast hands of a hot no-nonsense Cramming Officer.

The new line of HCO B 5 Mar 71 is a great success.

It greatly increases *delivery quality* as well as volume if this HCO B is stressed in putting the new line into action.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:mes.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 31 MARCH 1971

Remimeo

C/S Series 31

PROGRAMMING AND MISPROGRAMMING

There are three important areas of technical application:

1. Auditing Cases.
2. Case Supervising Cases.
3. Programming Cases.

Auditing generally should be gotten into an org on the routine basis of:

1. Get Auditing Volume UP.
2. Get Auditing Quality UP.
3. Get C/Sing Volume UP.
4. Get C/Sing Quality UP.
5. Get Programming Volume UP.
6. Get Programming Quality UP.

To do it in any other sequence is to organize before producing or to inhibit production.

Auditing quality is raised by getting in Cramming and getting Cramming done.

C/S quality is raised by *C/S* study of cases and the Qual Sec Cramming the *C/S*.

Programming quality is raised by getting FESes done so that the action does not block production and Cramming or Programming and then studying the case to make the Programming more real and effective.

MISPROGRAMMING

1. Programming a case without data is risky. Dropping out the FES step, not getting White Forms done, etc, short-cutting on data in general can cost tremendous amounts of lost auditing.
2. Doing a vague general hopeful program of Repair (Progress) trusting something will come up is ineffective. With data on the person's life even on a pc never before audited, one can hit the key points even if only with 2-way comm on them. Cases that have been audited and are boggy are so for a reason. Programming without finding that reason can be very ineffective and result in few wins.
3. Running a new major program into an incomplete major program can be as deadly as failing to flatten a process before starting another process only more so.
4. Failing to end off a program when its End Phenomena is achieved is another gross error.
5. Being too ignorant of the basic bank and the tech *theory* (as different than processes) is another barrier to programming.
6. Not Programming at all.

The above six are the principal gross errors in programming.

LRH: mes.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 4 APRIL 1971 RA
REVISED 24 MARCH 1974

Remimeo

C/S Series 32RA

USE OF DIANETICS

(Revised per HCO B 15 July 1971, Issue I,
“Quads Cancelled”—Revisions *in this type style*.)

It is mandatory important urgent that one does not audit *three* flow items until one has brought *all* earlier Dianetic Items into *three* flows.

TRIPLE

On a case where only Flow One (Single) has been run, you don't suddenly run a Triple (F1, F2, F3) such as on the LX Class VIII lists until one has run the earliest Dn item ever run (or that can be found) on Dn Triple and then on forward on Triple up to the LX.

REASON

Auditing additional flows while earlier items remain Single restimulates the missing flows and stacks them up as mass. They can make a pc uncomfortable until run.

All the missing flows (that were not run) are still potential mass.

This mass restimulates like something too late on the chain when a flow not run on earlier items is run on later items.

Auditing itself is a sort of time track. The earliest session blows the later sessions.

FULL FLOW TABLE

Before running *Triple* Dianetics one makes a table of earlier items run. Like this:

Full Flow Table

<i>Date</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Flow</i>	
		<i>Previously Run</i>	<i>Must Run</i>
2/3/62	Guf Shoulder	F 1	F 2, 3
3/3/67	Gow in Foot	F 1	F 2, 3
30/4/67	Chow in Chump	F 1	F 2, 3
29/9/68	LX Anger	F 1, 2, 3	
	LX Peeved	F 1, 2, 3	
4/10/69	Feeling Numb	F 1, 2, 3	
5/9/70	EXT RD	F 1, 2, 3	
9/10/70	Feeling of Goof	F 1, 2, 3	
10/10/71	Dn Assist on Head	F 1	F 2, 3

FLOWS

F 1 is FLOW ONE, something happening to self.

F 2 is FLOW TWO, doing something to another.

F 3 is FLOW THREE, others doing things to others.

F 0 as run in the Introspection RD is FLOW ZERO, self doing something to self.

R3R COMMANDS

Standard R3R Commands are used on *Triple* Dianetics.

They are the subject of another HCO B.

The Zero Command for the Introspection RD, however, is very easy being “Locate an incident of (loss or emotion) (pain and unconsciousness) when you caused yourself to have a(an) (item)” with the other commands of R3R as usual.

NARRATIVE

The question will come up, do we Triple Narrative items or Multiple somatic items.

The test is, did the flows already run F/N when they were originally run. If they did, include them. If they didn’t run exclude them.

This does not mean you omit everything that didn’t run.

REPAIR

While auditing this FULL FLOW DIANETICS you will find various chains that did not F/N when originally run.

These are included and should be concluded to F/N. This means one has to find out if they by-passed the F/N, went too early, jumped the chain, etc. Usually an L3RD assessed on that faulty action will give the answer. It is easy to make these old flubbed chains F/N unless you work at it too hard. Usually the reason they didn’t is visible on the old worksheet. The auditor forgot to ask for Earlier Beginning or by-passed the F/N or jumped the chain or tried to run it twice forgetting he’d run it before. Corny errors.

RESULT

The result of doing a FULL FLOW DIANETIC ACTION on a case is quite spectacular. The shadowy remains of somatics blow, mass blows and the pc comes up shining.

OFFERING FFD

Offering the public Full Flow Dianetics must include the cost of C/S work since it is sometimes lengthy. It is best to sell the action at a flat price that’s more than adequate to cover the auditing as well as the hours of FESing and FF table making as the time can be quite long.

The auditing can be remarkably brief. The greatest amount of time is usually spent on the C/Sing and table making.

A C/S must liaise with the Dissem Sec and Treasury Sec on selling it or he'll find the org is losing money doing the C/Sing and tables.

A nice big fat flat price, not by hours, is best.

OT WARNING

When doing *Triple* Dianetics on Clears and OTs (and a very few others) it may be found that many chains are now missing or are just copies of the original. Don't be disturbed. Pc says they're gone now they're gone. Just F/N the fact and carry on with the next flow or item.

LRH:ams.rd
Copyright ©1971, 1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

[Added to by HCO B 4 April 1971-1R, Addition of 13 January 1975, Revised 22 February 1975, C/S Series 32RA-1 R, *Use of Quad Dianetics*, which is on page 377.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 4 APRIL 1971-1R
ADDITION OF 13 JANUARY 1975
REVISED 22 FEBRUARY 1975

Remimeo

*(Cancels HCO B 4 Apr 71, Reissued 13 Jan 75, same title.
Does NOT cancel HCO B 4 Apr 71RA, Rev. 24 Mar 74,
C/S Series 32RA, which is still valid.)*

(Changes in this type style)

C/S Series 32RA-1R

USE OF QUAD DIANETICS

With the introduction of Quadruple Dianetics it is mandatory important urgent that one does not audit four flow items until one has brought *all* earlier Dianetic items into four flows.

TRIPLE

This also applies to Triple Dianetics. On a case where only Flow One (Single) has been run, you don't suddenly run a Triple (F1, F2, F3) such as on the LX Class VIII Lists until one has run the earliest Dn item ever run (or that can be found) on Dn Triple and then on forward on Triple up to the LX.

QUAD

However, one would now not bother to run only Triples forward. He would locate the earliest Single or Triple (if no Single Flow) item and run it Quadruple by now running the missing flows. In the case of a pc run Triple, Flow 0 is checked for read before running it.

INT RD

In doing an INTERIORIZATION RUNDOWN one mustn't suddenly introduce the 4th flow (F Zero).

If the case has only had Triples in Dianetics one mustn't suddenly introduce a Flow Zero on INT. The case should be done on Triple Flow INT.

THEN all earlier Dn items in sequence run are:

- (a) Listed from W/S or Folder Summaries.
- (b) Brought up to current by running in all the missing flows of Quad.

- (c) The INT RD fourth flow is audited in when one gets to it IF IT READS.

REASON

Auditing additional flows while earlier items remain Single or Triple restimulates the missing flows and stacks them up as mass. They can make a pc uncomfortable until run.

All the missing flows (that were not run) are still potential mass.

This mass restimulates like something too late on the chain when a flow not run on earlier items is run on later items.

Auditing itself is a sort of time track. The earliest session blows the later sessions.

FULL FLOW TABLE

Before running Quad Dianetics one makes a table of earlier items run. Like this:

FULL FLOW TABLE

<i>Date</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Flow</i>	<i>Previously Run</i>	<i>Must Run</i>
2.3.62	Guf Shoulder	F1		F2, 3, 0
3.3.67	Gow in Foot	F1		F2, 3, 0
30.4.67	Chow in Chump	F1		F2, 3, 0
29.9.68	LX Anger	F1, 2, 3		F0
	LX Peeved	F1, 2, 3		F0
4.10.69	Feeling Numb	F1, 2, 3		F0
5. 9.70	Int RD	F1, 2, 3		F0
9.10.70	Feeling of Goof	F1, 2, 3		F0
10.10.71	Dn Assist on Head	F1		F2, 3, 0

FLOW

F1 is FLOW ONE, something happening to self.

F2 is FLOW TWO, doing something to another.

F3 is FLOW THREE, others doing things to others.

F0 is FLOW ZERO, self doing something to self.

R3R COMMANDS

Standard R3R Commands are used on Quad Dianetics.

They are the subject of another HCO B.

The Zero Command however is very easy being “Locate an incident of (loss or emotion) (pain and unconsciousness) when you caused yourself to have a(an) (item)” with the other commands of R3R as usual.

NARRATIVE

The question will come up, do we Triple or Quad Narrative items or Multiple somatic items.

The test is, did the flows already run F/N when they were originally run. If they did, include them. If they didn't run exclude them.

This does not mean you omit everything that didn't run.

REPAIR

While auditing this FULL FLOW DIANETICS you will find various chains that did not F/N when originally run.

These are included and should be concluded to F/N. This means one has to find out if they by-passed the F/N, went too early, jumped the chain, etc. Usually an L3RD assessed on that faulty action will give the answer. It is easy to make these old flubbed chains F/N unless you work at it too hard. Usually the reason they didn't is visible on the old worksheet. The auditor forgot to ask for Earlier Beginning or by-passed the F/N or jumped the chain or tried to run it twice forgetting he'd run it before. Corny errors.

RESULT

The result of doing a FULL FLOW DIANETIC ACTION on a case is quite spectacular. The shadowy remains of somatics blow, mass blows and the pc comes up shining.

OFFERING FFD

Offering the public Full Flow Dianetics must include the cost of FESing, FF table making, and C/S work since it is sometimes lengthy. The auditing can be remarkably brief. The greatest amount of time is usually spent on the C/Sing and the table making.

FFD is offered to the public in intensives as per HCO B 31 May 1971R, C/S Series 39R, “Standard 12 1/2 Hour Intensive Programs”. Admin time spent on C/Sing, FESing and FF table making should be deducted from the Intensive Hours purchased by the pc. This must be made known to the public when purchasing the service.

When offering FFD it should be called Quadruple Dianetics—4 times more powerful than previous auditing.

A C/S must liaise with the Dissem Sec and Treasury Sec on selling it or he'll find the org is losing money doing the C/Sing and tables.

OT WARNING

When doing Quadruple Dianetics on Clears and OTs (and a very few others) it may be found that many chains are now missing or are just copies of the original. Don't be disturbed. Pc says they're gone now they're gone. Just F/N the fact and carry on with the next flow or item.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt .rd
Copyright © 1971, 1975
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 5 APRIL 1971RA
REVISED 8 APRIL 1974

Remimeo
All Auditors
C/Ses
Class VIII

C/S Series 33RA

TRIPLE RERUNS

(Revised per HCO B 15 July 71 Issue I
“Quads Cancelled”—Revisions *in this type style.*)

LAW: WHEN ONE OR MORE OF THE *THREE* FLOWS OF AN ITEM OR GRADE ARE LEFT UNRUN, WHEN USED IN LATER PROCESSES THE EARLIER UNRUN ONES RESTIMULATE AND MAKE MASS.

This tells you that high TAs, heavy pressures and even illness can come from by-passed flows.

BY-PASSED FLOWS

Example: Dianetic singles have been run on 7 items. Now the auditor begins to run new items Triple without running Triple on the already run items. The result will be 7 unrun Flow 2s and 7 unrun Flow 3s. These will restimulate and form mass and by-passed charge.

Example: Now let us say that Dianetics was all run Single and Grades were run Triple. This will restimulate the Dn chains F2 and F3.

ANY LATER GRADE RUN WITH MORE FLOWS THAN USED IN EARLIER ACTIONS CAN THROW THE EARLIER UNFLAT FLOWS INTO RESTIM, PILE UP MASS GIVING HIGH TA AND BPC GIVING ARC BREAKS.

REPAIR

The more the condition is *repaired* by L1C, L4BR, etc, etc the *worse* the Mass gets.

SOURCE OF HIGH TA

Thus High TAs have three principal sources:

- (1) Overruns
- (2) Auditing Past Exterior
- (3) Earlier Unrun flows restimulated by those flows used in later actions.

There are other minor ones such as Drug Background, illness, etc as per Hi-Lo TA Assessment.

REHABS

One must NOT recklessly or continuously rehab a past major action. This causes overrun. The thetan is placed at the *end* of the incidents not yet in restimulation or run and the bank gets more solid.

MASSY THETANS

The whole trick of this universe is contained in thetans copying or picturing incidents and then getting stuck in the later portion of them.

“Incidents” is the keynote. A Thetan is incident hungry.

This is what traps him.

For some reason he has to be at the earliest end of incidents to erase them. The later he is in incidents and the later he is on the track the more solid he is.

This also applies to the “auditing time track”.

By omitting things like flows on the auditing time track, the thetan thus becomes massy.

The whole theory of the Exteriorization Remedy is based on having gone out (later) *after* he went in (earlier). So Exteriorizing can stick him. (People buy the Ext RD to Exteriorize but the remedy is only done to permit further auditing. They Ext of course when the bank is handled.)

When flows of items are by-passed and then later restimulated by auditing them, mass occurs.

GETTING IN ALL FLOWS

When doing additional flows on earlier items or processes one must *also* check or rehab those flows marked as run to F/N in worksheets.

This again will leave unflat flows and BPC unless it is done.

And if it is overdone it will raise the TA by overrun.

So if one had a case that had Single Dianetics and was later run on Triple for new items (but the Singles not done into Triple) one would have to RUN FIRST the missing unrun flow or flows and then *check* the first Single F1 for flatness, then check other previously run flows.

The rule is run the previously unrun one or ones first to get charge off, then verify or run the ones listed as run already.

Then one would do the same for the next item. Run the previously unrun flow or flows and then verify or run those listed as already run to be sure they F/N.

All items, in chronological sequence, and *all* processes, would have to be run *Triple*.

IT WOULD BE A WASTE OF TIME NOW TO RUN IN ONLY SINGLES.

So all C/Ses and Auditing actions are “Rehab or Run F1, F2, F3” when getting in all flows on things run to date.

HIGH TA

When you are sure an EXT RD has been done correctly and its 2wc went F/N and the TA later goes high, you check the EXT RD. That is the most usual reason. This simple action is amazingly subject to flubs.

If the TA goes high later you can do a Hi-Lo TA Assessment and handle.

If the TA is still high or low, you had better check the state of flows. Were more flows run on later actions than were run on earlier actions?

If so, your pc has felt massy, sometimes even ill.

The right action is to get in all flows from the beginning. Bring *all* his auditing up to *Triple*.

(If his folder is not available, he has kind of had it. I know of no way, at this writing, to recover lost Dn items but will have to work something out.)

NOT IN TROUBLE

If the pc is not in trouble, his best bet is to get on up the grades to Expanded OT III.

IN TROUBLE

If he *is* massy and is having trouble the best bet is to:

- (1) Be totally sure of his Int RD
- (2) Check O/Rs particularly of a major grade twice or by-passed F/Ns, locate and indicate them
- (3) FES, list the items and grades and do a Full Flow action from the beginning of his auditing, raising them all to *Triple*.

RUNNING ZERO FLOWS (As run in the Introspection RD)

The Zero Flow in Dianetics is a bit strange. It can be done by full R3R BUT it often depends on the decision the pc made and may F/N very suddenly. It is easily overrun and can be very fast.

A pc can be gotten into trouble on Zero Flows if the auditor is slow and is not alert to his meter and misses the F/N and gives R3R commands after the flow has blown.

REHAB OR RUN

The auditor getting in *Triple* Flows can also ARC Brk the pc by failing to verify if the previously run flows are flat. All the auditor wants is to see them F/N on the command. If they don't he runs them.

Sometimes when he has "run them" again he finds they are being overrun or run twice and has to rehab them by finding this out. The pc sometimes doesn't know until he actually starts to run them. Then he finds they are already run. The clue to this is a climbing TA. If the TA goes up, get off that flow and rehab it.

Example: Pc at first thinks "Pain in shoulder" F2 was never run. Starts to run it. TA goes up. Auditor must pull him off of it by finding out if it is being run twice and rehab it to F/N.

The moral in all these reruns is don't firefight, keep an L1C List and an L3RD List handy and use them.

RESULTS

The results of straightening up the Int-Ext RD, rehabbing O/Rs and putting in ALL FLOWS on a pc are fantastic.

Getting an All Flows Rundown done correctly gives one all the latent gain the pc has been begging for.

So send to Cramming all C/Ses and auditors who flub.

Program it right.

C/S it right.

Audit it right.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:mes.ntm jh.rd
Copyright ©1971, 1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[This HCO B is added to by HCO B 5 April 1971, Reissued 13 January 1975, C/S Series 33RA-1, *Triple and Quad Reruns*, page 380.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 5 APRIL 1971
REISSUED 13 JANUARY 1975

Remimeo
All Auditors
C/Ses
Class VIII

C/S Series 33RA-1

TRIPLE AND QUAD RERUNS

LAW: WHEN ONE OR MORE OF THE FOUR FLOWS OF AN ITEM OR GRADE ARE LEFT UNRUN, WHEN USED IN LATER PROCESSES THE EARLIER UNRUN ONES RESTIMULATE AND MAKE MASS.

This tells you that high TAs, heavy pressures and even illness can come from bypassed flows.

BY-PASSED FLOWS

Example: Dianetic Singles have been run on 7 items. Now the Auditor begins to run new items Triple without running Triple on the already run items. The result will be 7 unrun Flow 2s and 7 unrun Flow 3s. These will restimulate and form mass and bypassed charge.

Example: Now let us say all 7 previous items have been run Triple. And the Auditor now runs a new item Quadruple. This leaves 7 unrun Zero chains. These can restimulate and form mass and by-passed charge.

Example: Now let us say that Dianetics was all run Single and Grades were run Triple. This will restimulate the Dn chains F2 and F3.

Example: Let us say that Dianetics and Scientology Grades were all run Triple. An *Interiorization* Rundown is now run Quad. This will throw all Dianetic and Scientology unrun Flow Zeros into restimulation and give by-passed charge.

ANY LATER GRADE RUN WITH MORE FLOWS THAN USED IN EARLIER ACTIONS CAN THROW THE EARLIER UNFLAT FLOWS INTO RESTIM, PILE UP MASS GIVING HIGH TA AND BPC GIVING ARC BREAKS.

REPAIR

The more the condition is *repaired* by L1C, L4BR, etc, etc, the *worse* the Mass gets.

SOURCE OF HIGH TA

Thus High TAs have three principal sources:

1. Overruns
2. Auditing Past Exterior
3. Earlier Unrun Flows restimulated by those flows used in later actions.

There are other minor ones such as Drug Background, illness, etc, as per Hi-Lo TA Assessment.

REHABS

One must NOT recklessly or continuously rehab a past major action. This causes overrun. The theta is placed at the *end* of the incidents not yet in restimulation or run and the bank gets more solid.

MASSY THETANS

The whole trick of this universe is contained in thetans copying or picturing incidents and then getting stuck in the later portion of them.

“Incidents” is the keynote. A theta is incident hungry.

This is what traps him.

For some reason he has to be at the earliest end of incidents to erase them. The later he is in incidents and the later he is on the track the more solid he is.

This also applies to the “auditing time track”.

By omitting things like flows on the auditing time track, the theta thus becomes massy.

The whole theory of the *Interiorization* Remedy is based on having gone out (later) *after* he went in (earlier). So Exteriorizing can stick him. (People buy the *Int* RD to Exteriorize but the remedy is only done to permit further auditing. They Ext of course when the bank is handled.)

When flows of items are by-passed and then later restimulated by auditing them, mass occurs.

GETTING IN ALL FLOWS

When doing additional flows on earlier items or processes one must *also* check or rehab those flows marked as run to F/N in worksheets.

This again will leave unflat flows and BPC unless it is done.

And if it is overdone it will raise the TA by overrun.

So if one had a case that had Single Dianetics and was later run on Triple for new items (but the Singles not done into Triple) one would have to RUN FIRST the missing unrun flow or flows *if they read* and then *check* the first Single Fl for flatness, then check other previously run flows.

The rule is run the previously unrun one or ones first *if they read* to get charge off, then verify or run the ones listed as run already.

Then one would do the same for the next item. Run the previously unrun flow or flows *if they read* and then verify or run those listed as already run to be sure they F/N.

All items, in chronological sequence, and *all* processes, would have to be run Quad.

IT WOULD BE A WASTE OF TIME NOW TO RUN IN ONLY TRIPLES.

Whether you have the Quad commands or not they are easy to figure out as you are only missing the Zero Flow, self to self.

So all C/Ses and auditing actions are “Rehab or Run Fl, F2, F3, F0 *if they read*” when getting in all flows on things run to date.

HIGH TA

When you are sure an *Int* RD has been done correctly and its 2wc went F/N and the TA later goes high, you check the *Int* RD. That is the most usual reason. This simple action is amazingly subject to flubs.

If the TA goes high later you can do a *C/S Series 53* or a Hi-Lo TA Assessment and handle.

If the TA is still high or low, you had better check the state of flows. Were more flows run on later actions than were run on earlier actions?

If so, your pc has felt massy, sometimes even ill.

The right action is to get in all flows from the beginning. And do it Quad. Bring *all* his auditing up to Quad.

(If his folder is not available, he has kind of had it. I know of no way, at this writing, to recover lost Dn items but will have to work something out.)

NOT IN TROUBLE

If the pc is not in trouble, his best bet is to get on up the grades to Expanded OT III.

IN TROUBLE

If he *is* massy and is having trouble the best bet is to:

1. Be totally sure of his Int RD.
2. Check O/Rs particularly of a major grade twice or by-passed F/Ns, locate and indicate them.
3. FES, list the items and grades and do a Full Flow action from the beginning of his auditing, raising them all to Quadruple.

RUNNING ZERO FLOWS

The Zero Flow in Dianetics is a bit strange. It can be done by full R3R BUT it often depends on the decision the pc made and may F/N very suddenly. It is easily overrun and can be very fast.

A pc can be gotten into trouble on Zero Flows if the Auditor is slow and is not alert to his meter and misses the F/N and gives R3R commands after the flow has blown.

REHAB OR RUN

The Auditor getting in Zero Flows can also ARC Brk the pc by failing to verify if the previously run flows are flat. All the Auditor wants is to see them F/N on the command. If they don't he runs them.

Sometimes when he has “run them” again he finds they are being overrun or run twice and has to rehab them by finding this out. The pc sometimes doesn’t know until he actually starts to run them. Then he finds they are already run. The clue to this is a climbing TA. If the TA goes up, get off that flow and rehab it.

Example: Pc at first thinks “Pain in shoulder” F2 was never run. Starts to run it. TA goes up. Auditor must pull him off of it by finding out if it is being run twice and rehab it to F/N.

The moral in all these reruns is don’t firefight, keep an L1C List and an L3RD List handy and use them.

RESULTS

The results of straightening up the Int-Ext RD, rehabbing O/Rs and putting in ALL FLOWS on a pc are fantastic.

Getting an All Flows Rundown done correctly gives one all the latent gain the pc has been begging for.

So send to Cramming all C/Ses and Auditors who flub.

Program it right.

C/S it right.

Audit it right.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt jh
Copyright © 1971, 1975
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 6 APRIL 1971

Remimeo
Class VIII
All C/Ses
All Auditors

C/S Series 34

NON F/N CASES

When cases do not bring an F/N VGIs to the Examiner, it is the signal to study the whole case anew and find the bug or bugs that keep it from running and get them handled.

Recently I took over a whole series of these non F/N VGI at Examiner cases and very very carefully studied each one. IN EVERY EXAMINER NON F/N CASE I FOUND FLAGRANT OUT TECH IN (A) THE PROGRAMMING (B) THE C/SING AND (C) THE AUDITING. All three outnesses existed.

These cases were taken as *all* the Non F/N Exam reports on a line containing hundreds of folders and over 600 w.d. hours a week. So you can see that these errors had been missed by expert C/Ses and Auditors. The errors were missed because HOPE was being used instead of study.

There was a *hope* that just routine C/Ses and auditing would work it out eventually.

The fact of non F/N at Examiner was not given sufficient importance.

The fact is that many who F/Ned at the Examiner had small flaws in them yet still got by.

The Exam Non F/N indicates FLAGRANT OUT TECH in the Programming *and* the C/Sing *and* the auditing. That's what it takes.

After a bug is found and corrected the case still may not F/N at the Examiner for a while. But after that while is passed the failure to give the Examiner an F/N means *another* bug and more study.

One case I found had had a major grade done twice two years apart. This was pointed out and rehabbed. But after 2 or 3 sessions the TA remained high. A restudy now found Recall Flow 2 of the Exteriorization Rundown had been run months ago to FIN and then continued for dozens of commands with the TA rising to 4.5. This was then repaired. The case then began to F/N at the Examiner. It now runs like an ordinary case.

There is always a bug, not necessarily current, often very old, in these Exam Non F/N Cases. There are sometimes two or three bugs.

The answer is NOT go on C/Sing and hope.

The answer IS, study and find the bug.

Cases run on triples after a long list of singles is a type of bug.

Cases exteriorizing and then getting no Ext RD is another bug.

Cases given false reads or already run w/hs, cases who don't tell their cogs, cases who were on drugs but drugs were never run, cases that Rockslammed but no crime found, any of the GF 40 or GF reading items, cases with lists out, cases that are always sad or tired .. well these types of cases are the usual bugged cases. But even they sometimes F/N if only to roller coaster.

The general rule of going back to where the case was running well and coming forward still holds. But an audit past Exteriorization can be before that and only eventually catch up.

General repair is harmful when a big bug exists.

Every case I examined had a big bug. Flagrant god-awful overruns, messed up Exteriorization Rundown, three major programs begun, each incomplete, engram after engram botched and run to high TA then walked off from. The errors were real! They had been sitting there for some time unnoticed. Session after session mounting up into piles of wasted auditing.

Sick pcs are another indicator. Pc F/Ns at Exam, then reports sick. Look behind it you find some wild program, C/S and auditing error.

So the answer is to STUDY THE CASE.

Get a total FES done if one has never been done. Get a current FES done or do it yourself.

Then examine the programs and the FESes and Folder Summaries and suddenly you'll find it.

Fortunately there aren't many things that can really foul a case up.

1. Overruns concealed within work sheets. Major grades twice.
2. Auditing past Exterior or flubbed Ext RDs.
3. Earlier unrun flows restimulated by later runs on those flows.
4. GF + 40 Items.
5. Never handled out lists.
6. Undetected drugs or drugs never handled by Dianetics.

7. False reads called (as in w/hs that “won’t blow”).
8. Hidden standards.
9. Long Duration ARC Brks.
10. Impractical or inapplicable programs.
11. Major actions started never completed.
12. Overrepair.

There can be combinations of these.

So there aren’t many. It’s really knowing what is right so well that the wrong shows up like skywriting.

Sometimes the errors are silly. A bogged Dianetic case had gotten tons of VI repair.

The C/S, an VIII, had never realized Dianetic C/Sing is its own brand of C/Sing. He didn’t shift gears to Dianetic C/Sing when C/Sing Dianetics sessions. The auditor way back had not known that when the pc originates “It’s erased” and the TA remains high, his correct action is one more A B C D. This C/S had then tried Class VI remedies instead of telling the auditor “Flatten or rehab the last chain”.

When the chains left unflat were rehabbed all was suddenly well.

Another case was interrupted for a year on a major action and when returned to auditing was begun on a long, long repair program. Inches of folder later the interrupted program was found and resumed and the case did great. All that “hopeful” repair was lost work. Ten minutes of case study would have saved twenty hours of useless repair.

The stable datum is CASES MODERATELY WELL PROGRAMMED, C/SED AND AUDITED RUN WELL.

So cases that don’t run well (unchanging Exam natter comment, Non F/N) have a BIG error in Programming, C/Sing and Auditing.

Look well and you will find it. And if that isn’t it, there was another to be found as well.

If you can’t find the folder or data in it you should take every imaginable measure to acquire more data. D of P Interviews, 2wc sessions, telexes to his last org and telegrams to his auditors. But get data from somewhere somehow.

Soon, when hours pick up and skill, all auditing will be sold by package not by hours. So learn economy of hours!

An auditor or C/S who really knows his theory and has a good grasp of practical application knows the right way. From that he can easily see how things are wrong.

An ounce of case study is worth ten pounds of wasted sessions.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH: nt.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 16 DECEMBER 1971 RA

REVISED 19 SEPTEMBER 1974

Remimeo
Int RD Checksheet

C/S Series 35RA

All changes are in this type style.

INTERIORIZATION ERRORS

(References: HCO B 11 Apr 71 RA "L3RD"
HCO B 27 Mar 71 "Dianetic Erasure")

Almost all the errors in an Interiorization Rundown are Dianetic errors. Most are very ordinary, even corny.

IT IS VITAL TO CORRECT AN INT RD ERROR AS A FIRST ACTION.

There is one Int RD error that is not a purely Dianetic error and that is the error doing anything else at all before an Int RD is done properly or an Int RD error is fully corrected.

The Int RD error may be simply that "Went In" and "Go In" did not read on the meter yet Int was run. This classifies as "running an unread item".

Or the Int RD could have been overrun. It goes flat on Secondary F2, let us say. The Auditor keeps on going past the win. This will hang up the Rundown. One of the ways an overrun occurs is the pc goes exterior during it. Yet the Auditor keeps on. Another way is pc has a big cog, big win. Auditor keeps going on with the RD.

When a pc is exteriorized by auditing and is then audited further without being given an Interiorization Rundown, his TA will go high or low and he may be very upset. Heavy masses may come in and he may also get ill.

Int RD errors also may go back to earlier Dianetic errors. A number of unflat incidents invite the overrun of these if they also occur on a Dianetic chain.

To clean up a balled-up Int RD chain or incident one may have to find and clean up the Dianetic error it is sitting on *during* the clean-up of the Int RD error.

Int RD errors, goofs, etc, are handled by using an Int RD Correction List Revised, HCO B 29 Oct 71R.

Auditors who can't run ordinary R3R with great success should not be let near an Interiorization RD as their lack of smoothness in handling Dianetics will wreck the Int RD.

CLASS IV, HDC AUDITORS

An excellent Class IV HDC Auditor can easily repair a messed-up Interiorization Rundown after a folder study and by use of an Int RD Correction List Revised, HCO B 29 Oct 71R.

A Class IV HDC Auditor with an excellent Dianetic Record of wins can be given an Int RD to do or to correct IF HE IS STARRATED ON THE INT PACK AND THE TWO-WAY COMM PACK.

REPAIR

Wherever you see a TA high and a pc in trouble your first suspicions should be:

1. Audited past Ext in Auditing without an Int RD being done.
2. Int RD botched by being unnecessary (“went in” didn’t read) or overrun or Auditor goofs in the session.
3. A previously messed-up Dianetic action has gotten fouled up with the Int RD.
4. The Int Command was improperly cleared (such as “means go in and out again” “means trapped” “meant leaving” etc).
5. Firefights and worries over the high or low TA have ensued after an Int ball-up has occurred.
6. Some major action like grades or items of Power have been run twice.
7. A C/S has hopefully kept on getting the pc audited without detecting the real reason as a flubbed Int RD.

PERCENTAGES

The percent of misrun Int RDs is high, many being unnecessary or overrun.

The liability of leaving them unrepaired is high.

Reasons for high TA are averaging out close to 100% as an unrun or a flubbed and unrepaired Int RD.

EXT IN SESSION

When a pc Exteriorizes in session it is the End Phenomena for that process or action. One gently ends off in any case. Then if after the fact of going exterior in auditing, a pc’s TA goes high, then you do the Int RD. You test Int for a read (test “went in” and “go in” per HCO B 24 Sept 71, “Interiorization Rundown”) and if it reads you do an Int RD.

You just don’t do one because a pc goes exterior.

Maybe it wasn't needed. So if it wasn't needed it will eventually have to be repaired.

If even years after an Int RD the pc has a high TA or a low TA then Int trouble is at once suspected and the original Int RD and any repair of it is suspect and must *be handled*.

The Int RD Correction List Revised, HCO B 29 Oct 71R, has been designed to straighten out Int RDs. L3RD handles the Dianetic errors. *Where Int RD Correction Lists have been done and the pc still has headaches, the C/S handles with AESPs (listed separately) that would make him interiorize.*

There is no real trick to either running a correct Int RD or repairing a flubbed one.

The whole clue is whether or not the Auditor can audit plain ordinary garden variety R3R.

So when ANY Auditor audits a pc past Exterior and the pc's TA goes high he should be checked out fully on the Int RD Checksheet so he won't continue to commit the error.

And when ANYONE is going to run an Int RD he must:

- A. Be an expert Dianetic Auditor and Class IV.
- B. Be Starrated on all the Int RD Pack.

And when any C/S is confronted with high TAs or low TAs and doesn't handle at once by getting an Int RD properly run or properly repaired he must be rechecked on the Dianetics Pack and the Int RD Pack.

DN C/S 1

A very careful Dianetic C/S 1 must be done on a previously unindoctrinated pc before he is run on an Int RD.

Otherwise it's all too new.

A C/S 1 isn't auditing.

The pc who can't do what the Auditor says or can't correct an erroneous action is lost.

A fully safe pc would be one who when he goes Ext in Auditing is made to do an HDC at once before he even gets any ruds put in and not audited again until he is an HDC. He'd be a pc who was relatively safe.

A pc who does what an inexpert Auditor says without question can really get fouled up ! Uneducated pcs require really flawless topnotch Auditors. The Auditor who can audit an uneducated pc is a jewel. He really has to know his business. Because the pc does whatever he says. And if he says wrongly, then there goes the session. Ever notice pc corrections in a worksheet? "I think you by-passed an F/N." "This feels

overrun.” “I *had* Grade I last year.” Such Auditors are not fully enough trained to handle wholly green pcs!

SIMPLICITY

Honest fellows, it's as easy to run an Int RD as it is to run “an ear pain”.

It isn't even mysterious or tough.

IT IS ONLY VERY IMPORTANT TO DETECT WHEN IT NEEDS TO BE DONE OR REPAIRED.

There are no mysteries.

Some Auditors have got me feeling like I'm trying to teach them to chew soft bread!

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1971, 1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 21 APRIL 1971 RB
REVISED 8 APRIL 1974

Remimeo
All Auditors
Class VIII
Dn Checksheet
Int-Ext Chksht

REISSUED 21 SEPTEMBER 1974
C/S Series 36RB
(Revised per HCO B 15 July 71, Issue I
"Quads Cancelled")
(Revisions in this type style.)

*This HCO B has been reissued as C/S Series 36RB.
HCO B 21 April 1971RA C/S Series 36RA,
"Dianetics—Getting in All Flows",
is cancelled.*

DIANETICS

(Applies also to Int-Ext Rundown.)
(Ref HCO B 4 Apr 71 RA, C/S Series 32RA,
and HCO B 5 Apr 71RA, C/S Series 33RA.)

TRs

TR Zero exists so an auditor is not ducking the session but can sit there relaxed, doing his job.

TR One must be done so the pc can *hear* and understand the auditor (without blowing the pc's head off either).

TR Two must be done so that the pc gets acknowledged. This can be so corrupted that the auditor doesn't ack at all but gives the pc meter reads! Instead of acks! Or keeps saying, "I didn't understand you," etc.

TR Three basically existed so that the auditor would continue to give the pc commands and not squirrel off or pack up with total silence.

TR Four exists so that the pc's origins are accepted and not Qed and Aed with or invalidated.

And, surprise, surprise, TRs are for use in the session itself, not just a drill. They are *how* one runs a session.

Metering can miss every F/N or give "F/Ns" with high or low TA. And one *never* feeds meter data to the pc: "That read," "That didn't read," "That blew down," just must not exist in session patter. "Thank you. That F/Ned," is as far as an auditor goes. And that's the end of the cycle and says so.

Floating needles can be overlooked by an auditor. In Dianetics this fault *is fatal*.

Auditor's Code must be in on all points and particularly Invalidation. Pc says, "That's so and so." An auditor who says, "I'm sorry. You are wrong," or any other invalidation is going to

wreck a pc's case. A full knowledge of the Auditor's Code and actually applying it saves endless troubles. It is an auditing TOOL, not just a nice idea.

REHABBING CHAINS

One rehabs a Dianetic Chain that, according to a previous worksheet, erased by saying, "According to session records (flow direction) (item) erased." That's all. One does not say, "Did the chain giving others a headache erase?" One does not run it again to find out. One does not run a single command "to see if it F/Ns again". One can say, "Do you agree that the chain giving another a headache erased?" But the more you ask the pc to look for an erased chain the more messed up things will get. It isn't there. But the auditor by his action can imply it *should* be there or *might* be there. A totally wrong approach would be "Look around your bank and see if what isn't there any more isn't there."

Dianetics is NOT Scientology. A Dianetic Chain is *not* a release. If you try to use Scientology rehab tech on a Dianetic Chain, you have had it. It isn't a "release" (which is a key-out). A Dianetic Chain is an erasure. You can't rehab erasures with "How many times?", etc.

The test of this is the doing. If you try to use Scn rehab on Dianetic Chains, the PC MIGHT TRY TO FIND SOMETHING. This causes him to key in other unrun or similar items.

It is a dangerous action at best to try to handle old erased chains. The best you can do is to tell the pc what the old W/S said. If no W/S exists leave the already erased flows alone!

FLUBBED CHAINS

Many times, a Folder Error Summary will give a flubbed chain and then fail to note it was repaired in the next session!

A C/S and auditor would have been pretty irresponsible to just go on auditing past flubbed chains.

The only safe way to handle some previous flubbed chain is to:

- (a) Verify in the folder if it was repaired.
- (b) If still unrepaired assess the *L3RD* on it and handle according to the *L3RD*.

L3RD

Using the new *L3RD* (HCO B 11 Apr 71 RA) is a Dianetic action.

A Scientology auditor erroneously can try to use it as a two-way comm type of list. If a chain needed one more ABCD, then two-way comm on it with no ABCD is not going to complete it.

L3RD has its own directions. Questions not marked with directions are used to indicate the fact. This can amount to two-way comm as the pc chews it over. But *L3RD* where marked is handled by Dianetics actions. Look over the list and its directions for each question and you will see that some are given directions that are NOT 2wc.

Example: "Earlier beginning" reads. You can't just say, "The incident had an earlier beginning," and you can't say, "Tell me about the earlier beginning." The pc will go up the

wall. There'll be no F/N. You have to use R3R and get him to the earlier beginning and then run it and if it still doesn't erase, get him to an Earlier Similar and erase that.

L3RD is a Dianetics List. It is not a Scientology List that is cleared each question to F/N by 2-way comm.

OVERRUN

Overruns are demonstrated by a rising TA.

If as you seek to get in Full Flow Dianetics the pc's TA begins to average higher, overrun is occurring.

Example: While doing FFD pc's TA has been riding at 2.2 and F/Ns. After a new FFD action it begins to ride at 2.5 and F/Ns. Something is being overrun. Find it and indicate it. And cease to stir the bank up so much! The fault is going over items already run.

In doing a Full Flow Table you often find that the same or similar have been run in the past. Sometimes you find that a previous attempt to run the item a second or third time has resulted in an ARC Break, the reason for which was never detected.

The right action is to note the session date it *was first* run and just tell the pc, "Feeling Surprised was run three times. On (first date it was erased) it was erased. When later run it was an overrun." This tends to blow the later charge laid in by trying to run the same item again.

It sounds so strange that erased chains can be overrun. But it is true. What happens is that pcs try to cooperate and put something there.

FIREFIGHTS

The action of a quarrel between an auditor and a pc is called a firefight.

Restimulating earlier unrun engrams or overrunning chains upsets a pc. The best action, as soon as a pc is disturbed, is to do an *L3RD* fast and handle what reads the way it should be handled according to the *L3RD*.

The wrong way is to argue or try to go on.

The pc does NOT know what it is. He just feels awful. He tries to guess. He will ARC Brk or get sad if the auditor continues.

The correct action is an *L3RD*.

L1C is not of great use in a Dianetic ARC Brk. *L3RD* is.

If the pc remains ARC Broken, try *L3RD* again, particularly the *whole L3RD*.

A Scientology session would be handled with some other list (L1C, L4BR, etc). A Dianetic session, including and especially FFD, is handled with *L3RD*.

You NEVER prepcheck while doing Dianetics. This mushes up the engrams.

INTERIORIZATION

ALL these cautions apply as well to an Interiorization-Exteriorization Rundown when restim occurs one uses an *L3RD* quickly.

Int-Ext RD is essentially a Dianetic, not a Scientology, action.

SAFE ACTIONS

A fully genned-in auditor, well crammed, well drilled, well skilled, can be trusted with Dianetics, Dianetic *Triples* and an Int-Ext RD. Auditors not so handled can get pcs into serious trouble with these things.

A safe course is to use *Triples* on new, never audited before pcs. Those begun on *Triples*, use then only Triple flows.

Another safe way is to use FFD only on OT IIIIs or OT IVs and done only by fully qualified FFD auditors who are also OT III.

The safest course is to require special drilling and cramming on auditors who are already known for their results by actual success story stats and call FFD and Int-Ext RD a skilled specialty.

C/S RESPONSIBILITY

Any trouble a C/S is running into comes from the factors of TRs, metering, Code and incomplete or false auditors' reports.

If when I am C/Sing I ever find an auditor has omitted key session actions or has falsified a report, I order that auditor not to Cramming but a full retrain HDC right on up.

A C/S does not see these points. He can get the pc asked what the auditor is doing or did. He can get sessions monitored. This helps him fill this gap in his data.

It's what isn't in the auditor's report that is often the trouble. Auditors omit what they said, omit the firefight, omit session alter-is in their worksheets.

All this sticks the C/S's neck out for the axe of failure.

So particularly in FFD, Int-Ext and other such actions, a C/S has to act to obtain confidence in the auditor's TRs, metering, Code use and accurate worksheets.

RISK

In FFD, Int-Ext RD and Power, experience has proven that if the auditor is not top grade, if the C/S is not alert, we put a pc at risk.

The USUAL is what keeps the pc safe.

A thorough study of his case, looking for obvious bugs (such as Int-Ext RD done twice, the case a druggie but drug engrams never run, Int done but its 2wc flubbed, to name a few serious ones), sending auditors to Cramming for the slightest flub, insisting on standard TRs USED IN SESSION, good metering, use of the Code, accurate and complete worksheets, use of standard tech, all guarantee the safety and progress of the pc.

INTRODUCING FFD

FFD (like the Int-Ext RD) requires flawless C/Sing and auditing or the case goes wrong.

When these actions were introduced they showed up any flaws in case studying, TRs, metering, Code and worksheets.

There are two ways to handle. (a) Cancel FFD and Int-Ext as actions. Obviously that is going backwards and is impossible. (b) Begin and continue a serious, effective campaign in the org to (1) Train auditors better, (2) Cram expertly on every flub, (3) Raise quality of TRs and metering.

As you can see, my approach is to improve quality of training, cramming and delivery.

Please help me out in getting this in.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH: nt .ts.rd
Copyright © 1971, 1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[This HCO B is added to by HCO B 21 April 1971-1R, Addition of 13 January 1975, Revised 22 February 1975, C/S Series 36RB-1R, *Quadruple Dianetics-Dangers of*, page 383.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 21 APRIL 1971-1R

Remimeo
All Auditors
Class VIII
Dn Chksht
Int-Ext Chksht

ADDITION OF 13 JANUARY 1975
REVISED 22 FEBRUARY 1975

*(Cancels HCO B 21 Apr 71, Reissued 13 Jan 75, same title.
Does not cancel HCO B 21 Apr 71RB, Reissued 21 Sept 74,
C/S Series 36RB, which is still valid.)*

C/S Series 36RB-1R

**QUADRUPLE DIANETICS
DANGERS OF**

(Applies also to Int-Ext Rundown)

(Ref HCO B 4 Apr 71-1R, Addition of 13 Jan 75, Revised 22 Feb 75,
C/S Series 32RA-1R, and HCO B 5 Apr 71, Reissued 13 Jan 75, C/S Series 33RA-1)

In observing Quad Dianetics in the hands of Scientology Auditors not specially briefed or who had additives and figure-figure on how to move a case already run on Singles and Triples into Full Flow,

INVARIABLY THEY OVERRAN.

This makes getting Quad Dianetics in on a case dangerous unless the Auditor has the hang of it.

The flagrant (and I do mean flagrant) errors found consisted of (a) not being able to run precise Standard Dianetics in the first place; (b) re-running already erased chains “to find if they were flat”; (c) Out TRs to a wild extent; (d) refusing utterly to accept pc’s data; (e) faulty metering; (f) complete ignorance of the Auditor’s Code, notably committing the crime of Invalidating the pc; (g) running unreading Flows when catching a pc up to Quad.

REQUIREMENTS

Anyone essaying to run Quad Dianetics MUST BE CRAMMED on his R3R, the use of L3RD, all data on Quad Dianetics (as per references above and including HCO B 27 Mar 71, “Dianetic Erasure”), his basic TRs, his metering and the Auditor’s Code, and this HCO B.

TRs

TR Zero exists so an Auditor is not ducking the session but can sit there relaxed, doing his job.

TR One must be done so the pc can *hear* and understand the Auditor (without blowing the pc’s head off either).

TR Two must be done so that the pc gets acknowledged. This can be so corrupted that the Auditor doesn't ack at all but gives the pc meter reads! Instead of acks! Or keeps saying, "I didn't understand you," etc.

TR Three basically existed so that the Auditor would continue to give the pc commands and not squirrel off or pack up with total silence.

TR Four exists so that the pc's origins are accepted and not Qed and Aed with or invalidated.

And, surprise, surprise, TRs are for use in the session itself, not just a drill. They are *how* one runs a session.

Metering can miss every F/N or give "F/Ns" with high or low TA. And one *never* feeds meter data to the pc: "That read," "That didn't read," "That blew down," just must not exist in session patter. "Thank you. That F/Ned," is as far as an Auditor goes. And that's the end of the cycle and says so.

Floating needles can be overlooked by an Auditor. In Quad Dianetics this fault is *fatal*.

Auditor's Code must be in on all points and particularly Invalidation. Pc says, "That's so and so." An Auditor who says, "I'm sorry. You are wrong," or any other invalidation is going to wreck a pc's case. A full knowledge of the Auditor's Code and actually applying it saves endless troubles. It is an auditing TOOL, not just a nice idea.

REHABBING CHAINS

One rehabs a Dianetic Chain that, according to a previous worksheet, erased by saying, "According to session records (flow direction) (item) erased." That's all. One does not say, "Did the chain giving others a headache erase?" One does not run it again to find out. One does not run a single command "to see if it F/Ns again". One can say, "Do you agree that the chain giving another a headache erased?" But the more you ask a pc to look for an erased chain the more messed up things will get. It isn't there. But the Auditor by his action can imply it *should* be there or *might* be there. A totally wrong approach would be, "Look around your bank and see if what isn't there anymore isn't there."

Dianetics is NOT Scientology. A Dianetic Chain is *not* a release. If you try to use Scientology rehab tech on a Dianetic Chain, you have had it. It isn't a "release" (which is a key-out). A Dianetic Chain is an erasure. You can't rehab erasures with "How many times?", etc.

The test of this is the doing. If you try to use Scn rehab on Dianetic Chains, the PC MIGHT TRY TO FIND SOMETHING. This causes him to key in other unrun or similar items.

It is a dangerous action at best to try to handle old erased chains. The best you can do is to tell the pc what the old W/S said. If no W/S exists leave the already erased flows alone!

FLUBBED CHAINS

Many times, a Folder Error Summary will give a flubbed chain and then fail to note it was repaired in the next session!

A C/S and Auditor would have been pretty irresponsible to just go on auditing past flubbed chains.

The only safe way to handle some previous flubbed chain is to:

- (a) Verify in the folder if it was repaired.
- (b) *If still unrepaired assess L3RD on it and handle according to the L3RD.*

L3 RD

Using the new L3RD (HCO B 11 Apr 71 RA) is a Dianetic action.

A Scientology Auditor erroneously can try to use it as a 2-way comm type of list. If a chain needed one more ABCD, then 2-way comm on it with no ABCD is not going to complete it.

L3RD has its own directions. Questions not marked with directions are used to indicate the fact. This can amount to 2-way comm as the pc chews it over. But L3RD where marked is handled by Dianetics actions. Look over the list and its directions for each question and you will see that some are given directions that are NOT 2wc.

Example: “Earlier beginning” reads. You can’t just say, “The incident had an earlier beginning,” and you can’t say, “Tell me about the earlier beginning.” The pc will go up the wall. There’ll be no F/N. You have to use R3R and get him to the earlier beginning and then run it and if it still doesn’t erase, get him to an Earlier Similar and erase that.

L3RD is a Dianetics List. It is not a Scientology List that is cleared each question to F/N by 2-way comm.

OVERRUN

Overruns are demonstrated by a rising TA.

If as you seek to get in Full Flow Dianetics the pc’s TA begins to average higher, overrun is occurring.

Example: While doing FFD pc’s TA has been riding at 2.2 and F/Ns. After a new FFD action it begins to ride at 2.5 and F/Ns. Something is being overrun. Find it and indicate it. And cease to stir the bank up so much! The fault is going over items already run.

Already flat zero flows are not uncommon. The zero flattened on the original Triple. Thus getting in that zero flow again is an overrun.

In doing a Full Flow Table you often find that the same or similar have been run in the past. Sometimes you find that a previous attempt to run the item a second or third time has resulted in an ARC Break, the reason for which was never detected.

The right action is to note the session date it was *first* run and just tell the pc, "Feeling Surprised was run three times. On (first date it was erased) it was erased. When later run it was an overrun." This tends to blow the later charge laid in by trying to run the same item again.

It sounds so strange that erased chains can be overrun. But it is true. What happens is that pcs try to cooperate and put something there.

FIREFIGHTS

The action of a quarrel between an Auditor and a pc is called a firefight.

Restimulating earlier unrun engrams or overrunning chains upsets a pc. The best action, as soon as a pc is disturbed, is to do an L3RD fast and handle what reads the way it should be handled according to the L3RD.

The wrong way is to argue or try to go on.

The pc does NOT know what it is. He just feels awful. He tries to guess. He will ARC Brk or get sad if the Auditor continues.

The correct action is an L3RD.

L1C is not of great use in a Dianetic ARC Brk. L3RD is.

If the pc remains ARC Broken, try L3RD again Method 5.

A Scientology session would be handled with some other list (L1C, L4B, etc). A Dianetic session, including and especially FFD, is handled with L3RD.

You NEVER prepcheck while doing Dianetics. This mushes up the engrams.

INTERIORIZATION

ALL these cautions apply as well to an Interiorization-Exteriorization Rundown, when restim occurs one uses an L3RD quickly.

Int-Ext RD is essentially a Dianetic, not a Scientology action.

SAFE ACTIONS

A fully genned in Auditor, well crammed, well drilled, well skilled, can be trusted with Dianetics, Dianetic Quads and an Int-Ext RD. Auditors not so handled can get pcs into serious trouble with these things.

A safe course is to use Quad only on new never audited before pcs. Those begun on Triples, use then only Triple flows.

Another safe way is to use FFD only on OT III's or OT IV's and done only by fully qualified FFD Auditors who are also OT III.

The safest course is to require special drilling and cramming on Auditors who are already known for their results by actual success story stats and call FFD and Int-Ext RD a skilled specialty.

C/S RESPONSIBILITY

Any trouble a C/S is running into comes from the factors of TRs, metering, Code and incomplete or false Auditor's reports.

If when I am C/Sing I ever find an Auditor has omitted key session actions or has falsified a report, I order that Auditor not to Cramming but a full retrain HDC right on up.

A C/S does not see these points. He can get the pc asked what the Auditor is doing or did. He can get sessions monitored. This helps him fill this gap in his data.

It's what isn't in the Auditor's report that is often the trouble. Auditors omit what they said, omit the firefight, omit session alter-is in their worksheets.

All this sticks the C/S's neck out for the axe of failure.

So particularly in FFD, Int-Ext and other such actions, a C/S has to act to obtain confidence in the Auditor's TRs, Metering, Code Use and accurate Worksheets.

RISK

In FFD, Int-Ext RD and Power, experience has proven that if the Auditor is not top grade, if the C/S is not alert, we put a pc at risk.

The USUAL is what keeps the pc safe.

A thorough study of his case, looking for obvious bugs (such as Int-Ext RD done twice, the case a druggie but Drug engrams never run, Int done but its 2wc flubbed, FFD grossly overrun, to name a few serious ones), sending Auditors to Cramming for the slightest flub, insisting on standard TRs USED IN SESSION, good metering, use of the Code, accurate and complete worksheets, use of standard tech, all guarantee the safety and progress of the pc.

INTRODUCING FFD

FFD (like the Int-Ext RD) requires flawless C/Sing and auditing or the case goes wrong.

When these actions were introduced they showed up any flaws in case studying, TRs, Metering, Code and Worksheets.

There are two ways to handle. (a) Cancel FFD and Int-Ext as actions. Obviously that is going backwards and is impossible. (b) Begin and continue a serious, effective campaign in the org to (1) Train Auditors better, (2) Cram expertly on every flub, (3) Raise quality of TRs and metering.

As you can see, my approach is to improve quality of training, cramming and delivery.

Please help me out in getting this in.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1971, 1975
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 3 JUNE 1971

Remimeo
VIII Checksheet
All VIIIs
Class IX
Dept 10s
All C/Ses

C/S Series 37R

REVISED

(C/S Series 37, HCOB 19 May 71 and C/S Series 37
Addition, HCOB 21 May 71, have been cancelled
and are not for use. They are replaced by this
HCOB, C/S Series 37R.)

**MUST BE CHECKED OUT *RATE
AND IN CLAY BEFORE USE!**

HIGH AND LOW TA BREAKTHROUGH

High and Low TAs have been a longtime puzzle and stumbling block to Auditors.

The usual definition of OVERRUN is “gone on too long” or “happened too often”. This causes high TAs to occur.

In examining a few failures on using “overrun”, I have found that underlying this there is a more basic principle.

When a theta believes something is “overrun” or “has gone on too long” or “was done too often” he is expressing only a symptom of another mechanism.

The truth is A THETAN CAN DO ANYTHING FOREVER.

To Audit “overruns” is auditing toward an untruth. Thus if carried on as a process it is really an out of ARC Process.

That which makes a theta *believe* something can be overrun is the EFFORT TO STOP or THE EFFORT TO STOP HIM.

The effort to stop something, when generalized, becomes a “stop everything” and IS the entrance point of insanity. This has been known since 1967. But I did not earlier connect it with the OVERRUN phenomenon.

When a theta has a long chain of efforts to stop or a chain of efforts to stop him (mixed up with protest, of course, and shame, blame and regret and other human emotion and reaction) he accumulates ridges. These make mass.

This mass makes the high TA.

In truth it is not possible to kill a thetan, so therefore any effort to stop a thetan would only have partial success. So the chain is also full of INCOMPLETES.

An incomplete cycle of action causes ARC Breaks.

Thus an OVERRUN is full of MASS and ARC Breaks!

As you possibly recall from the material of about 1955 the one process you must not run on a pc is "Look out of here and find something you can go out of ARC with." This sends him into a dwindling spiral.

The common denominators of a bank are OUT OF ARC and STOP!

Thus if too long a list of "What has been Overrun" is required to obtain the first BD F/N item the listing action may very well restimulate much more bank than can easily be handled on some pcs.

As these are *also* the pcs with very high TA, if one lists for overrun and runs much too long a list to get his first BD F/N item, the pc can be heavily restimulated.

Listing errors or upsets can make this, then, too uncomfortable a proceeding for a pc and should NOT now be done.

And if it doesn't work on some pcs in the hands of some auditors, it must therefore be cancelled. Any recommendation on VIII Course to do it is cancelled.

The theory is correct as given on the VIII Course. There, a *few* items were intended. But now some very long lists have come up on some pcs which made the pc uncomfortable and were hard for the auditor to handle. Thus the BD F/N item overrun list must not be done.

CONTINUE is then the Reverse Action to overrun. Continue equals Survival.

The REVERSE to overrun therefore can be run as a process, to wit, "What would you be permitted to continue?" or "What could be Continued?"

This however would not be very successful. Thus the listing action is recommended as the process to use.

LISTS

SEVEN Lists can be done on Overrun itself by using the in-ARC Approach.

- Assess
 - A. Self to another
 - B. Another to self
 - C. Others to others
 - D. Others to self
 - E. Self to self

F. Another to others

G. Others to another

Ordinarily the biggest read or any read has located a flow that will run and will be most real to the pc. But this is not true in handling overruns. The most stopped or rising read is where he's really hung. To get a TA down list the most stopped read or the *rise* of the read or the item that raised the TA when called. This is ONLY true of Overruns.

The list questions for the above are:

If A stopped: "What could you continue to do to another?"

If B stopped: "What could another continue to do to you?"

If C stopped: "What could others continue to do to others?"

If D stopped: "What could others continue to do to you?"

If E stopped: "What could you continue to do to yourself?"

If F stopped, list "What could another continue to do to others?"

If G stopped, list "What could others continue to do to another?"

The "Most stopped read" would be one that really froze the needle or caused it to rise or caused the TA to RISE such as 3.5 to 3.6.

The lists would be listed to a BD F/N item, Cog, VGIs. Actually the list could be listed forever. But the pc will get an item he likes and that F/Ns. He is then given his item. One does NOT null such lists unless one has really goofed.

ALL the lists A, B, C, D, E, F and G can be listed. To get a TA DOWN you list the flow that sends the TA UP. Then reassess for the next that sends the TA up, etc.

LOW TA

The same exact thing causes LOW TAs. The flow could be said to have overwhelmed the pc.

Exactly how you read the list for Low TA will be given in another HCOB after further tests are made. In theory it would go lower on assessment.

Please note that OUT TRs on the part of auditors is the most frequent cause of low TAs. TR 1 that drives the pc out through the back of his head can cause a low (below 2.0) TA on a lot of pcs.

END PHENOMENA

The End Phenomena, the “EP” of a TA HANDLING RUNDOWN would be all lists assessed or listed to F/N and the pc’s needle doing a persistent continual F/N for *days*. This means an F/N, wide, that nothing can kill.

DEPT 10

The Department of Special Cases should have auditors who can do this rundown by the book and with perfect results. It is really a Dept 10 technique.

FLOW NOTE

There are about seven flow directions that can be used or listed. (1) Self to another, (2) Another to self, (3) Others to others, (4) Self to others, (5) Others to self, (6) Another to others, (7) Others to another.

“Flow” is an electronic flow in a direction. In Phoenix, Arizona, in 1952 an “Oscilloscope” (has a face like a radar, shows wave patterns and directions) was once hooked up to an E-Meter movement and showed that a mental flow will flow just so long in one direction. By reversing the repetitive commands when the left-right directional flow slowed, the flow turned around and flowed right-left then slowed, etc. So actual electrical flow occurs in response to the directional command (like “self to another”). Also it jams up when run too long on an average human because his mind has “overruns” in it already.

“Ridges” and masses come about from a conflict of flows opposing or being pulled back as in withdraws.

High TAs are caused by two or more flows opposing thus making a mass or ridge.

Low TAs are caused by overwhelm by flows.

The theta thinks of them as overruns and so quits on a subject or wishes he could.

This is why the TA behaves as it does on life and certain subjects.

There is no real reason why a flow can’t go on forever in one direction unless a theta tries to stop it. Then it ridges and makes mass which then reads on a TA.

AUDITOR QUALIFICATIONS

An Auditor must be a master at Listing and Nulling in order to touch such Actions as these lists. To foul up on listing on an already fouled-up pc is quite out-tech !

An auditor’s TRs should have been passed the Hard Way.

His metering must be excellent and flawless.

His command and use of the Auditor’s Code must be complete.

He should himself have had case gain.

He must have a full checkout on this HCO B and be able to do it in clay.

And as I say, he must know the subject of Listing and Nulling so well, he can always list smoothly to a BD F/N item with never a quiver.

INTERIORIZATION RUNDOWN

This HCO B does not change the Interiorization Rundown in theory or in practice.

It does however give this procedure.

1. On a high or low TA pc check for Exteriorization in auditing.
2. If pc has gone Ext in Auditing make *sure* he has not had an Ext-Int RD earlier before giving him another.
3. If an earlier Int RD exists repair, complete or rehab it. Often an Int RD is itself overrun. An L3B on it will show what is wrong with the earlier one. Some poor High TA pcs have had 2 or 3 Ext-Int RDs! All run past the EP.

Some Ext-Int RDs went totally flat on the secondaries! Or on the recalls. All else was overrun.

4. If no earlier Ext-Int RD was done, then do one.
5. If the check of the Ext-Int RD situation shows it not to be the reason, or was the reason but the TA goes high or low days later, then DO THIS TA HANDLING RD.

As pc high and low TAs have been blocking auditing for a lot of auditors this discovery and its remedy is Delightful news!

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 15 JUNE 1971

Remimeo

C/S Series 37R
Addition

HI-LO TA ASSESSMENT RULES

In assessing and listing the Continue process it is VITAL to continue to assess the seven flows and list until the entire list widely F/Ns.

There can be more than seven lists taken from the seven flows.

One finds a rise or blow up item, does a list on it, then reassesses ALL seven flows, finds the next most rising item, lists then and assesses ALL seven flows and finds the next most stopped or rising item and lists that. One just keeps this up.

Eventually on assessing the seven flows you can only get a stopped needle. Then a slowed or killed F/N. One uses these for lists. Sometimes toward the last they blow on indication and cog.

The end of it all is the auditor assessing the seven flows without being able to disturb a wide wide persistent F/N.

THAT is the EP of the 37R process. There is no other EP. If not done to that EP the 37R process is incomplete.

CLEARING FLOWS

The idea of *flows* should be cleared with the pc before assessment is done.

One can do this by getting the pc to draw them.

Don't confuse the pc with this clearing and make sure he is not confused before assessing the seven flows.

REPEATED ASSMT

One can take a sheet of paper lengthwise and write the seven flows along the left edge with lines to the right. By putting in dividing vertical lines one then has 10 or 12 assessments laid out ready to do.

LOW TA

Unless one does a THOROUGH JOB to the 37R End Phenomena on a low TA case the TA will continue to go low in future sessions.

A low TA takes more times through the assessments and listing than a high TA.

CRAMMING

Auditors who can't do this well must be fully crammed on reading a needle and TA on stops, rises and blow *ups*.

The result, if properly done, is invariably good.

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 16 JUNE 1971 R
Issue IV
(Corrected and Reissued)

Remimeo

C/S Series 37R

Addition 2R

LOW TA ASSESSING

If after an apparent EP of a wide F/N on the last assessment, the pc then has a low TA at the Examiner or subsequently has a low TA, one must NOT start a new program as the existing one (37R) is incomplete.

The correct C/S for an apparent 37R EP which then went sour would be

1. L4B Method 3 and handle.
 2. Ask if there is another flow not yet touched. Note its read as it is described and list it.
 3. Reassess the existing and the additional flows for any slightest slow or choke and list it.
-

Should there still be trouble with low or high TA subsequently, it lies in the area of overts and withholdings which blow loose on the Continue process. This is true because overts and withholdings add up to stopping something which is discontinuance.

The next process (when all possible thoroughness has been taken with 37R yet trouble of high or low TA persists) has not yet been released.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1971, 1973
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 26 JUNE 1971

Remimeo

C/S Series 37R

Addition 3

37R is a very beefy process.

It has been combined into L9S, HCO B 17 June 71, and is best done as part of this full rundown.

37R works on anyone, regardless of TA or state of case. Neither it nor L9S are used only on bad off cases. They work on both the worst and the best.

In doing 37R the items are sometimes very heavy and it takes the pc a bit to accept them. Therefore when one gets a BD F/N item, one asks "Is _____ your item?" If he says yes, indicate it to him by saying "_____ is your item." The meter should give a fall and the F/N will widen.

If the pc says it is NOT his item, ask the question again and continue to list. The pc will put the item back on the list usually for it *was* his item. But he has to list further to realize it. He can also fail to put it back on the list and if so and he is getting restless in listing, give him the BD F/N item again and he'll buy it.

A very big item that alters the pc's whole concept of things with big cogs and 2 wc is a good place to stop a session. 37R doesn't all have to be done in one session. When you begin a new list before the last item is discharged the pc can get a bit overwhelmed. This is a "nice" point, not a vital one.

Also the big item will often cause the next assessment to be a bit hard as the pc's attention remains tied up in it for a while.

If after 37R the pc's TA later goes up or down again out of normal 2.0 to 3.0 range the action to do is an L4B in general on 37R. It usually picks up the cognitions and confirms rather than corrects. L4B reads on wrong item. Auditor says which one. Pc gives it. Quite usually it's a right item pc hasn't cogged on.

After the L4B, one can again run 37R. However, a better action is to

Fly all ruds Continue with L9S.

RUDS

When Ruds are out during 37R a pc can feel strange. Of course with a high or low TA you can't get the ruds *in*.

So you can do a list of 37R and as this will F/N the meter, you can get in all ruds.

FLOWS

The pc may have NO idea of flows. So before assessing the first time one must clear “flows”. The pc must understand that these words self to another mean a *flow* from himself to any another, etc.

If while clearing the word “flow” and “flows” you watch your meter also you will get your first blow up of the TA.

ASSESS SLOWLY

By reading a flow and waiting a moment, you give the TA time to rise.

You can assess too rapidly and find that the TA has gone up, but which of the last items did it go up on? By proceeding a little more slowly you will be sure.

ADDITIONAL FLOW

There is another flow.

H. ANOTHER TO ANOTHER.

This should be added to your assessment sheet.

ASSESSMENT FORM

An assessment form can be printed. The flows A to H (adding the new one above) are put in on the left-hand edge of the paper held the long way. They can be repeated A-H and A-H. Lines and boxes lead out for repeated assessments.

This makes it easier for the auditor.

STEPS 37R

1. Clear the word “flow”.
2. Clear the idea of flow (watch meter) for each flow A to H so you have no misunderstandings.
3. Assess the listing sheet. Take the biggest Blow Up or speeded rise (if no big Blow Up).
4. Mark it on the assmt form and W/S.
5. Fit it into the Q on a separate listing sheet, What could _____ continue to do to _____ ?
6. Ask the Question of the pc.
7. Get the pc to give you items.

8. Write the items down while watching the meter. Mark needle reads or BDs. Put down TA reads regularly on the list.
9. Get the first item that Blows down (or up) and F/Ns.
10. Ask pc if _____ is his item.
11. If pc says Yes, say, “_____ is your item.” Circle it on listing sheet and mark the F/N and “*Ind*” for Indicated to pc. If pc says No, continue to list. Pc will put item back on the list, at which time do 10 and 11 above. Pc will accept it. If he goes on and begins to protest, give him the first BD F/N item and do 11 and 12. He will accept it.
12. Mark item and TA and any 2 wc on the item or cogs on the W/S.

DON'TS

Don't do this process without

- (a) Checking out on C/S Series 37R, with Additions 1, 2 and this one, 3.
- (b) Do I hrs confront and I hour reach and withdraw on your meter.
- (c) Dummy running the 12 steps above with no pc but all the paper and tools until it is a faultless action.
- (d) Don't call pc's attention to the meter with comments or stares or looks of horror or edginess or fumbles.
- (e) Have smooth, perfect TRs.
- (f) Follow the Auditor's Code.

USING L9S

If used in conjunction with L9S then L9S should also be drilled on dating and locating and dummy run.

SESSION FORM

These processes and rundowns are done in a streamlined session form.

SPECIAL 37R

The various flows of Auditor to pc can be run and indeed an assessment of many subjects or dynamics can be assessed by rise and then flow patterned as in Auditor-pc below.

This Special 37R is mentioned here but will be laid out in full for other subjects in another issue.

Pcs who have protest on auditing can be done in this way.

The flows are

Auditor to pc _____

Pc to Auditor _____

Auditors to pc _____

Pc to Auditors _____

Pc to Self _____

Auditor to Self _____

Aside from list change—Auditor-pc is done like general 37R.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH: nt.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[HCO B 17 June 1971, L9S, referred to on first page of this issue, is a Flag Only issue and is not in these volumes.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 26 MAY 1971

Remimeo
Basic Cse Super Hat
D of P Hat
C/S Hats
Tech Sec

C/S Series 38

**TRS COURSE AND AUDITING
MIXING MAJOR ACTIONS**

With the use of TRs The Hard Way on basic courses, auditors and students, a rule must be laid down:

**A PERSON ON A TR COURSE OR IN PROGRESS ON
A TR CYCLE MAY NOT ALSO BE AUDITED.**

And a second rule:

**HGC ADMIN AND THE D OF P MUST BE
INFORMED OF ENROLLMENTS ON TR COURSES
OR TRS IN CRAMMING AND MUST SO MARK A
PC'S FOLDER WITH DATE.**

And a third rule:

**IN AN ADVANCED ORG THE ADV CSE ADMIN
MUST ALSO BE INFORMED OF STUDENTS
ENROLLING ON A TR COURSE.**

And a fourth rule:

**A SIGN MUST BE PLACED IN QUAL AND IN A TR
CLASSROOM "WHILE WORKING ON TRS AND
UNTIL THEY ARE PASSED, DO NOT ACCEPT
AUDITING." IN AN AO OR SH THIS READS "WHILE
WORKING ON TRS AND UNTIL THEY ARE
PASSED, DO NOT ACCEPT AUDITING OR DO
SOLO."**

The reason for these rules lies in the major C/S rules:

DO NOT BEGIN NEW PROGRAMS TO END OLD.

**DO NOT START A NEW ACTION BEFORE
COMPLETING THE EXISTING ONE.**

And the auditor rule:

OBTAI AN F/N BEFORE STARTING THE NEXT C/S ACTION. IF UNABLE TO DO SO, NEVER BEGIN THE NEXT C/S ACTION BUT END SESSION AND RETURN THE FOLDER TO THE C/S.

The surest way in the world to bog a case is to:

1. Begin a new process without obtaining an F/N on the one just run.
2. Begin a major action without completing the old one.
3. Begin a major action without setting up a case with ruds and F/Ns.
4. Begin a new program without completing the old one.
5. Start several programs without finishing any.
6. Enter a new major action into a case already in progress on another incomplete major action.

I have seen a case on as many as *five* major actions with none complete. And when I see this the first thing I take up is the first unflat incomplete program and get it finished, then the next, then the next. The case comes out all smooth.

Example: Case is on but not complete on Dianetic auditing. Switched to grades. Incomplete on grades, gets a Prog Pgm. Incomplete on a Prog Pgm, shifted to Power.

The only apparent exception is a repair. A case can be repaired if bogged PROVIDING THE ORIGINAL ACTION IS REHABBED IF O/R OR COMPLETED TO EP.

A Progress Pgm may reach EP before the *written up* program is completed.

Thus a Process Completion is defined as the END PHENOMENA of the process. A Program is complete when the END PHENOMENA of the Program is attained.

TRs

Any course or program containing TRs 0-4, 6-9 or Admin TRs is a major program in itself. It produces case gain—if run right—and has an End Phenomenon.

Further, by actual experience when a person is on a real (not a patty-cake and weak) TR Course and is also being audited at the same time, the C/S and Auditor if they don't know the person is also on TRs can be utterly baffled and worried as the case does not run right. "What did I do?" "What C/S was wrong?" "Look, his TA is high." "Now it's low." "Last session he ____." And the C/S and auditor engage in efforts to handle the odd case behavior. But the person, unknown to them, was *also* on a real TR Course and his case was changing!

INTERJECTED PGMS

You can also run into this same oddity with a mystic who does “bathe the body in light” every night or a wife whose husband audits her between HGC sessions or a self-auditor.

The principle is the same. The C/S and auditor are going down Wellbeing Street and hidden trucks keep dashing out of alleys and running into the pc.

LIFE

The reason auditing should be done in intensive packages, not 1 hour a week or a session a month lies in the fact that LIFE can run a new action in on a pc.

It's a great way to waste auditing to let a pc have a session once a week. You can't even keep his ruds in if he lives in any confusions.

So nothing is done for the *case*, all the auditing goes to handle the life interjections!

CROSS PROGRAMMING

A case runs on cycles of actions. This is true in the auditing comm cycle. It is true in a process cycle. It is true in a program cycle.

New things being crossed into old incomplete things make a sort of ARC Break situation like a cut comm cycle.

One could do everything with a process or a program OR A COURSE that you find on an L1C. It would not be very wise.

No case gain can be created by lack of a comm cycle in an auditor, lack of an action cycle in processes or messing up a program cycle.

If you don't believe it, run an L1C on a pc with “Processes” and “Programs” and “Courses” as a prefix. You'd be amazed. Further the fellow who doesn't reach the EP of a *Course* is likely never to use that material or be faulty with the subject.

Usual study courses like admin or tech give case gain. One can carry on with auditing parallel to them. But still expect a case to change a bit by study and baffle a C/S once in a while. But a *real* TR Course produces changes up and down and up that are not possible to *also* audit around. So they don't mix.

VISUAL IDEA

To get a visual idea of this:

Optimum:

	Start	Change	End
TR Course	I-----	I-----	I-----
	Start	Change	End
Pgm 1:	I-----	I-----	I-----
	Start	Change	End
Pgm 2:	I-----	I-----	I-----

LRH:nt.sb.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 31 MAY 1971R
REVISED 21 OCTOBER 1971

Remimeo

C/S Series 39R

STANDARD 12½ HOUR INTENSIVE PROGRAMS

The sale of 12½ hour Intensives modifies earlier versions of Advance Programs (Grade Chart) since a C/S now needs everything he can get a pc audited on. It is not now a question of selling the public anything with a name. You just sell 12½ hour Intensives. The C/S decides what to run and runs all he can as lengthily as he can. Refunds come from not enough auditing. Gains come from auditing in large blocks of hours such as 1 to 6 12½ hr Intensives, always delivered at 12½ hrs per week or weekend.

SAMPLE PROGRESS PROGRAM

Repair Program.

(Can include GF.)

Life Repair

C/S Series 53

(Int Repair or Int RD wherever indicated and if reading.)

GF 40X Revised Method 3

Dianetic C/S I

Engram Handling of, R3R Triple

GF 40X Revised.

ADVANCE PROGRAM

C/S 54 (omit running things already run in GF 40X)

Dianetics R3R Triple to Completion (Any Ruds or repair needed during Dianetic actions.)

ARC St Wire Triple

Grade Zero Expanded Triple (or Ex Single if you don't have the Triple processes in)

Grade I Expanded Triple (or Ex Single if you don't have the Triple processes in)

Grade II Expanded Triple (or Ex Single if you don't have the Triple processes in)

Grade III Expanded Triple (or Ex Single if you don't have the Triple processes in)

Grade IV Expanded Triple (or Ex Single if you don't have the Triple processes in)

(Any repairs above at any place during above, using GF, etc.)

Power Set-up: Life Ruds and G Form

Power Triple
Va
R6EW
Clearing Course
OT I
OT II
OT III to attest
OT VII
OT III Expanded to attest
L-10 (when released)
OT IV
OT V
OT VI
Rehab OT VII
Any higher OT grade.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 7 JUNE 1971

Remimeo

C/S Series 40

LOW TAs

As per C/S Series 37R, further work was done on low TAs.

LOW TAs ALSO ASSESS ON RISE JUST LIKE HIGH TAs.

There is no difference of procedure except that a low TA can blow UP to 2.0 + and F/N.

Thus one can't say using 37R on a low TA case, "List to a BD F/N item" as it may be a Blow UP F/N item.

The TA may be at 1.8 in listing and when the F/N item goes on the list, the TA will blow UP to 2.0 or 2.1 and F/N.

Further if the F/N promptly dies, and the TA falls, one lists further until one blows up, the F/N continues and the pc is pleased with it.

Assessment on a low TA is done on RISE for the item listed or a Blow UP, just as in the case of high TAs.

When you list a low TA's falling flow (in assessing the seven flows) and use it for the Continue list the pc can get very unhappy and will get even more overwhelmed.

Thus low TA or high TA, list the 7 flows for *rise* or blow UP and list the one that rose most. This is true of the first and every other flows assessment.

Realize this blow UP rule only applies to 37R and the Continue list and is not used in any other listing.

37R works on low TAs like a bomb!

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 9 JUNE 1971
Issue I

Remimeo

C/S Series 41

C/S TIPS

LISTS

Always C/S to correct lists first when lists are out or suspected to be out.

Don't do ARC Brks first in a case of out lists as an out list can make an ARC Break that can't be handled by ARC Brk but only an L4B.

On a GF when lists show up or overlists you should handle that (first action in handling the GF) but also you must order an "L4B Method 5 and Handle." Method 5 is the once through for assessment.

NO READ AUDITORS

When auditors can get no reads on things you get their

- a) TRs checked to see if they can even be heard.
- b) Their metering checked for meter position on auditing table, can they see meter, pc and write without shifting eyes? And can they see pc's hands on the cans?

And was the meter turned on and charged and can an auditor work the Tone Arm smoothly with his thumb?

- c) Does the auditor discount reads gotten on clearing commands? (They are the reads.)
- d) Can the auditor read out a list and see the meter reads as a coordinated action?

CRAMMING

Send auditors to cramming on all flubs, insist they GO to cramming, insist cramming calls them in and crams them and insist on a carbon copy of the fact that cramming has been done. *All* the hard work of C/Sing comes in when auditors are flubby.

It takes weeks to make an auditor after he has had a course and it's only done by Cram-Cram—Cram.

R FACTORS

Never order an R Factor that takes pc into future or past as he then won't be in session. Example: C/Ses "R Factor we are setting you up for Dianetics." Promptly the pc is up ahead not in *this* session.

MIXING STARTS

There are many ways to start a session. Don't mix them.

It's "2 wc what do you have your attention on?"

"Fly a rud if no F/N."

"Fly all ruds."

"2 wc the TA down."

"Fly a rud or GF + 40 Method 5 and handle."

It's not a mixture of frantic efforts to get a TA down.

If the auditor can't on what the C/S says THE AUDITOR ENDS OFF.

Interiorization is undone or out, there may be list errors, there may be overruns, but for sure it's a case for FOLDER STUDY, not for an auditor C/Sing in the chair.

HIGH TA & ARC BRKS

Train your auditors NEVER TRY TO GET A TA DOWN FROM 3.5 OR ABOVE ON ARC BREAKS.

LOW TA QUILTS

Some auditors see a TA sink below 2.0 and then won't continue the 2 wc or process to get the TA back up.

"The TA sank so I quit" is a common auditor note.

Compare this: "The TA rose above 3.0 so I quit."

See? Doesn't make sense.

If a TA sinks below 2.0—and the auditor's TRs are good—the same action will usually bring it up to 2.0 and F/N.

Come down hard on auditors who do this.

Get their TRs checked, make them continue.

EXAM F/Ns AFTER FLUBS

Pcs whose TAs are high in session or low in session and get F/N at the Exams put the finger on the auditor. They are protesting or being overwhelmed.

Always C/S “Examiner! Ask pc what auditor did in session.”

Then you know it's the auditor or the case. The pc will say the auditor was okay. So it's case. But usually *when cases are puzzles* there's weird things going on with TRs.

Also the auditor may be noisy or laugh hard or is boisterous and being “interesting”.

C/S VIA

The C/S is handling cases on the via of an auditor.

If the auditor is *perfect* the C/S can handle the work out of the case. If the auditor is not perfect in TRs, metering, Code, reports and doing the C/S then the C/S is solving a factor unknown to him, not the pc's case.

So, be a perfect C/S. Demand perfect auditing. Cases fly.

HIGHER LEVELS

A C/S who assesses a pc to higher levels to solve lower ones is really asking for a wreck.

It's always the earlier actions that are out.

Trying to cheat a case up to Grade 2 when he won't run on Grade I is like trying to run the whole grade chart to cure a cold.

A pc can always be solved in or below where he is.

“Oh, we'll put him up a grade and cure his high TA” is like “He can't pass kindergarten so we'll enroll him in college.”

C/S EXPERTISE

A C/S has to know his auditing materials, HCO Bs and texts MUCH better than an auditor.

If a C/S is not being successful, get a retread on VI and VIII materials.

A C/S also must be confident HE could crack the case as an auditor.

When a C/S is shaky on his materials then the world of auditing looks very unstable.

The tech is very exact, very effective. If any errors existed in it they've been corrected.

So the variables are the knowledge of the C/S, his discipline and demands of auditors and the actions of the auditor.

If THESE are stable then the cases that come along are easy as can be.

The successful C/S knows his materials. If he wants to be even more successful he keeps his study up.

Then he is steady and calm for he is totally certain.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 9 JUNE 1971
Issue II

Remimeo

C/S Series 42

C/S RULES

COMPLETE CYCLES

Don't leave cycles incomplete on a case.

If a C/S starts a 37R and the auditor goofs, correct the auditor and then get the 37R completed. Don't disperse and do something new.

If you have a program going and it's goofed, repair the auditor and the goofed pc and continue the program you began on the case.

Repair (Progress) Programs are ended when the pc is flying nicely. When a repair hits that, don't re-repair.

On Advance Programs, take each step to its EP. Don't suddenly start something new.

A sure way to solve a case is go back and find the earliest incomplete program, complete it and so on up to PT.

Keep your "finger in the book" on a case. Don't lose your place. That's done by having the current pgm on the inside front cover, paper clipped on, and checked off with each step done. When it's done, put a new pgm on top of it.

Insist that auditors keep up the inside front cover folder summary each session with their auditing time and admin time in the box. This FS is a 2 column set of boxes, date, what's run, F/N or bogged and time.

By seeing Admin is in you can keep your place in the book or study back rapidly to find what's been done.

DOUBLE ACTIONS

The deadliest faults on cases are running the same action or grade twice. This drives TAs up through the roof.

Example: Power done in '65. Done again in '69!

Example: Grade IV done in '69, done in '70.

You find the case isn't doing well or find the error. In doubles, rehab by date of the first time it was done.

I've seen Interiorization done three times on one pc, Power twice and the same Dianetic Chains run over and over. And people wondered "Why is the TA high" !

So when you order a major action always check to see if it's ever been done before! Save you grief. And if a major action won't run, suspect it may have been done before.

SET-UPS

Always set up a case fully for the next major action.

Don't overrepair. But be sure the case is not sick, has had good exam forms and does well.

Then C/S the next major action.

BLAMING THE PC

Never blame the pc. Many it is true are dog cases.

But even dog cases can be handled.

When you find auditors (or feel yourself) blaming the pc, get the overts and withholdings run out.

Once I got the most splendid sessions out of an HGC. I had the auditor's overts and withholdings checked on each auditor before he went into session. It was just research, but my it worked! Those were the smoothest sessions! Pcs began to fly!

Too many times one blames the pc only to find later that the auditor's TRs were ghastly and that a major action had been run twice. Such discoveries make a C/S out of a C/S.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 9 JUNE 1971
Issue III

Remimeo

C/S Series 43

C/S RULES

TROUBLE FOR THE PC

Never make trouble for the pc.

When a pc is running well let it roll. The C/S can spot a *possible* error but the pc is Wide F/N VGIs at the Exam, let it go.

Chew the auditor, send to Cramming. But don't throw the well running pc into extensive repair—don't break into a winning program harshly. It gives the pc a loss.

The pc who *isn't* running well is the one you repair. Don't keep a pc going on and on, running badly with no case study. Study the case folder, find the right why by going back to where the pc was running consistently well and then come forward for the error. It will be in the exact next session.

If the pc wasn't ever audited before, you go into his life of course, with a GF + 40 Method 5 and handle and other Life repairs.

OVERREPAIR

Any Repair or Progress action has reached its End Phenomena when the pc is running well again.

This is peculiar to the Repair or Progress program.

Wrong Example: Pc was on Grade III, fell on his head. C/S studied case, found out lists, wrote an extensive Repair Pgm and C/S. Half way through repair the pc again was flying. C/S continued the repair. Pc bogged. C/S C/Sed the pc to flying again. C/S continued the repair. Pc bogged.

Right Example: Pc falls on his head on Grade III. C/S writes a Repair Pgm and C/S. Auditor finds the out list, corrects it. Pc flies. C/S puts pc at once back on Grade III to complete.

AUDITOR INVAL

An auditor can be invalidated by a C/S by having a lot of questionable tech points thrown at him.

The auditor's *data* gets shaky.

If no decision was ever made—is not in HCO Bs and tapes—is not to hand and can't be referred to by HCO B and tape, then a C/S should not be making the point.

Example: Auditor extends a list three more items beyond an F/N. C/S chops him. There is no such rule. The pc maybe wouldn't accept the item until he listed a few more. Result is a firefight between C/S and auditor, simply because it isn't a valid point.

HCO Bs and Tapes *are* the stable data that form the agreement between the auditor and the C/S. "If it isn't written (or spoken on tape) it isn't true."

Don't wander off known tech points in C/Sing.

Never shake an auditor's data by advancing data not on HCO Bs and Tapes.

Always know your data, your HCO Bs and Tapes and refer the auditor to them in Cramming.

Cramming MUST have a library of all materials.

A hidden data line can build up in C/S-Auditor lines (or course lines or Cramming lines) that CAN UNSTABILIZE ALL TECH AND DENY FURTHER RESULTS.

The decay of tech in areas begins with hidden data lines that ARE NOT TRUE.

So use and refer to HCO Bs and Tapes and leave all other points alone. Your auditors will become confident and certain and Tech will improve.

It's enough just to insist on the usual.

Then auditors and cases will fly.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 10 JUNE 1971
Issue I

Remimeo

C/S Series 44R

C/S RULES

PROGRAMMING FROM PREPARED LISTS

There are many vital prepared lists.

King of these is the Green Form. The additional No. 40 items are the original Seven Resistive Cases. The best way to do a GF + 40 is Method 5 (once through), lengths of reads and BDs marked and C/S to then write a C/S for it.

Hi-Lo TA is also such a list, also done Method 5.

Any such prepared list can be done Method 5 and the C/S to then write a C/S.

But L4B (Lists correction), L3B (Dianetic errors) and L1C (ARC Brks and bypassed charge) are usually done Method 3 (auditor assesses to a read, gets the action done, and/or earlier similar to an F/N, not going on until his action has resulted in an F/N and then going on to complete handling and F/Ning each read he gets).

When the C/S has a list assessed Method 5 he expects usually to get it back with the reads and then write the C/S for it. Sometimes he asks for a GF + 40 and a Hi-Lo TA both to be done Method 5.

Now the question comes up, which reads does the C/S write up to be handled first? And second? And third? Etc. In other words how does he arrange the C/S the auditor is to do now? What sequence are the items handled in?

These rules apply:

Handle an Out Int RD first.

Handle anything connected with "Lists" (meaning Listing and Nulling Lists) first if Int isn't out. Like "Listed past right item," reads. The C/S would get that handled FIRST. Always handle list errors first. And usually do an L4B additionally, Auditor to handle. A pc can get sick after a listing error and you can't get auditing done when lists are out.

Doesn't want auditing, why, is then handled if it read.

Next C/S to handle anything to do with rudiments. ARC Brks, PTPs and W/Hs take precedence in that order.

(Listing errors are first, before ARC Brks because an apparent ARC Break after a listing error can only be handled by getting the charge off the list.)

Anything that *looks* like a withhold comes next.

After that one just takes the lengths or BD of reads. Take the biggest reads before you take the smaller ones, once you have C/Sed for Lists, doesn't want auditing and Ruds and evident other withhold.

The only confusion that one can get into is a very high TA. But List errors can cause high TAs. Next in frequency is withhold.

Never C/S to take a TA down with an ARC Brk rud or an L1C. *Never*.

You can C/S to “talk a TA down” only when there are no list errors or withhold reading on a GF.

Of course an Interiorization Rundown error is a primary target. But you don't have that once it's handled. You will get a soaring TA if Int is out. L3B is a potent tool to order for Int outnesses, the auditor handling as he goes, Method 3.

So the above gives you the rules by which you C/S from assessed prepared lists.

Basically—when Int is out, auditing will drive the TA up.

When lists are out nothing will handle but lists and L1C won't nor will ruds.

When ruds are out nothing else will straighten up and you mustn't order auditors to audit with out ruds.

Doesn't want auditing can come from a bad L & N list. Or out Int. Or out ruds. Previous bad auditing can be cured by L1C on previous bad auditing. The craziest out auditing I ever ran into was an auditor using reads and F/Ns when there were none and failing to take up or flatten reads he did get. So there can be variations on bad auditing and there can be, to our shame, false auditing reports. The best C/S is to find what auditor and find out what the error was. Bad TRs on a poor TR Course where the pc was a student (False passes and invalidated wins) can also cause “doesn't want auditing”.

“Protest” is a frequent reason for high TA and is a cousin to “doesn't want auditing” and is handled by checking “Lists” for read and doing an L4B if it reads or finding the out ruds or other BPC as in L1 C.

As there are so many combinations of reading items from prepared lists, you have to C/S according to these general principles.

These rules serve as a steadyng guide that you'll find win for you.

LRH:sb.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

[This HCO B is added to by BTB 31 October 1971, Reissued 2 July 1974, C/S Series 44R Addition, *C/S Rules- The Sequence of Programs*, which is in the C/S Series Volume, page 151.]

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN

31 OCTOBER 1971

Reissued 2 July 1974 as BTB

C/Ses
Auditors
Cramming

CANCELS

HCO BULLETIN OF 31 OCTOBER 1971
SAME TITLE

(Addition to HCO B 10 June 71, Issue I)

C/S Series 44R Addition

44R—C/S RULES (Programming From Prepared Lists) THE SEQUENCE OF PROGRAMS

Progress Programs (Repair) also follow the sequence laid out in HCO B 10 June 71, Issue I—C/S Series 44R.

The first action of a Progress Program would of course be to ensure that any reasons for False TA per HCO B 24 Oct 71, “False TA”, were handled.

The Progress (Repair) Program MUST then handle the following:

Int Rundown (or Int repair if RD already done and Int still reads).

Repair of past listing actions.

Doesn't want auditing and all out ruds.

Full drug handling per C/S Series 48R.

Full handling of Psychiatric and Psychoanalytic treatment, etc, handled R3R Narrative Triple. (Data from GF40XR and Pc Assessment Sheet.)

Incomplete or tangled Engram chains and other things may also need handling to fully repair the Pc. The various prepared lists are used to get all the data on what needs handling on a Progress Program.

Any other reason for resistiveness as a case.

These things above are the things that prevent or slow case gain. Just handling them correctly and fully gives the case terrific wins. Failure to handle them sets the *Pc*, the *C/S*, and the *Auditor* up for losses.

Once the *Pc*'s case is fully repaired with the Progress Program he is then set up for excellent gains and will be very auditable. He is now put onto the Advance Program which completes any incomplete Grade cycles and fills in any missing ones as it takes him up the Grade Chart. (See C/S Series 39R, 31 May 71 Revised 21 Oct 71.)

Processes should *not* be extracted from the Expanded Grades and other *standard programs*, for use in Progress Programs (Repair) or “Special Programs” but should be taken from other sources, so as not to break up the standard program for later use on the case.

Written from notes on an
LRH Lecture to Senior Tech
Personnel 30 Oct 71.
Training & Services Aide
Reissued as BTB
by Flag Mission 1234
I/C: CPO Andrea Lewis
2nd: Molly Harlow

BDCS:SW:AL:MH:BW:rnh.rd
Copyright © 1971, 1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Authorized by AW
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 19 JUNE 1971
Issue I

Remimeo

C/S Series 45

C/S RULES

A C/S never C/Ses exclusively for result. He C/Ses for exact tech application. If *what* occurs he'll also get his result. If a goof still wins, the C/S stomps on the goof.

This prevents auditors getting hung on an accidental win. The wins a C/S wants are exact tech application.

If a C/S can finally get auditors exactly auditing the exact processes with exact TRs, metering and Code everybody then wins all the time.

So the pc got an F/N at the Exam after the auditor failed to do the final run through, leaving the TA high at session end. That's a goof. To hell with the F/N at Exams or how PR the pc was. *That is* a goof. The C/S stomps on it.

Never give a "very well done" on wins only. Give them on tech exactness. Got an Exam F/N not quite by the book. That's only "well done". Got an Exam F/N *and* did it by the book is the "Very well done".

We know the tech works. That's no surprise. Perfect application by the Auditor is what the "Well Dones" and "Very Well Dones" are for.

The moment a C/S loses sight of this point he has started his team on a downgrade that will wind up with everyone losing, org, auditors and pcs.

That's the secret of how I as a C/S make star auditors. If it's by the book, hurrah. If it isn't by the book then a pc dial-wide F/N VGI rave at Exams gets, from me, a flunk! on the auditor. With a good plain why.

The Very Well done means "You applied the tech splendidly". It does *not* mean "You helped the pc". We know the standard tech will do that.

So watch this point. It's an awful big one. It will make your auditors into stars or bums.

Auditor runs a narrative chain. Gets away with it. Pc F/N VGIs at Exam. My C/S includes "Auditor to cramming on HCOBs covering types of items."

Now please recognize that auditors for whom I C/S *do* make it and go on making it. Well, in addition to knowing the subject, this is the one thing I do that is not always done by C/Ses.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 19 JUNE 1971
Issue II

Remimeo

C/S Series 46

DECLARES

It is the C/S's responsibility that a pc or Pre OT is sent to Declare?

This is *not* an Admin point I'm making. It is a technical point.

Every so often a pc is found hung up in not having declared and attested the state attained.

A Declare Completes his cycle of action and is a *vital* part of the action.

One never forces or feeds one to the pc. I recall one org where the entire tech and income structure crashed, the C/O and several personnel had to be removed because they were forcing "clear cogs" on their Dianetic pcs who hadn't had them (and then telling them they couldn't be audited further on Scientology) (Connie Broadbent, ASHO, March '70).

So this goes 2 ways.

THE PC OR PRE OT WHO KNOWS HE MADE IT MUST BE SENT TO EXAMS AND C & A TO ATTEST.

THE PC OR PRE OT WHO HASN'T MADE IT MUST NEVER BE SENT TO EXAMS TO DECLARE AND ATTEST.

This gives us a third:

PCs AND PRE OTs WHO HAVEN'T MADE IT MUST BE HANDLED UNTIL THEY HAVE MADE THAT SPECIFIC DECLARE, EVEN THOUGH IT MEANS SIGNING UP FOR MORE AUDITING.

TRUTH is the keynote, the essence, the point here.

All the "PR" (slang for promotional talk) in the world will not supplant truth.

The pc KNOWS he made something. Therefore he must be sent to declare it whether it's a standard grade or not!

The pc who hasn't made it KNOWS he hasn't and so when forced to declare or ordered to attest tends to cave in.

His concept of the validity of the org and honesty of Scientology depends on this, and really on this alone.

The correct declare or not declare decision of the C/S is a vital C/S action.

LRH:nt rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 20 JUNE 1971

Remimeo

C/S Series 47

THE SUPREME TEST OF A C/S

(Reference HCO B August 19, 1967, *The Supreme Test*
which must be read with this HCO B)

A C/S or auditor who knows his tech is able to hold the line on any given action in auditing or C/Sing and not mix up.

One C/Ses Dianetics purely. Not Dn, Cl VI, Class VIII, Dn, Class VI.

One C/Ses or audits a Rundown as itself, not as a botch of several actions run into it.

So this brings to view that some can run the process or program for A to B.

And some, worse luck,

- (a) Go from A to G to Q to A and wonder why they don't arrive at the B of result.
- (b) Some go from A to B all right but when at B go right on past it.

Both, actually, are a type of non-confront. The A.G.Q.A can't confront and disperses off arriving at B. The A beyond B hasn't confronted B and so doesn't recognize B.

The ability to confront the pc and the session and parts of the session permits one to accurately go from A to B.

Proving this, perception reduces in ratio to overts. Accept that fact as it's true. If you run O/W on an auditor regarding the pc he is to audit, the auditor will give a perfect session to that pc. Why? He can confront because he can see.

Programming is simply an A to B action. The road is all laid out.

Auditing a process is a simple A to B Action.

What if you had an auditor who half way through Level Zero with no completion found a picture, did Dianetics on it, didn't flatten the R3R because pc cogged it was like his mother and the auditor did O/W on mother in the middle of the engram!

The pc would be a mess! B was run away from.

Same way with programming that isn't handled.

What if you had an auditor who got an F/N Cog VGIs and continued the same process to TA 5.6? He got to B and kept right on going.

You should look into some folders where the C/S or auditor dispersed off B or where B was reached with no halt.

The most recent examples I've seen have been taking processes out of one Rundown and using them in another Rundown all in an effort to achieve a maximum effect when the error that was present came from failure to complete 2 earlier programs.

The correct action would have been to complete the earliest program left incomplete and then complete the next incomplete program, not scramble parts of two *new* programs.

A to B is a cycle of action. A clean one.

It is best to keep it so.

The Supreme Test of an Auditor or a C/S is to make Auditing go right—by the book.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 15 JULY 1971
Issue III

Remimeo
Dianetics Checksheet
All Dn Auditors
All C/Ses

IMPORTANT

URGENT

C/S Series 48R

DRUG HANDLING

See: HCO B 28 Aug 68, Issue II, "Drugs"
HCO B 29 Aug 68, "Drug Data"
HCO B 23 Sept 68, "Drugs & Trippers"
Refer: HCO B 19 May 69, "Drug and Alcohol Cases
PRIOR Assessing"
HCO B 12 Aug 69 (HCO B 10 Dec 68 Updated),
Confidential—"Case Supervisor Actions"
(Page 24 Resistive Case 220D.) [Now BTB]

(In this revision of HCO B 4 July 71, C/S Series 48,
Quad [4] Flow has been changed to Triple Flow.
There is no other change.)

A person who has been on Drugs is one of the "Seven types of resistive cases". (These types are found on the Scientology Green Form No. 40.)

In other words, someone who has been on drugs does not make good case gain until the drugs are handled. The same somatics will come back again. The case roller-coasters—goes up and down.

Drugs since 1962 have been in very widespread use. Before then they were rare. A worldwide spread of drugs occurred. A large percentage of people became and are drug takers.

By drugs (to mention a few) are meant—tranquilizers, opium, cocaine, marijuana, peyote, amphetamine and the psychiatrist's gift to Man, LSD, which is the worst. Any medical drugs are included. Drugs are drugs. There are thousands of trade names and slang terms for these drugs.

ALCOHOL is included as a drug and receives the same treatment in auditing.

They are supposed to do wonderful things but all they really do is ruin the person.

Even someone off drugs for years still has "blank periods". The abilities to concentrate or to balance are injured.

The moral part of it has nothing to do with auditing. The facts are that:

- (a) People who have been on drugs can be a liability until the condition is handled in auditing.
- (b) A former drug user is a resistive case that does not make stable gains until the condition is handled.
- (c) Auditing is the only successful means ever developed for handling drug damage.

THOSE ON DRUGS

On persons who are currently on drugs, it is necessary to take them through a special TR Course while they are still on them. They gradually come off of them voluntarily in most cases without painful “withdrawal symptoms” (which is the term for the agony and convulsions caused, particularly in the case of heroin takers, by just stopping the drug. Alcoholics are of course included.)

DRUG ENGRAMS

People who have been on drugs are sometimes afraid of running engrams.

In fact, it is almost a way to detect a “druggie”.

The drugs, particularly LSD and even sometimes antibiotics or other medicines to which the person has an allergy, can turn on whole track pictures violently.

These tend to overwhelm the person and make him feel crazy. Some of these people are afraid to confront the bank again.

The TR and other steps of the special TR Course improve their confront.

If a person “doesn’t like Dianetics” and doesn’t want to be run on engrams, it is necessary to put them on the special course. If Dianetics *has* been run but poorly, it should of course be repaired fully with an L3B (List used to correct Dianetic errors). But if the person still flinches, the Special Course successfully completed will handle. It contains recall steps giving the pc a chance to confront the bank more easily and get used to it.

FULL AUDITING RUNDOWN

A full auditing rundown on drugs, all done on the same pc, would be:

1. Special TR Course for ex-drug users or alcoholics.
2. Pc Assessment Form.
3. Class VIII Drug Rundown Triple (done by a Class IV or VI).
4. By a Dianetic Auditor: Pains, emotions, sensations, attitudes connected with drugs (or alcohol), R3R Triple.
5. Prior Assessment to Drugs, Triple R3R, Dianetic Auditor.

This can be followed by routine Triple Dianetics to EP for the grade.

DONE FIRST

Drugs are done *first*. They are NOT done after the Health Form and regular Dianetics.

Why? Because Drugs make a resistive case! Regular Dianetics will get loses.

Any current Dianetic case failures are from flabby Dianetic auditing or the person has been on Drugs or alcohol which were not handled by Dianetics.

It hasn't harmed anyone to omit drugs. But it made it hard or impossible to get stable case gain.

THUS ANY DIANETIC PC WHO HAS HAD DRUG HANDLING OMITTED MUST BE RUN ON DRUGS AS SOON AS POSSIBLE BEFORE MORE AUDITING IS GIVEN.

I repeat, drugs or alcohol in most instances make a resistive case so the point must be handled before the case will attain and hold case gain.

ANY PC WHO IS NOT MAKING IT IN AUDITING SHOULD BE CHECKED FOR A DRUG OR ALCOHOL HISTORY.

DISCOVERY

In investigating a series of cases who were not making it, I found in each one that the person had been on drugs or alcohol and that drugs or the alcohol had not been run out.

Drug data was not covered fully enough in the Dianetics pack. Only Prior Assessment to Drugs was given.

Thus I find several Dianetic pcs were only run on the Prior Assessment to Drugs. This is not good enough.

DIANETICS ONLY

Where Dianetic Auditing only is available and the rest of the rundown given above is not, drugs can still be handled by a Dianetic Auditor in this way with this Dianetic Pgm.

1. PC Assessment Form.
2. Full C/S 1, also doing the TRs well with the pc.
3. Write down the drugs from the pc assessment form. Take the one that reads best on the meter.
4. List, what pains, emotions, sensations or attitudes are connected with taking (the drug).
5. Take the best reading Dianetic item from the list in (4). Run R3R Triple.
6. Complete items on the (4) above with R3R Triple.
7. Take another drug from (3) above that reads.
8. Repeat (4).
9. Repeat (5).

10. Use up the whole list in (4) above in this way until the entire list of drugs F/Ns when called.
11. Do Prior Assessment to Drugs (or alcohol). R3R Triple.
12. Triple R3R on any missing flows of earlier Dn items run.
13. Do Health Form.
14. Proceed with routine Triple Dianetics.

This program is the one that would be done at step 4 in the full Drug Pgm above that includes the TR Course and Class VIII Rundown.

However, when only Dianetic Auditors are available, at least the above Dianetic Program must be done.

This repairs an omission in the Dianetic pack and unblocks the case gain of a great many pcs on whom a drug or alcohol history was never noticed or handled.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH: nt. rd
Copyright ©1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 5 JULY 1971 R
Revised & Reissued 8 June 1974

(Only changes the 2nd last & 4th last paras.)

Remimeo

C/S Series 49R

ASSISTS

There are three types of assists.

They are:

1. Contact Assist
2. Touch Assist
3. Dianetic Assist.

They are quite different from each other. They are VERY effective when properly done.

A severe injury or illness case can be run on all three and SHOULD BE.

If the handling is very soon after injury, burns do not blister, breaks heal in days, bruises vanish.

But to obtain such results it is necessary that the C/S and auditor or auditor alone know and RESPECT the assist tech. It is too often a toss-off, only one kind being done and then not to EP.

Every assist must end with an F/N (at Examiner or checked on a meter).

CONTACT ASSIST

Done off meter at the physical Mest Universe location of the injury. EP - Pain Gone. Cog. F/N.

See HCO B 9 Oct 67, Assists for Injuries. [See BTB 18 Feb 74, same title.]

DIANETIC ASSIST

Done in session on the meter. EP Pain Gone. Cog. F/N.

See HCO Bs

- | | | |
|----|--------|--|
| 12 | Mar 69 | Issue II, Physically Ill Pcs and Pre OTs |
| 24 | Apr 69 | Dianetic Use |
| 14 | May 69 | Sickness |

- 20 May 69 Issue II, Dianetics (Dn Auditing Assists) [see BTB 10 Dec 74, VI]
 23 May 69 Narrative Versus Somatic Chains
 24 July 69 Seriously Ill Pcs
 27 July 69 Antibiotics
 15 Jan 70 The Uses of Auditing
 21 June 70 C/S Series 9, Superficial Actions (Sick Pcs)
 1 Dec 70 Dianetics—Triple Flow Action [now BTB I Dec 70R, same title]
 5 Jan 71 Going Earlier in R3R (Dn Auditing Assist) [see BTB 10 Dec 74]
 8 Mar 71 C/S Series 29, Case Actions, Off Line
 15 Mar 71 Assists—A Flag Expertise Subject [see page 335]

TOUCH ASSIST

Done off the meter by an auditor on the pc's body. EP Pain Gone. Cog. F/N.

See HCO Bs

- 9 Oct 67 Assists for Injuries [see BTB 18 Feb 74, same title]
 5 May 69 Issue I, Touch Assists [cancelled, see Volume IX, page 502]
 22 July 70 Touch Assist—An Improvement on Spinal Adjustment
 23 Aug 70 The Body Communication Process [cancelled by BTB 10 Dec 74]
 15 Mar 71 Assists—A Flag Expertise Subject [see page 335]

UNCONSCIOUS PC

An unconscious pc can be audited off a meter by taking his hand and having him touch nearby things like pillow, floor, etc or body without hurting an injured part.

A person in a coma for months can be brought around by doing this daily.

One tells them a hand signal like, “Press my hand twice for ‘Yes’, once for ‘No’,” and can get through to them, asking questions and getting “Yes” and “No” hand responses. They usually respond with this, if faintly, even while unconscious.

When one has the person conscious again one can do the assists.

FIRST AID RULES APPLY TO INJURED PERSONS.

IN MAKING THEM TOUCH SOMETHING THAT WAS MOVING, STOP IT FIRST.

IN MAKING THEM TOUCH THINGS THAT WERE HOT, COOL THEM FIRST.

WHEN POSSIBLE MAKE THEM HOLD THE THINGS THEY WERE HOLDING, IF ANY, WHILE DOING A *CONTACT ASSIST*.

IF AFTER A TOUCH OR CONTACT ASSIST THEY DON'T F/N WHEN TAKEN TO OR GIVEN AN EXAM, CHECK FOR O/R AND IF NO F/N TAKE THEM AWAY AND COMPLETE THE ASSIST.

DIANETIC ASSISTS CAN BE RUN TRIPLE.

This is important tech. It saves pain and lives. Know it and use it.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1971, 1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[The second last paragraph originally read, "DIANETIC ASSISTS CAN BE RUN TRIPLE OR QUAD." The change in the fourth last paragraph simply corrected a typographical error.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 15 JULY 1971
Issue II

Remimeo

C/S Series 50

C/S CASE GAIN

Some C/Ses get audited over the present time problem "How to get case gain."

Working with pcs who sometimes don't can become a minor PTP.

This is also true of some auditors.

The way to C/S this is to run it triple PTP, but in this sequence:

THE C/S

1. 2WC Have you ever had a problem in getting case gain for another? E/S to F/N.
2. 2WC What solutions have you had in getting case gain for another? E/S to F/N.
3. 2WC Have others ever had a problem getting case gain for others? E/S to F/N.
4. 2WC What solutions have others had getting case gain for others? E/S to F/N.
5. 2WC Have you ever had a problem getting case gain for yourself? E/S to F/N.
6. 2WC What solutions have you had getting case gain for yourself? E/S to F/N.

Once handled it ceases to be a problem when one does it in the future.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH: nt.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 17 JULY 1971

Remimeo
C/Ses
Testing Personnel
Class IX Checksheet

C/S Series 51

OUT OF VALENCE

(OCA Graph)

On OCA graphs (the plotted test score of a pc) you find sometimes a case that read high on the graph will drop and read lower after auditing.

This is caused by the fact that the person was OUT OF VALENCE in the first place.

Social machinery was what the first registered.

Now after auditing the graph expresses something closer to the actual being even though it dropped.

We have known about this since '57 or '58 but I do not think it was fully written up. Further, we now know MORE about it.

If you look into Suppressive Person tech you will find an SP *has* to be out of valence to be SP. He does not know that he is because he is himself in a non-self valence. He is "somebody else" and is denying that he himself exists, which is to say denying himself as a self.

Now this doesn't mean all persons whose graphs dropped were active SPs. But it *does* mean they weren't being themselves.

After some auditing they became themselves somewhat and this self isn't the social cheery self the first graph said.

But the dropped graph is nearer truth.

Now, how to get the graph UP again?

The person with the dropped graph is closer to being himself but is not yet fully restored, not yet fully into his "own valence".

While Class XI would handle this a bit differently, Class VIII rundown already has an answer.

The Class VIII out of valence lists LX1, LX2 and LX3 and the recall, secondary and engram triples for each assessed item from these lists is a way to handle.

Completing any cycle the pc is on is of course fundamental. And even if the pc goes on to next grade the graph will improve.

The fact is that the pc is emerging more and more and becoming himself and then he himself begins to gain.

The graph that dives will come back up if general processing is done.

The pc will keep saying he is “more there”. And it is true.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH: nt .rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 19 JULY 1971

Remimeo

C/S Series 52

INTERNES

The word INTERN or INTERNE means “An advanced graduate or a recent graduate in a professional field who is getting practical experience under the Supervision of an experienced worker”.

An Internship then is serving a period as an Interne, or an activity offered by an org by which EXPERIENCE can be gained.

Internships have been arranged this long while for every auditing class.

The apprenticeship of an auditor is done as an org Interne.

C/Ses very often have Internes on their lines and sometimes have trouble with getting them to audit.

The WHY of this is that the Interne seldom knows the definition of the word “Interne” (which is as above). They sometimes think they are still students. They do not know this fact:

A COURSE GRADUATE BECOMES AN AUDITOR BY AUDITING.

That means LOTS of auditing.

The failure of “auditors” is that they go from one level to the next, HDC to IV to VIII, without ever becoming an auditor for that Class.

Thus you can get a silly situation where a Class IX can’t audit or C/S well. Thus you get tech going out.

An HDC graduate who doesn’t then audit under an experienced Case Supervisor who knows and demands the standard actions rarely gets to *be* an HDC *AUDITOR*. It takes tons of hours to make a real Dianetic auditor who can toss off standard sessions and get his routine miracles.

So if an HDC doesn’t INTERNE, but simply goes on to the Academy Courses or SHSBC he has skipped his apprenticeship as a Dianetic Auditor.

If he gets his Class VI and never Internes but goes on to VIII well, we now have somebody who has long since lost touch with the reality of why he is studying.

Therefore you CAN’T take a Class VI graduate who was never a Dianetic *Auditor* and Interne him as a VI. He’ll goof-goof-goof. So you have to Interne him as an HDC.

WHEN he can turn out flawless Dianetic sessions on all kinds of pcs you can Interne him as a IV etc.

In other words you have to catch up all neglected Apprenticeships.

I don’t care if the guy is an VIII, if he wasn’t ever a Dianetic *Auditor* and a Class VI *Auditor* and isn’t Interning as an VIII then he is only a provisional.

Flubby auditors are the biggest time wasters a C/S has. If auditors on his lines aren’t good, he’ll take forever to get his C/S work done. And he won’t get results.

The answer is, regardless of Class as a course graduate, a C/S MUST INTERNE HIS AUDITORS FOR EACH INTERNESHIP MISSED ON THE WAY UP.

The “ok to audit” system is used.

One takes any graduate and Internes him on the lowest Interneship he has missed. He reviews his material, gets his drills checked, gets his misunderstood words cleared and gets an “ok to audit” for *that* level. If he goofs he is crammed. And sometimes wholly retreaded. The “ok to audit Dianetics” would be his first okay. This suspends if he has to retread.

When he then has turned out pcs, pcs, pcs, pcs, 5, 6, 8, 10 hours a day for weeks and weeks and is a total success as a Dianetic Auditor, he can go on up.

At first as a Dianetic Interne he is part time studying Dianetics. Then as he gets flawless and while he is getting experience and practice on Dianetics, he can gradually phase over into re-studying his next Interneship, usually IV or VI.

Then one day he is word cleared, checked out on his drills, and he qualifies for “ok to audit” for IV or VI.

Now it begins all over again. Flubs—Cramming, midnight oil, audit audit cramming audit audit new word clear new drill work audit audit audit 5, 6, 8, 10 hours a day.

Now he *is* a IV or VI auditor.

His next real step is a VI or VII Interne at an SH. If he has been a good IV Interne *Auditor* his VI Interneship after his SHSBC will be a VII Interneship. VII *is* an Interne activity.

When he’s an *Auditor* that can do VI and Power, he is ready for VIII and IX.

If he is going to be a good VIII-IX auditor he will Interne in an AO or SH under an experienced C/S.

Now when he goes to his own org, you have a real honest to goodness C/S. And as a C/S he must know how you use Internships to make auditors.

Wherever this function is neglected, you don’t get auditors. You get doubtful students and out-tech.

On Flag C/Ses have to catch up every missed Interneship to make a high volume high quality auditor.

The world renowned Superiority of Flag Auditors is built just like I am telling you here.

There is no reason just that same quality can’t be built in any org.

One does it by the Interne method.

By using this method you get IN tech and high volume.

Any auditor in any org that is limping and fumbling simply has never been properly Interned.

The way to remedy it is to set up a good Cramming that uses only HCO Bs and has them available (and no verbal tradition), a Good Word Clearer and a Qual “okay to audit” Interne system. The Internes are a Section in Qual. They have a Course Supervisor. They study and audit cram audit cram study audit, audit audit audit.

And one day you have IN tech and high volume high Class auditing all over the place.

Otherwise you just have a bunch of students, in doubt, chewing on their misunderstood words and failed tech.

There IS a right way to go about it.

It is by Interneship.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH: nt .rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 24 NOVEMBER 1973RB
(Cancels HCO B 24 Nov 1973, Rev. 12 Nov 1974)
Revised & Reissued 22 March 1975

Remimeo

C/S Series 53RJ

SHORT HI-LO TA ASSESSMENT C/S

This is the basic prepared list used by Auditors to get a TA up or down into normal range. A GF Method 5 may also be used after TA is in normal range to get pc's case handled better.

		PC Name _____	Date _____
1.	Assess pc Method 5 on this sheet. (Go down the list calling off the items to the pc, watching the meter. Mark any Tick, SF, F, LF, LFBD [to what TA], Speeded Rise or Blow Up.) NOTE: A C/S 53RJ should be reassessed and all reads handled until it F/Ns on assessment.		
A.	Interiorization _____ Went in _____ Go in _____ Can't get in _____ Want to get out _____ Kicked out of spaces _____ Can't go _____	Have others committed _____ overts on others _____ Not saying _____ Problems _____ Protest _____ Don't like it _____ Audited over out ruds _____ Feel sad _____	
B.	List errors _____ Overlisting _____ Wrong items _____ Upset with giving items to auditor _____ <i>Wrong date</i> _____ <i>Wrong location</i> _____ <i>Wrong Why</i> _____ <i>Wrong Indication</i> _____ <i>Wrong PTS Item</i> _____	Rushed _____ Tired _____ ARC Brk _____ Upset _____ Can't get it _____	
C.	Some sort of W/H _____ Are you withholding Something _____ Is another withholding something from you _____ Are others withholding _____	D. Drugs _____ LSD _____ Alcohol _____ Pot _____ Medicine _____	
E.	Engram in restimulation _____ Same engram run twice _____ Can't see engrams too well _____ Invisible _____		

something from others	_____	Black	_____
<i>False withhold</i>	_____	Loss	_____
<i>Withholds gotten off</i>	_____	Lost	_____
<i>more than once</i>	_____		
Has another committed overts on you	_____	F. Same thing run twice	_____
Have you committed any overts	_____	Same action done by another auditor	_____
G. Doing something with mind between sessions	_____	K. Can't have	_____
Some other practice	_____	Low havingness	_____
H. Word Clearing errors	_____	L. PTS	_____
Study errors	_____	Suppressed	_____
I. False TA	_____	M. Something went on too long	_____
Wrong sized cans	_____	Went on by a release point	_____
Tired hands	_____	Overrun	_____
Dry hands or feet	_____	Auditor kept on going	_____
Wet hands or feet	_____	Over-repair	_____
Loosens can grip	_____	Puzzled why auditor keeps on	_____
Wrong hand cream	_____	Stops	_____
J. Auditor overwhelming	_____	N. Something else	_____
Interruptions	_____	Physically ill	_____
Feel attacked	_____	O. Repairing a TA that isn't high	_____
Something wrong with F/Ns	_____	Repairing a TA that isn't low	_____
Overrun F/Ns	_____	Faulty Meter	_____
Missed F/N	_____	Nothing wrong	_____
Items really didn't read	_____	P. False Exam Report	_____
<i>False reads</i>	_____	Waited at Exam	_____
Bad auditing	_____	Upset by Examiner	_____
Incomplete actions	_____		
Invalidation	_____		
Evaluation	_____		
Couldn't get auditing	_____		

2. Use only the small falls or falls or BDs. The rises will however show where mass lies.

A. If A or any of the A Group, and the pc has *had* an Int RD, do an Int RD Correction List, and handle the reads. (HCO B 29 Oct 71 R, Revised 14 May 74.)

If the pc *has never had an Int RD*, then give him a standard Int RD providing you have checked out on the Int-Ext pack and are good at R3R.

B. If any of these read, do an L4BR on the earliest lists you can find that have not been corrected. Lacking these do an L4BR in general. You can go over an L4BR several times handling each read to F/N until the whole L4BR gives nothing but

F/Ns. Handle a Wrong Why or Wrong Indication or Wrong PTS Item per C/S Series 78.

- C. If any of these, handle with 2wc and earlier similar to F/N. If more than one reads do biggest read first and then clean up each of the others E/S to F/N. If all read on assessment you have to get an F/N for each or 20 F/Ns. On overts and withhold, get what, and E/S to F/N. On out ruds, find which rud and handle. (See GF40RB, HCOB 30 June 71R, Revised 1 Dec 74.) Feel sad, handle the ARC Break. (Feel sad = ARC Brk of long duration.)
- D. Rehab releases on each “drug” taken to F/N. Complete the Drug RD per C/S Series 48R after handling all reads on this assessment. If pc has had a Drug RD, do L3RD on it, and handle.
- E. If any of these, do L3RD and handle according to what is stated to do on L3RD.
- F. Clean up any protest and inval and rehab to F/N.
- G. Find out what it is. If Yoga or Mystic exercises or some such 2wc E/S it to first time done, find out what upset had occurred before that and if TA now down do L1C on *that* period of pc’s life.
- H. If Word Clearing, do a Word Clearing Correction List, handle all reads. If Study errors, 2wc E/S to F/N, and add a Study Correction List to the pc’s program.
- I. False TA is wrong cans. Use HCO Bs 24 Oct 71, 12 Nov 71R, 15 Feb 72, 18 Feb 72, 29 Feb 72R, 23 Nov 73, all on False TA. Then clean up the bypassed charge with (1) Assess for best read (a) TA worries, (b) F/N worries. (2) Then 2wc times he was worried about (item) E/S to F/N. (3) Rehab any overruns due to False TA obscuring F/Ns.
- J. These are auditor errors. Low TA is generally caused by overwhelming TRs and incomplete actions. A high TA can be caused by an auditor overrunning F/Ns or failing to call them. Or trying to assess through an F/N and mistaking an F/N right swing for a read. An F/N can be obscured and mistaken for a read if Sensitivity too high. These items are all 2wc E/S to F/N. Auditors who made them need Cramming badly or retread.
- K. Can’t have or Hav. Find correct Havingness process and remedy.
- L. PTS or Suppressed. Check for SP or get a full PTS RD.
- M. Find out what. Clean up any protest. Rehab to F/N on each (or date to blow, locate to blow, if qualified).
- N. 2wc to find what. Note BD item. If BD item covered by one of these categories handle per instructions. If not just 2wc to F/N and get further C/S instructions for handling if necessary.
- O. Get pc to tell you about it briefly. If correct then indicate to F/N. Go E/S and indicate it if no F/N on first. If False TA handle per I above.

P. Indicate and 2wc to F/N.

General. Handle Int RD (A) if it reads at all before handling rest as nothing will go right if Int is still out. For the remainder prefer to handle any BD group if you get a BD. If in doubt about what to do, return to the C/S.

Revised by

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt jh
Copyright © 1973,1974, 1975
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 28 JULY 1971

Remimeo

D I A N E T I C S

C/S Series 54

DIANETICS, BEGINNING A PC ON

Make Dianetics work fully in our modern culture.

DO NOT BEGIN DIANETICS WITH A HEALTH FORM ANY LONGER.

BEGIN DIANETICS WITH A PC ASSESSMENT SHEET, HCO B 24 April 1969.

This is VITAL.

DRUGS

IF YOU GET ANY TA ACTION OR READS ON DRUGS EVEN IF THE PC SAYS “NO” THE FIRST DIANETIC ACTION IS THE THIRD PAGE OF HCO B 15 July 1971, Issue III.

If the pc is currently on Drugs, then a Special Drug TR COURSE IS VITAL until the pc is off them. *Then* do the third page of HCO B 15 July 1971, Issue III.

ACCIDENTS

If you get a read on Part E of Assessment Form, Accidents, run them out Narrative R3R Triple.

ILLNESS

If Illness Part F Assessment Form reads, run it out Narrative R3R Triple.

MENTAL TREATMENT

If Mental Treatment reads, run it out Narrative R3R Triple.

OPERATIONS

If Operations Part G reads run the reading one out Narrative R3R Triple.

MEDICINE

If Medicine Part M reads TREAT IT HCO B 15 Jul 71, Iss III, as it reacts like any other drug but pcs don't sometimes think of medicines as drugs when they are.

DEATHS

If Deaths of relatives, etc read on Part 7, run them out Narrative as SECONDARIES R3R TRIPLE.

FAMILY INSANITY

If Part L reads on a member of the family going insane, run it out Narrative SECONDARIES R3R TRIPLE.

PERCEPTION

Lack of perception (sight, hearing, etc) comes from overts and improves when Flow 2 is done on any of the above or any R3R.

PROGRAM

The C/S Programs the Case from the Assessment Form as above, using Drugs or Medicine first and the rest by largest reads first.

Narrative Items or incidents were used for years with great effect. BUT THE ITEM MUST BE DONE R3R TRIPLE and is once in a while very long.

REPAIR

Repair by L3B ANY FLUBBED DIANETIC SESSION OR CHAIN WITHIN 24 HOURS. Do not let it go unrepaired.

HEALTH FORM

WHEN any and all of the above are handled, then and only then proceed with the usual Health Form by item.

The pc in many cases won't be able to run engrams at all unless you run out drugs or medicines first. They will run these and these alone until the engrams are gone.

People who "can't run engrams" are usually drug cases.

This is CORRECT Dianetic Programming.

MAKE DIANETICS WORK FOR YOU.

Program it correctly. C/S it correctly.

It won't work unless used on where the pc's attention is.

IT WILL WORK IF YOU USE IT.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 8 AUGUST 1971

Remimeo

C/S Series 55

THE IVORY TOWER

It has been stated before that the Case Supervisor is most successful when he supervises in seclusion.

This is called the IVORY TOWER rule.

It comes from the practical experience that in C/Sing thousands of cases the only few mistakes I made (and repaired) were when I listened to the opinion of the auditor or saw the pc.

This can be quite fatal to a case's progress.

The fantastic results I achieve as a C/S mainly stem from not permitting what I know of tech and cases to be clouded by "Human Emotion and Reaction" (a Scn Public Relations term) by others.

Part of a C/S's duty is to get the case through it despite auditor opinions and flubs or the opinions of others.

A C/S has no political or personnel opinions. He can of course have his own opinions of the pc's case. But he is the FRIEND of the pc even when being harsh.

Often the C/S, unseen by the pc, is sometimes never suspected but quite often adored by those for whom he C/Ses. One often sees this in success stories, "Thank you, thank you to my great auditor (name) and the C/S (name) and Ron." Sometimes it's only the auditor. But mos. pcs know the C/S is there.

This awareness is also a great trust and it is a trust that is earned by great results and is never betrayed.

To the majority of pcs, then, it is a trio—always in the same order—his auditor, his C/S and myself.

He trusts us. And we do our best for him.

We don't change our actions, then, if he is a dope addict, a wife beater, a criminal, a degraded being or an upstat (one who has high statistics) and a sterling person.

When we are researching, C/Sing or auditing, we do our best for him.

We have nothing to do with whether his seniors like him or for that matter whether we like him.

It is our job. We hold it in trust.

In our hands is his future, his sanity, his immortality.

It depends on us whether he survives and lives a full life or whether he goes into limbo.

If we do our duty, when we know and do our jobs, he achieves everything. When we don't, he is gone.

No priest or fancied idol has ever been endowed with more cause over the beingness of another than a C/S and his auditor. This isn't my opinion or my feeling about it. It's the way pcs look at it.

Actually one can't really state the full actuality of it.

The pc is justified in trusting us when we keep up to date on our tech, know our job, take every care that a good job is done and do our duty.

AUDITOR OPINION

Some auditors develop overts and withhold on pc and color their auditing reports with critical remarks about a pc = more withhold.

A C/S who pays much attention to these *opinions* is foolish. When they get too bad on too many pcs, get the auditor's overts and withhold pulled as he'll begin to flub.

The Worksheet and What the pc said or did is important. The opinions aren't.

An auditor has a right to refuse to audit certain pcs as long as he audits others. That's as it should be.

But a lot of "dog cases" are just unsolved cases that can be solved. Some are very difficult, true, but the difficulty is finding the bug. Some pcs are rather wild in conduct. But they solve too.

So an auditor's *opinion* is not a study of the case. Talking to an auditor about a case he is auditing is *not* of any technical value to a C/S.

Again, a case does not know what is wrong with it or it would as-is and wouldn't be wrong. So talking to a case about his case is a waste of time for a C/S. Some write huge notes to a C/S. The only value in all this is to analyze whether it's a hidden standard or an ARC Brk or a w/h or a PTS matter. TECHNICAL considerations are all that enter in looking over such.

EXECUTIVE opinion is the world's worst source of data on a pc. No C/S should ever take what seniors say about a junior. It's all Human Emotion and Reaction. It's not tech.

FAMILY, husbands, wives, fathers, mothers, brothers and sisters, aunts and uncles are of little value to listen to about a case. The most they could give you would be a list of accidents or illness or time in a home. But beware, they may be worse off than the pc.

No. The C/S is the pc's safest friend.

The pc trusts the C/S and the auditor. Or he wouldn't sit still at all.

Sometimes he only trusts me. And that's the time I have to trust you.

And I do.

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 25 AUGUST 1971
Re-issued 2 November 1972 as

Remimeo

Auditor Admin Series 2

C/S Series 56

**HOW TO GET RESULTS
IN AN HGC**

Obtaining excellent case results is an ADMINISTRATIVE not a wholly technical function.

Auditors and C/Ses are often weak on Administrative. They think general tech results improve only by more tech study. If they continue to think this way they wind up squirrelizing. For they are working on a wrong target for improvement, a wrong WHY or reason.

Auditing is a *team* activity. The day of the individual country doctor is dead. Even if an individual field auditor starts out as an individual he goes one of two directions—he overworks and squirrels himself into failure or he builds up a team—may only be a receptionist and an apprentice auditor but he is still building up a team. I have never seen individual auditors succeed over a long period. Failing to form or become part of a team, they eventually fade out or squirrel.

The reason is simple enough.

These rules apply:

TO IMPROVE TECH RESULTS YOU MUST IMPROVE ADMINISTRATION.

And I don't mean just writing better in folders.

DEFINITION

ADMINISTRATION consists of the formation and handling of the lines and terminals involved in production.

Unless an auditor understands this fully, he will never insist on a Tech Sec, a Tech Establishment Officer, D of P, C/S, Examiner, Pages, Folder Admin and himself will begin to omit keeping a Folder Summary and then omit the session actions and then, with big loses, retire from it all.

If I were an auditor and saw some of these things missing, I'd be liable to say, "Are you guys kidding? I thought we were here to audit pcs."

Without the correct pattern of lines and terminals YOU DON'T GET RESULTS, you get headaches, mad neighbors and refunds.

Auditing on lines, an auditor should regard himself as a highly skilled expert, a technical specialist whose work requires respect and *service*.

And Case Supervising on lines, a Case Supervisor should consider himself a sort of Czar whose word is so law even the Exec Director thinks several times before he approaches—duly servile of course and bowing the prescribed three times as he exits.

A Class XII on Flag is listened to by others with a hush even if he is only commenting on the weather.

These are the stars of the team. Their worldwide reputation for smooth flubless auditing is *an administrative* result!

Short of space, overloaded, short of admin personnel, turning out the highest well done hours in the world, Flag's Div IV produces because of an *Admin* system.

The highest of these C/Ses and auditors goes to Cramming if he misplaces a comma or drops a TR 1.

If the sessions' exams at Examiner drop from 90% F/N the whole place gets overhauled.

Folders are Folder Error Summaried by an FES section. The Folder Summary is kept up each session (or Cramming). The folder is studied and C/Sed. The D of P assigns the sessions. The C/S is done correctly (or Cramming). The folder travels on *its* lines. The tests are done.

In short it is a complex but constantly flowing pattern of moving pcs, folders and examinations interspersed with testing and interviews and re-registration.

There is *a right way* to do it.

RESULTS

If *an* org has only 65% of its sessions F/N VGIs at Examiner the *right* answer is to organize the place.

Why?

Well, the first answer is that the *third* dynamic is stronger than the first dynamic.

An auditor auditing alone is a first dynamic. The pc is a first dynamic. As it is the auditor plus pc that must be greater than the reactive mind, one can easily work the rest out.

If the auditor is part of a functioning third dynamic, not just an individual, the auditor plus pc versus the bank is a LOT more than the bank.

Another answer is that an auditor knows the pc, if only because of sessions, and personal opinion enters into it. That is not a pure technical view as a C/S's must be.

Another answer is that an auditor in a group gets more *auditing* done.

Individually practicing auditors often fail because nobody is taking care of the auditor as a person. Further they get loses. No one sends them to Cramming. When they get loses they often start squirreling. Then they *really* get loses.

That ends them as auditors.

An auditor working in a good on policy organization is given service. He does get sent to Cramming. He does keep his tech updated. He gets wins. When he doesn't he's put back on standard tech. So he happily keeps going and makes lots of happy people.

So if I were auditing in a group I would *insist* as a condition of work that Div IV and Div V be good on policy divisions, fully organized with no nonsense.

I know whereof I speak. As a part-time duty I work as a consulting C/S with a good IV and a good V. Sometimes I have had to take over the whole C/S line. When the organization bogs in any way I know the whole thing is heading toward single-handing the lot. So I get the lines back in and get people to Cramming and get the F/N at Examiner ratio approaching 100% again.

Thus, the advice you get about C/Sing is live-live-live, not canned theory.

ORG WINS

Being on administrative lines to all orgs, I can tell you pointblank that

THEIR STATS DEPEND ON THEIR VOLUME AND QUALITY OF SERVICE.

That isn't propaganda. It's pure fact.

The F/N-no F/N at Examiner ratio tells you at once if Divs IV and V are organized and operating or if they are just fooling about.

At 50% to 75% F/N at Examiner the administrative functions of Divs IV and V are stinking bad. C/S Series 25 is out. Cramming is out. Hidden data lines exist. HCO Bs, books and tapes are not used.

The public, at that % of F/N, will stay away in droves. Registrars will go batty and adopt "Hot Prospect Systems".

The staff will go low pay and the execs will be a perpetual dark shade of purple from yelling. The cash-bills ratio will be the subject of finance missions and the neighbors will be phoning the police.

Why?

Because an org is itself a technical delivery organization and 50% to 75% F/N at Examiner is an overt product.

The Academy has already failed to apply student study tech and word clearing. Qual is a joke.

There is no library of tech available and if available isn't read.

The org as a tech service delivery unit is treating its public to a no-auditing situation and will get in trouble.

REMEDY

The way to remedy is to get on policy with tech organization.

Put in a Qual with word clearing and a library and cramming.

Put in the C/S Series 25 Tech lines.

Tolerate NO out-tech or out-admin in folders.

Dummy run the lines until they're in.

Cram Cram Cram C/S and auditor and tech personnel flubs whenever they occur.

Get the organization functioning.

Your F/N at Examiner ratio will climb straight up to 90% 95% 98%.

By actual *test* pcs will flood in, Reg lines will get easy, success stats soar.

More auditors more C/Ses, more organization. A second, a third HGC.

And the more thoroughly the admin lines are manned the better the tech lines work.

This conclusion came from actual inspections of orgs and studies of their stats.

Orgs should be selling more training than processing.

But why train if you can't interne them in a good Qual and HGC? They'll never amount to anything as auditors unless they work in an organization that is on tech and on policy.

So you need an HGC.

Tech, done in a proper administrative framework, works.

Some orgs really don't believe they could ever attain the flubless auditing quality of Flag.

But they *can*.

It is even easy.

It is even easier to attain flubless quality of auditing than any other kind.

You put in a real on policy admin pattern in IV and V. You begin with a Qual Interne Course.

You send to Cramming for any C/S or auditing error no matter how minute.

The results come up.

The errors cease.

You're a success! If you do it.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH: nt .rd
Copyright © 1971, 1972
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 1 SEPTEMBER 1971
Issue I

Remimeo

C/S Series 57

**A C/S AS A TRAINING OFFICER
A PROGRAM FOR FLUBLESS AUDITING**

It is wholly and entirely up to the C/S whether or not his auditors ever come to be FLUBLESS AUDITORS. Auditing flubs are the main things that make a C/S's job long and hard and the main thing that denies his pcs high results.

For example-with competent auditors I can C/S the day's folders in $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours. With green flubby auditors the same number of folders takes $6\frac{1}{2}$ hours.

The answer plainly is to groove the auditors in until they are flubless. And this is what a competent C/S does.

Because he has internes on his lines and because any group of auditors can be bettered, the training officer part of the C/S hat is one which is always worn.

Also, if the Tech-Qual administrative set-up is nonextant or a confused mess, the errors in folders and various upsets react suppressively both on the C/S and auditors and they—both C/S and auditors—make mistakes. So the administrative lines and terminals must be there.

Thus a C/S out of self-defense is not merely a training officer of auditors but of other Tech-Qual personnel as well.

Officially this hat belongs with the other terminals. But to *coordinate* the operation, the C/S has to have a large amount of know-how about the lines and terminals of Tech and Qual. As it is the C/S who is directing the running of cases and as the lines and terminals exist only to obtain auditing results in volume with high quality, no C/S can afford to neglect his duties as a training officer. Otherwise he will promptly drown.

The folder flow must be smooth with no flaps. The auditor-pc assignments must be smooth with no lost auditing time. The sessions must occur. The auditors who flub must be promptly handled. The Cramming Officer in Qual must know his business. The C/S depends on him to get the kinks out of the auditors' tech and its application.

The processing must be paid for adequately or there will be no funds to hire enough terminals and, indeed, there would be no HGC at all. The C/S is trying to obtain Volume, Quality and Viability.

By experience volume comes from the whole org working and the auditors auditing correctly without lost hours spent in fumbles and repairs. Quality comes from smooth Tech-Qual lines and hatted terminals and the auditors auditing flublessly.

It is not that the C/S is in charge of the whole org. But every point where a C/S is having trouble is where an org terminal has broken down. Therefore a C/S has every right to INSIST upon hatted functioning terminals.

The C/S has a definite effect upon the efficiency of an org's personnel. He can ensure the staff gets audited either on his lines or from Dept 13. And he can insist on quality staff auditing for it will help keep his own post going.

Tech *works*. It works splendidly. The materials are there. Read, understood and applied, FLUBLESS AUDITING occurs.

It is so *easy* to C/S just for cases using standard actions. All puzzles come from FLUBS.

The sequence of actions a C/S should take to attain Flubless Auditing could be listed more or less in this order.

1. Make sure his own tech is up to date and do part-time study or retread where needed.
2. Make sure *he* has no misunderstood words the length and breadth of the subject.

Get Word Clearing Method 2 on every major tech writing, each HCO B or P/L if it comes to that. Then get Word Clearing Method 1 to full EP.

3. Practice locating the bugs in "failed cases" or "dog cases" long in auditing until the C/S knows it was an application failure, an auditor failure or a former C/S failure.
4. Study out the terminals and lines necessary IN YOUR ORG, physically going over them, to
 - (a) Get a pc in.
 - (b) Get an auditor employed.
 - (c) Get a pc assigned to an auditor.
 - (d) Get auditor and pc together in an auditing room.
 - (e) Get the pc examined.
 - (f) Get the folder turned in for C/Sing.
 - (g) Get an auditor to Cramming and back.
 - (h) Get a pc to Ethics and *handled*.
 - (i) Get a D of P to interview pcs, muster auditors, do assignments and other D of P duties.
 - (l) Get a pc to attest.
 - (k) Get a pc to Success.

- (I) Get folders FESed.
- (m) Get folders stored and found.
- (n) Get folders made up or neatly covered.
- (o) Get supplies for auditors.
- (p) Get an area for auditor admin.
- (q) Get an area for pcs to wait.
- (r) Get the various boards made and *kept up*.
- (s) Get stats kept and reported.
- (t) Get bonuses paid.
- (u) Get pcs handled when adrift on lines.
- (v) Get a Qual in.
- (w) Do his own job.
- (x) How to get and keep all this and any more points going all at once rapidly.

He will now know the *scene* and can achieve a more ideal scene by insisting the Org Officer (emergency) or the HAS (permanently) handle. Now it all gets less confusing as one understands what is out when it is out.

5. Set up a close fast line with the Cramming Officer so that auditors who flub are in actual fact rapidly straightened out and gotten back to auditing without great time loss.
6. Fend off and refuse to give tech advice as such. KNOW WORD CLEARING SERIES 16 THOROUGHLY and get a great reality on it and insist that the Qual Sec and Cramming Officer know it, use it and hammer away with it. Otherwise such weird tech confusions will be floating about that even the C/S gets confused and begins to wonder if the material IS in the books and bulletins!
7. Gather up a Tech and Admin Library for fast reference for personal use.
8. Get in a system whereby every flub by an auditor, a D of P, a Div IV or V Admin personnel, a page, anyone that flubs as it affects the C/S in ANY way gets a Cramming chit with the exact reference to be crammed on. Keep a carbon of the chit, send the original to Cramming, get the chit back when done and marked off on the carbon. Keep the Admin of it simple but the execution of it TOTALLY effective.
9. The Qual Sec, Cramming Officer and Interne Supervisor are the close technical links with the C/S. In technical matters the C/S is senior. Sometimes the C/S is sent to Cramming by the Qual Sec and should accept and do it gracefully. Sometimes there is a Senior C/S in the org (the Assistant Guardian, ED or some other senior exec may be an HSST or even a Class X). In such a case he has the right to cram or send any of these terminals (or any other terminal) to Cramming. Including any Senior C/S, and including any C/S for another Department or for crew or in the Guardian's Office, these terminals constitute the tech hierarchy of the org: Senior C/S, C/Ses, Qual Sec, Cramming Officer and the Interne Supervisor and they have to hold a hard *technical* line. The Tech Sec is mainly concerned with production and administration and a Tech Establishment Officer is

concerned with establishing. It can happen that a Tech Sec or TEO are also very well trained technically and if so are part of this *technical* hierarchy but they are not necessarily so. Therefore there is a sort of ex-officio technical committee on the subject of technical matters composed generally of the Senior C/S, C/Ses, Qual Sec, Cramming Officer and Interne Supervisor that monitors the quality of HGC and Dept 10 auditing. The Director of Training can be advised concerning the results of his students after graduation in order to remedy his training and as such is a part of the Committee, as can be the Tech Sec. Most narrowly and most continually Tech quality is between the C/S and the Cramming Officer. More widely, the Senior C/S, Qual Sec and Interne Supervisor enter in. And in the widest sense, the Tech Sec, Tech Establishment Officer and Director of Training enter in. It is an error to suppose the C/S and auditors are the technical monitors of the org. They are the main technical personnel. But a C/S can waste tons of time by talking to or with auditors beyond an auditors' conference and can really get whizzing if he spends the same time with the Cramming Officer who then crams auditors and with the Interne Super who then persuades internes to function. Knowing who is as important in organization as knowing how. So hold some meetings small and large and thresh out the bugs.

10. Missing materials is a C/S point of upset.

“What is a Course” Policy Letter can be out on tech courses to a degree that you wouldn’t believe. Not only no routing form or roll book but NO MATERIALS.

The Books, HCO Bs, tapes MUST be available. They exist. It is suppressive to run a course without them. Pubs Org, CLOs have them. Financial Planning can’t deny this necessity as they’re what their income comes from.

Qual MUST have a complete *and safeguarded* library for use in Cramming actions.

Under Omitted Materials would be omitted meters and at this writing there is no restriction on these and supply is abundant.

The “no materials” gag is the last straw for a C/S.

Future auditors won’t have a clue and current auditors will have no way to find out.

So the C/S must not permit “economy” or plain laziness or “we sent a despatch three months ago” to get in the road of materials. IT IS CHEAPER TO PUT SOMEBODY ON A PLANE WITH A CHEQUE TO BRING THEM BACK than to do without materials.

So a C/S should definitely defend himself against a “no materials” blockage and handle it.

11. No Study. When one has materials and particularly when one is getting new materials a breakdown can occur when the materials, especially new ones, aren’t *read*.

A technical person must keep up with the advances in technology. That is true of any profession.

A primary failure of new technology is (you won't believe it but it is true) the materials aren't read before the process is tried!

I have even caught Class IXs out on this, believe it or not, so don't think it can't happen.

Process G is received. Auditors audit it. Process fails. Why? Auditors never read the bulletin first!

SO BE SURE YOUR AUDITORS READ THE MATERIALS AND CHECK OUT BEFORE THEY DO THE PROCESS.

Write C/Ses like this — “Auditor to Cramming to check out on HCO B . When attested, do the following 1. ,”

Do this on new materials and, on new auditors, on any materials you believe he may goof.

Why have the first 12 pcs on Process G go sour just because the auditor only glanced at the commands and missed the tech?

Interiorization Rundowns are *still* in this category in some areas. The auditor doesn't study and Clay demo the pack before doing them. So they fail.

Now and then Power hits the same snag.

So, simple as it seems, get new materials read and checked out in Cramming as the first part of a C/S on them!

And get new materials read.

And keep up on them yourself.

12. Hidden Data Line trouble can wreck an HGC (and the org and field).

A “Hidden Data Line” is a pretense that certain data exists outside of HCO Bs, books and tapes. It can include “data in HCO Bs is conflicting” and “nowhere does it say how to ____”. This is deadly and a C/S should work hard to stamp it out. THE CAUSES OF A HIDDEN DATA LINE OR IMAGINED CONFLICTS IS A FAILURE TO USE WORD CLEARING METHODS TWO AND THREE ON COURSES AND A FAILURE TO USE AND ONLY USE METHOD TWO IN CRAMMING. A C/S can go straight up the wall trying to grapple with these omissions and eventually begin to believe that it takes 500 Cramming chits to make an auditor who still isn't made and that flubless auditing can't be done from HCO Bs, books and tapes. As soon as a C/S finds his Cramming orders getting too thick he should check

(a) Is Method 2 (meter) Word Clearing used hard in Cramming as a first action?

- (b) Are Methods 2 and 3 Word Clearing in use constantly on tech courses?
- (c) Is Method 1 Word Clearing (full rundown) available and faultlessly done on every auditor?

Get these points IN.

Poof! The Hidden Data Line vanishes. (See Word Clearing Series 16.)

Word Clearing has been around for years but people sometimes are themselves so fogged by misunderstood words that they don't hear you at all when you say USE WORD CLEARING!

- 13. Invalidation kills auditors. So don't chew on them any harder than is necessary to get the job done.

Get "To Cramming" to mean, "normal procedure even for Class XIIIs".

We had one student who every evening gasped with relief that he hadn't been sent to Cramming. We finally found out that he was really terrified *he* would be found out for false study stats!

Only when an auditor refuses to go to Cramming do you begin to push.

The auditor sent to Cramming to do an action must not do the action on another pc until he has been to Cramming on it.

This can "hold up production" in somebody's mind. But how an auditor can *produce* anything while flubbing is someone else's misunderstood, not mine. He can't. Better five hours in Cramming and one good session than no Cramming and five goofed sessions.

The *real* invalidation of an auditor is failing at tech. So don't let them fail. "Johnny, your TRs are too hard to hear. Get over to Cramming and get hearable" is perfectly acceptable. If it is correct.

So Invalidation could be defined as

- (a) letting an auditor lose
- (b) correcting things he does right.

That's about the extent of invalidation.

- 14. Auditor morale depends not on PR (Public Relations) or phoney stats. It depends on actual, honest completions.

A well trained auditor allowed to get completions will have high morale.

Thus, a C/S must push an auditor toward

- (a) Flubless tech

(b) Completions

You keep pushing and he'll make it.

You don't push or push on the wrong things and he won't.

As to completions try to get auditors to do the whole program so something is completed. This is for the auditor not the pc. The Auditor's Code on a frequent change of auditors was written for pcs. But it also applies to auditors. Let them complete programs. Even if they spend half the day in Cramming. Don't yank them off cases. And don't let your D of P assign auditors to different cases or he'll soon have downtime apathetic auditors who never see what their auditing finally does for one particular pc.

Auditor Morale has little to do with anything but the above two things.

Also if you have those two things in as a C/S, you will see something new happen. Pcs will be around slapping auditors on the back and cheering the org and the place becomes a very happy place.

So work for auditor morale with pushing them relentlessly toward flubless tech and toward completions.

The above actions are numbered. If a C/S were to work to get these in, one by one, and if he then went over them again and again, he would wind up about the most complimented upstat C/S anywhere around.

These are the giant points to get in while plugging along each day C/Sing the usual and handling the noise.

The way to get out of cope is to organize. And these fourteen points give a sequence of organizational steps that lift one out of cope and into a smooth productive time of it.

The org would become very prosperous.

The staff would be very happy.

The field would be delighted.

Just remember that when you reach an average 700 well done auditing hours, you better have a new C/S in training and persuade him to follow himself these 14 points in a new and necessary additional HGC.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.nt.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 7 SEPTEMBER 1971

Remimeo

C/S Series 58

PROGRAMMING CASES BACKWARDS

When you see a case that has struggled along through 200 hours of processing without much gain you sometimes see a C/S has only recently ordered, or has not ordered at all as yet, an Interiorization RD check and a Green Form No. 40 Expanded. That would be programming backwards.

The tools of auditing are the Grade Chart Processes and the numerous correction lists.

Like a gardener, a C/S has the choice of numerous tools to raise a flower.

If you were to see a gardener digging holes with the lawn mower and cutting grass with a spade, you would say he needed to be checked out on the use of his tools, what each is for.

Similarly, running Power on someone who needs Dianetics, doing a life repair on someone who is ready for R6EW, would be a misuse of tools.

Similarly, going on auditing someone on Dianetics who desperately needs his ruds put in or an Interiorization Rundown is wasting auditing and messing up a preclear.

Let me give you some examples I have seen recently:

- A. Case audited through many major actions since his Int RD. Auditor and C/S in despair. Pc not progressing. A C/S 53 disclosed the Int RD was faulty *and* its repair was also faulty. Int Rundown was handled. Case began to run. Months of auditing had been wasted. Needed had been a C/S 53 where out Int would have shown.
- B. After 200 or more hours of no change in his personality graph (Oxford Capacity Analysis) the pc came up with the withhold that he was a homosexual and also that he did not know what "Scientology" meant. About 2 years of auditing had been wasted. Needed had been Word Clearing and rudiments.
- C. After scores of hours of no-win auditing and no graph change it was finally decided to run a GF 40X and found the person practised witchcraft!
- D. After a year of auditing on major grades all wasted it was finally found that the person had had a leg injury he was trying to cure that required only a simple Dianetic assist. Today that would be a C/S 54. He had never had a Pc Assessment Form.
- E. After racing from POWER to OT III without doing any real auditing or having any change, it was found on a GF 40X that the whole world had been unreal and the person could not begin to face the idea of looking at pictures or the bank and had not been able to since her first drug experiences. Needed had been Objective Processes, CCHs, Op Pro by Dup, etc which get a drug addict to look and be aware.

All these are simple if flagrant errors in ordering the right program actions.

In order to be able to say what should be done on the case, one has to have three things:

1. Data about the case.
2. A knowledge of what lists are available.
3. Auditors who can do the actions required.

From a C/S point of view, all these things are under the C/S's control.

DATA

In the Class VIII materials the 7 Resistive Cases are described. The full lot of them are now found in GF 40X.

There are numerous other lists for assessment.

If a C/S really doesn't know his lists he can order them all, Method 5 and take his choice of symptoms.

Also a C/S can have the pc simply asked questions.

From this data a C/S knows why the case is not running well and can order the actions to remedy it.

If nothing is wrong, complete the earliest incomplete grade on the Grade Chart.

KNOWLEDGE

A C/S who is well Word Cleared on his materials and has studied on the courses knows what things hang a case up more than what other things.

This gives one the knowledge necessary to choose what lists.

Case no case gain then it's GF 40X.

And to keep from auditing over an out Int RD there is C/S 53.

And for chronic aches and pains there is C/S 54.

And for "might be anything" there's a GF.

What lists and actions that can be done are for is very easy to sort out.

AUDITORS

If a C/S's auditors aren't flubless or expert one needs to get in a Cramming and needs to get hired and interned lots of new auditors. C/S Series 57, "A C/S as a Training Officer", solves a lot of this. And a Tech Establishment Officer is vital to keep it solved.

Then auditors, the numbers and quality of, are not on the C/S's plate as a continual problem. Scientologists want to audit. They will go on auditing as long as you make them audit well enough and C/S for them well enough to keep them winning on pcs.

SUMMARY

So the tools of the C/S are

1. Data from pcs.
2. Knowledge of list uses.
3. Knowledge of the Grade Chart.
4. Auditors.
5. The organization of delivery.

LRH:nt rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 14 SEPTEMBER 1971

Remimeo
Also Dn Text

C/S Series 59

DIANETIC LIST ERRORS

It *can* happen that a Dianetic list of somatics, pains, emotions and attitudes can act as a list under the meaning of the Laws of Listing and Nulling as per HCO B 1 August 68.

The most violent session ARC Brks occur because of list errors under the meaning of Listing and Nulling. Other session ARC Brks even under withholdings are not as violent as those occurring because of listing errors.

Therefore when a violent or even a “total-apathy-won’t-answer” session upset has occurred in Dianetics, one must suspect that the preclear is reacting under the Laws of Listing and Nulling and that he conceives such an error to have been made.

The repair action is to assess the prepared list which corrects listing errors. This is L4B—HCO B 15 Dec 68 amended to 18 March 71.

It is used “On Dianetics Lists _____” as the start of each of its questions when employed for this purpose.

When a pc has not done well on Dianetics and when no other reason can be found the C/S should suspect some listing error and order an L4B to be done “On Dianetic lists _____ at the start of each question.

Each read obtained on the list is carried Earlier Similar to F/N as per HCO B 14 Mar 71 “F/N Everything” or, preferably the list is found in the folder and properly handled in accordance with what read on L4B.

ALL Dianetic Lists can be carried to an item that blows down and F/Ns.

This does not mean the item found is now wholly clean. Even though it F/Ned it can be run by recall, by secondaries and by engrams as found in Class VIII materials. It is usually run by engrams, triple, R3R.

A C/S must be alert to the fact that

- (a) Extreme upsets and deep apathies are almost always list errors.
- (b) That a Dianetic List can be conceived to be a formal list and can behave that way.

(c) L4B is the correction list used in such cases.

Very few Dianetic lists behave this way but when they do they must be handled as above.

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 15 SEPTEMBER 1971

Remimeo

C/S Series 60

THE WORST TANGLE

Sometimes a C/S gets a terrible tangle handed to him as follows.

1. INTERIORIZATION RUNDOWN IS UNDONE OR MESSED UP.
2. FAULTY LISTS HAVE BEEN DONE.
3. THE PC IS IN A HEAVY ARC BRK WITH PTPs AND W/Hs.

Now each *one* of these three things "must be done first".

Auditing cannot be done with *Int messed up* except to handle the Int RD.

Auditing cannot be done over *bad lists* without repairing the lists.

Auditing cannot be done over out ruds without putting the ruds in.

So WHAT does the C/S do?

There is fortunately a different degree of upset in these three things.

Int RD trouble is worse than list trouble is worse than out ruds.

Therefore the correct C/S would be to

1. Repair Int
 2. Repair Lists
 3. Put in Ruds.
-
1. Repair Int RD is done by using L3B on each flow. And (on Flag) by dating to blow and locating to blow.
 2. Lists are repaired with L4B on each list, preferably with the list available and preferably with the actual list repaired (such as added to if incomplete or correct item found and given to pc).
 3. And if the pc also had out ruds THESE ARE NOW PUT IN WITH "Have you been audited over an (ARC Brk, PTP, w/h)?" as the pc has been.

It will all come out all right if properly done. Very few pcs get that messed up. But when they do even they can be untangled.

If a lot of engrams were also run on top of that and these are also in the mess, repair them last as a fourth action. And don't forget to send auditors responsible to Cramming and report C/Ses who get a case *that snarled up*.

C/S Series 53 is written with the above sequence of handling. But it omits ARC Brks (as these don't raise or lower TA out of normal range). And C/S Series 53 as it is designed only for high or low TA does not cover the trick of putting in the ruds as "Were you audited over an (ARC Brk, PTP, w/h)?" as it purposely has to omit ARC Brks.

Hope this helps.

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 22 SEPTEMBER 1971

Remimeo

C/S Series 61

**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
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 28 SEPTEMBER 1971

Remimeo

(corrected and reissued)

C/S Series 62

KNOW BEFORE YOU GO

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 plays 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.

The watchword is KNOW BEFORE YOU GO.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 2 OCTOBER 1971

Remimeo

C/S Series 63

C/SING FOR NEW AUDITORS OR VETERANS

There is a considerable difference between C/Sing for internes and new auditors and C/Sing for veterans.

This shows up mainly in C/Sing prepared lists.

For an interne or new auditor or one who is not very experienced or expert, the rule is that a C/S gives as little thinking to do as possible in the session.

It is enough for such an auditor to do the actions. It is too much to also ask him to use judgment or work something out *while* auditing.

A veteran on the other hand knows the tools so well that he can also figure out what to do.

Example:

C/S for non-veteran:

1. Assess GF Method 5 and return to C/S.

C/S for a veteran:

1. Assess GF Method 5 and Handle.

It is quite a trick to assess a whole list, then take the biggest reads and handle. It is quite beyond an auditor who is still worrying about his TRs or how you run a meter.

In an effort to speed up lines or escape work, a C/S can err *badly* in this. It becomes mysterious why Word Clearing Correction List ceases to work, why F/Ns are few at the Examiner.

Giving an inexperienced auditor the responsibility for assessing a list and also handling it is in fact asking him to audit and to a faint degree C/S in the chair. It is quite beyond a green auditor.

Given that he knows his Tech, most of a C/S's troubles come from

- (a) Asking green auditors to follow C/Ses for which they have not studied the HCO Bs or on which they have not been crammed,
- (b) C/Sing for green auditors to decide something in session or combine actions such as assessing and handling without a new C/S in between,
- (c) Not sending the auditor (green *or* veteran) to Cramming for *every* goof,
- (d) Having no Cramming.

It takes a while to make an auditor.

The C/S is responsible for all actions in the session. He has only himself to blame if he is asking someone to C/S for him in the chair.

It is easier to plan out and write up the needed GF actions (or any other list) from the Method 5 reads than it is to correct a messed-up handling. It does not save any time at all but more than likely makes new problems for the C/S.

It is very easy to have even a green auditor assess some prepared list. One can even now say, “Take the list just assessed and do 2wc on each item I have marked. Carry each E/S to an F/N before leaving it.” The C/S simply puts a dash ahead of each item that read in the assessment.

The C/S can also number the items in different order than the list (because of better programming or bigger reads) and have each one handled to F/N.

An L3B can be ordered “Method 5” and then the C/S can get it back and precisely order what’s to be done with its reads. And in what sequence.

This is true of any prepared list.

The only small hitch is that a C/S has to be there and available so as not to stall the session. Even so, in the long run it is faster because less mistakes are made. Assess—send to C/S—handle. Instead of “Assess and Handle”.

This even applies to a C/S 53 or C/S 54 or White Form or GF 40X. Any prepared list.

Perhaps this will greatly improve your F/N VGI ratio.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:mes.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 5 OCTOBER 1971

Remimeo
Qual Hats
Tech Estab
Officers

C/S Series 64

F/Ning AUDITORS

Students who study well are said to be F/Ning students.

An auditor who is auditing well could be said to be F/Ning the whole time.

When an auditor goofs or is having a rough time because of his own TRs and misunderstood words and lack of data, he is not F/Ning.

A C/S who lets an auditor struggle along without insisting on a Cramming being in existence and without sending an auditor to Cramming on each goof is actually condemning the auditor to a miserable time.

When an auditor's production is low and when he is making goofs, he is not an F/Ning auditor. This shows up heavily in the Exams of his pcs. These Exams will drop away from F/N VGIs.

An auditor should be sent to Cramming when his production is low or he goofs in order to get his TRs, misunderstood words and lack of data remedied.

Cramming should be carried out until he is F/N VGIs.

EVERY AUDITOR LEAVING CRAMMING SHOULD GO THROUGH THE EXAMINER.

The Exam report with TA and needle state and indicators should be done exactly like a pc report.

Compliance reports on the Cramming cycle should have the Exam report attached so the C/S can see if the fault was remedied. If it was, then it will be F/N GIs.

This also puts Cramming on its toes.

An auditor, just crammed, who doesn't F/N VGI should be hauled straight back into Cramming for the cycle is incomplete or invalidative or faulty in some way.

Cramming Officers who win on auditors and students are F/Ning Cramming Officers.

C/Ses who send auditors to a good Cramming for every goof will wind up as F/Ning C/Ses.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN

6 OCTOBER 1971R

Issue I

Remimeo

Revised & Reissued 14 January 1975 as BTB

(Revision in this type style)

CANCELS

HCO BULLETIN OF 6 OCTOBER 1971

Issue II

SAME TITLE

C/S Series 65R

AUDITING OF STAFF & PUBLIC

(See HCOPL 20 July 1970, "Cases and Morale of Staff", HCOPL 8 Sept 70, "Examiner's 24 Hour Rule", HCOPL 13 Jan 71, "Exam 24 Hour Rule (Additional Information)", *HCO B 25 Sept 74, C/S Series 94, "Reduction of Refunds—C/Ses and Overload", HCO PL 26 Sept 74, "Important—New Case Supervisor Postings".*)

Just as the PR man has his own "Public" so does the Case Supervisor.

C/Ses are responsible for the case condition and well-being of all their public Pcs and C/S for these Pcs, not for the Registrar or the Org Execs. If well audited, those Pcs will go on to training and will also enhance the Org's reputation in the field, which will make other public desire the services of the Org.

The *Staff C/S* is responsible for the well-being of the staff in his organization as per HCO PL 20 July 70, "Cases and Morale of Staff". If the staff are regularly audited and patched up, then they will be happier, they will have more R on Scientology and the Org will function better. This is classified under correction of the machine (Product 2) whereas auditing of paying Pcs would be correction of the product (Product 4 in the Product Org Series).

The *Staff C/S* would regularly overhaul the folders and note the outnesses which need correcting. In other words, if a staff member slumps (PTS) he is *priority* for a session. Somewhere along his auditing history he was flying. Then somebody came along and did a goofy action, which has lain dormant in the folder waiting to be rectified, while he received more auditing. Hence FOLDER ERROR SUMMARIES. There is always one big "WHY" such as an overrun Exteriorization Remedy.

Staff members *classified as "24 hour repair"* must get auditing first. Those who are doing well can be audited after the "24 hour cases" have been pulled out of the mud.

The C/S must keep Ethics notified as to the progress of roller coasting staff members as well as PTS paying preclears.

An executive who suddenly goes “sploie!” should receive immediate attention. He probably had something badly upset him in his environment, or else he recently had some lists done—which most probably look fine. However, we know that a sudden heavy ARC Break like that is probably a wrong item.

The worst ARC Breaks were caused by a bad list. C/S Series 53 and GF No. 40X Revised will unearth these.

The *Staff C/S* can keep a tally of staff as to their condition in a log book. I.e. good and bad. A new C/S who comes on post and finds 35 24-hour repairs out of a staff of 50 would be suspicious (think of the paying Pcs who just never showed up for more!).

He would embark on a project to have these cases investigated (by folder inspection) and handled.

When the staff is in “F/N” condition then the *Staff C/S* would concentrate on getting his staff up the Grade Chart.

Lt. Quentin Hubbard
Class XII C/S

Notes from a lecture with

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

Revised & Reissued as BTB
by Flag Mission 1234

I/C: CPO Andrea Lewis
2nd: Molly Harlow

Approved by
The Commodore's Staff Aides and
The Board of Issues
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:CSA:BofI:AL:MH:QH:mh.rd
Copyright © 1971, 1975
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 3 NOVEMBER 1971

Remimeo

Re-issued 6 November 1972 as

Auditor Admin Series 15

C/S Series 66

AUDITOR'S WORKSHEETS

A very fast way for a C/S to do himself in is to fail to insist on GOOD LEGIBLE HANDWRITING.

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

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

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
Copyright © 1971, 1972
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN

30 NOVEMBER 1971 R

Remimeo
All Auditors
All C/Ses
to Starrate
on receipt

Corrected & Reissued 16 December 1971
(correction next page, no. 17)

Revised & Reissued 17 July 1974 as BTB

CANCELS

HCO BULLETIN OF 30 NOVEMBER 1971
SAME TITLE

(The only revision is on this page, References section.
HCO PL 15 Nov 69 is now BPL 15 Nov 69R.)

C/S Series 67

THE CODE OF A C/S

References:

HCO B 15 Nov 69 Case Supervision, How It Goes Non-Standard
BPL 15 Nov 69R Rights and Duties
HCO B 17 Sept 68 Gross Case Supervision Errors
HCO B 22 Sept 71 The Three Golden Rules of the C/S
(C/S Series 61)
HCO B 19 June 71 C/S Series 46, Declares

This is the Code of a C/S as regards his Auditors and their Pcs for whom he is C/Sing.

1. I promise to know my Dianetics and Scientology totally cold up to the Level at which I am C/Sing.
2. I promise never to look for some imagined error in Tech Data but always to look for and find the real error in the auditing, programming or C/Sing.
3. I promise never to treat a case as "different".
4. I promise that if I cannot find the reason why a session has failed from the folder that I will suspect a False Auditing Report and get the Pc asked about the session and get data as to why it failed.
5. I promise never to punish an Auditor for querying a C/S.
6. I promise to refrain from discussing or mentioning data from Pc folders socially.
7. I promise to correct my Auditors' application of Tech positively without invalidation.
8. I promise that I will order the Auditor to Cramming or retraining for any flunked session.
9. I promise never to order an unnecessary repair.
10. I promise never to use repair processes to get case gain when the Pc needs the next grade.
11. I promise never to give verbal C/S instructions but always to write them down.
12. I promise never to talk to the Auditor about the case.
13. I promise never to talk to a Pc about his case.

14. I promise to send the Pc to the Examiner or D of P, to get data, if unsure why the folder has been sent up for C/S.
15. I promise never to be reasonable as a C/S.
16. I promise to maintain sufficient Ethics presence to get my orders followed.
17. I promise never to issue involved repair orders.
18. I promise never to follow C/S advice from a Pc but I will accept the Pc's data.
19. I promise that I will ALWAYS read through the Pc folder before C/Sing a case.
20. I promise I will always have the folders of cases in trouble casewise, ethically or medically reviewed to find the Out Tech.
21. I promise never to put a Pc on a grade to "solve his case".
22. I promise to always order a repair of a misaudited grade until the End Phenomena has been achieved.
23. I promise to advance the Pc up the Grade Chart in the proper sequence.
24. I promise never to order a grade run that the Pc is not set up for.
25. I promise never to indulge in the practice of "hopeful C/Sing".
26. I promise never to C/S a session I cannot read but will instead return it to the Auditor for clarification.
27. I promise to make every effort to find and point out an actual goof and send the Auditor to Cramming.
28. I promise never to invalidate or harass an Auditor for a correct action or when no Technical goof has occurred.
29. I promise to recognize and acknowledge a Technically perfect session.
30. I promise to see that a Pc or Pre-OT who knows he has made an EP is sent to Exams and C&A to attest.
31. I promise never to send a Pc or Pre-OT who hasn't made it to declare and attest.
32. I promise to see that Pcs and Pre-OTs who haven't made it are handled until they have made that specific Declare.
33. I promise to complete cycles of action on the Pc and never start a new one while an old one is still incomplete.
34. I promise to ensure that the Auditors for whom I am C/Sing continue to improve in skill and training level.
35. I promise to maintain a standard of the highest Professional conduct.

Flag Dept 12 C/S

Reissued as BTB
by Flag Mission 1234

I/C: CPO Andrea Lewis
2nd: Molly Harlow

Authorized by AVU
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:SW:AL:MH:RL:mh.rd
Copyright © 1971, 1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN

8 DECEMBER 1971

Reissued 3 July 1974 as BTB

Remimeo
All C/Ss
cramming Officer
Hat

CANCELS
HCO BULLETIN OF 8 DECEMBER 1971
SAME TITLE

Cramming Series 9

C/S Series 68

THE C/S AND CRAMMING CYCLES

A fast way for any C/S to go into Doubt about the skills of his Auditors is to send them to Cramming and get only a “done” back.

Cramming is there to find the real cause of any error. So if the real WHY is not made known to the C/S he has a “something is wrong with Joe’s TRs” which hangs up in time and never is resolved.

A response from Cramming to an order from the C/S to “check his TRs—Pc’s TA went low in session—” which states: “I checked his TRs and they are good. But he audited the Pc in a room that was overhot and the cans were too big. He has been drilled on Auditor’s Code and session environment handling and HCO Bs on TA Errors and now has this down pat. It won’t happen again,” leaves the C/S in no doubt as to what really happened. What’s more he can order this repaired on the Pc by a “2wc on times he felt worried about his TA or F/Ns” taken E/Sim to F/N (which will clear it up).

Furthermore the Auditor now knows that the C/S knows what the real error was, doesn’t get hung with a withhold or a false idea about his TRs from the C/S.

In essence one is putting the Exact Truth on the line.

So the following rule is now mandatory in all HGCs and Quals:

THE CRAMMING OFFICER IS ALWAYS ON ANY CRAMMING ORDER TO REPORT THE EXACT OUTNESSES FOUND OR THE EXACT SESSION GOOFs, WITH ANY ADDITIONAL DATA, IN DETAIL, TO THE C/S.

A C/S receiving a Cramming Order back giving no Why or an unreal Why that does not make sense when compared with the session and its results MUST return the Cramming Slip to the Cramming Officer requiring the Why be found or the wrong Why abandoned and the real Why found and corrected.

A good C/S should know his Data Series down cold and be able to spot such outpoints at once. He would go over the session with the Cramming Officer and point out what it is he wants handled.

This data is not theoretical but is taken from actual practical experience in C/Sing.

Flag Dept 12 C/S
Reissued as BTB
by Flag Mission 1234
I/C: CPO Andrea Lewis
2nd: Molly Harlow
Authorized by AVU
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:SW:AL:MH:RL:mh.rd
Copyright © 1971, 1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN

12 DECEMBER 1971R

Remimeo
Auditors
Internes
C/Ses

Revised & Reissued 1 August 1974 as BTB
(*Revision in this type style*)

CANCELS

HCO BULLETIN OF 12 DECEMBER 1971
SAME TITLE

C/S Series 69R

MANDATORY C/SING CHECKLIST

These are the actions, compiled from earlier LRH HCO Bs, that are always done by a C/S whenever he C/Ses any folder.

All the C/Sing data in the world would be of little use if these mandatory actions were omitted.

1. *INSPECT THE EXAMINER'S REPORT* to see if the Pc thought the session was okay and if the Examiner's notation of TA, needle and indicators shows it was F/N GIs.
2. *INSPECT THE PRE-SESSION C/S* to see what was previously ordered done.
3. *INSPECT THE LAST SESSION* to see if the C/S was *done*. (Check that each separate part of the C/S was done.)
4. *INSPECT IN THE WORKSHEET THAT EACH STEP OF EACH PROCESS OR ACTION WAS CORRECTLY DONE INCLUDING CORRECT COMMANDS USED AND EXPECTED PC RESPONSE FOR THOSE COMMANDS.* (For Dianetics this would be the 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 sequence and A, B, C, D, etc. to see if it was standard. Other processes and actions have their own steps—which the C/S must know in order to be in compliance with the High Crime PLs.)
5. *INSPECT CAREFULLY THAT ALL LISTING ACTIONS HAVE BEEN CORRECTLY DONE;* find out if there was mislisting.
6. *INSPECT THAT F/N, COG, AND VGIs OCCURRED AT THE END OF EACH PROCESS AND ACTION* (each *chain* in Dianetics) *AND AT SESSION END.*

(Text is seldom read unless the session did not go well. If you can't read the reports, send them back to have the Auditor overprint illegible words. Never try to C/S an illegible worksheet.)

7. *HAVE THE EXAMINER ASK THE PC WHAT THE AUDITOR DID IF THE AUDITING REPORTS DON'T SHOW THE ERROR AND SEEM FALSE* (i.e.

Auditor's account of session doesn't match Pc's statement and indicators at Examiner).

8. *GIVE THE SESSION A GRADING OF VERY WELL DONE, WELL DONE, WELL DONE BY EXAM, NO MENTION OR FLUNK* depending on what was found in above points.

VERY WELL DONE if all the above points are okay and the session is exactly by the book.

WELL DONE for F/N, VGIs at session end and at Examiner—no major tech errors but not exactly by the book.

WELL DONE BY EXAM for F/N, VGIs at session end and at Examiner but Admin and session actions not OK.

NO SESSION GRADE MENTION if the session end was F/N, VGIs but the F/N wasn't present at the Examiner—provided there were no major tech errors in the session.

FLUNK FOR ANY OF THE FOLLOWING:

F/N did not get to Examiner and was not present at session end.

Major errors or flubs occurred like no EP, multiple somatic run, unflown ruds, mislisting, etc.

C/S not followed or completed.

Auditor's Rights errors occurred.

No F/N and BIs at Examiner, etc.

9. *WRITE OUT IN TRIPPLICATE ON ANY OUT TECH AND AUDITOR GOOPS—INDICATE THE RIGHT OUTNESSES AND CRAMMING CYCLES FOR THEM.* One copy goes to D of P to Auditor, one copy goes to Cramming Officer and one copy is kept as a check to see that the order is done.
10. *NOW INSPECT—IS THE CASE RUNNING WELL AND IS IT CORRECTLY PROGRAMMED? DO WE JUST CONTINUE? DO WE REPAIR RECENT GOOPS AND CONTINUE? DO WE NEED FULL FES OR LISTS TO FIND THE BUG IN THE CASE AND THEN REPAIR THAT (INCLUDING PREVIOUS INCOMPLETE CYCLES)?*
11. *NOW CHECK THE AUDITOR'S C/S FOR THE NEXT SESSION—DOES IT FOLLOW THE PROGRAM FOR THE CASE IN THE FRONT OF THE FOLDER OR DOES IT Q AND A AND GO OFF IN ANOTHER DIRECTION?*
 - A. Does it recommend to continue with the next action on the case program, if the case is doing well and the last session went okay?

- B. Does it recommend the necessary brief repair action and then continue the program actions if the case has been running well but there has now been an error on the case?
- C. Does it recommend a program to debug and handle the case if it is not running well or has started to do poorly in life (Ethics conditions, accidents, etc.) (including use of lists to get data or an FES, etc.)?

It is the C/S responsibility to ensure that all Ethics, medical and other relevant reports are included in the Pc folders and that Pcs are not audited while under heavy ethics actions.

- 12. *APPROVE THE EXISTING C/S IF IT IS OKAY IN LINE WITH THE ABOVE, OTHER WISE CORRECT IT OR WRITE UP AN ENTIRELY NEW C/S.*
- 13. *WRITE UP A CRAMMING ORDER ON THE C/SING ACTION IF THE AUDITOR WAS WAY OFF ON HIS C/S (OR ADD THIS TO THE EXISTING CRAMMING ORDER FOR THAT SESSION).*
- 14. “If the case is not running well and generally, the C/S goes back to the point where the case WAS running well (good wins) and comes forward. The largest bug on the case often will be in the session later than the last good one. The C/S should correct the bad session. Where this does not resolve the case, a study for incomplete programs and other outnesses should be made with a program to complete and handle. “LRH

IMPORTANT:

Keep the three Golden Rules of C/Sing always in the above actions. They 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.
-

The C/S must drill on this *bulletin* until he knows each point by number just the way a Dianetics Auditor is required to know points 1 to 9 and A to D. He can *also* keep a copy of this *bulletin* on the wall over his desk, to refer to until he knows the sequence cold. Even then he should refer to it from time to time to ensure he drops out none of the steps.

Auditors writing up C/Ses for the next session must refer to this *bulletin* also.

(This *BTB* is compiled from earlier C/S Series HCO Bs and from the following earlier *LRH* HCO Bs:

HCO B 1 Sept 68 "Points on Case Supervision"
HCO B 11 Sept 68 "Case Supervisor Data"
HCO B 8 Oct 68 "Case Supervisor—Folder Handling"
HCO B 28 June 69 "C/S—How to Case Supervise Dianetics Folders".)

Training & Services Aide
From C/S Coaching Actions
by
L. RON HUBBARD
Founder
Revised & Reissued as BTB
by Flag Mission 1234
I/C: CPO Andrea Lewis
2nd: Molly Harlow
Authorized by AVU
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:SW:AL:MH:BW:mh.rd

Copyright © 1971, 1974

by L. Ron Hubbard

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 3 JANUARY 1972

Remimeo
Auditors
Interns
C/Ses

C/S Series 69 ADDITION

C/SING CHECKLIST

(If a copy of C/S Series 69 is
posted on the wall, also post this.)

Nothing in this checklist for C/Sing relieves the auditor or C/S from full knowledge of the entire C/S Series. Nothing in the C/S Series is changed by this checklist.

ADDITION

No. 10. Add. The time-honored way of seeing what has to be repaired in a Case not running well is:

**GO BACK IN THE FOLDER TO WHERE THE CASE WAS RUNNING WELL
AND COME FORWARD.**

The major error or departure is in the very next session after that. The bugs after the high point should be repaired as the fast action to set the case going again.

The repair and handling of bogged cases is the finest skill of a C/S. Really it is why he is there.

To do this he has to know the C/S Series thoroughly, know all the materials of all levels he is C/Sing better than the auditor.

The use of prepared lists, WC Correction List, Green Form, C/S 53, Hi-Lo TA, GF 40 RR, Int-Ext Corr List, L1C and others, including "Have Examiner ask the pc what happened in session" are used to get information and correct as well as folder studies. **KNOW BEFORE YOU GO.**

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt rd
Copyright © 1972
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN

12 DECEMBER 1971 R

Issue XIV

Remimeo
Cramming Offs
C/Ses

Reissued 9 July 1974 as BTB
Revised 26 November 1974

CANCELS

BTB OF 12 DECEMBER 1971

Issue XIV

SAME TITLE

Cramming Series 8R

C/S Series 70R

HOW TO WRITE UP A CRAMMING ORDER

There is a certain technology on how to write up a Cramming Order.

1. Isolate and state briefly the exact outnesses (in the Pc folder or staff member area).
2. Order those HCO Bs or PLs crammed.

The Cramming Officer also looks in a slightly wider circle around the data flunked and locates which basic is involved (i.e. Auditor's Code, TRs, metering, handling a session, handling the Pc as a Being, or student basics and staff basics) and gets that crammed, too.

The Cramming Officer is not bound to accept any Cramming Order if his own investigation proves that something else entirely needs correction. It is part of the Cramming Officer's responsibility to prevent Wrong Target correction. According to Qual Senior Datum, the Cramming Officer must not take orders but must do his own investigation and handling. It will be found that there is usually a valid corrective action to be made. He does not just waive the cycle if the original order is incorrect. He finds out what is really wrong and corrects that.

Written & Revised by CS—5
Ensign Judy Ziff

Commodore's Staff Aides

Approved by the Board of Issues
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:BofI:JZ:mh.rd
Copyright © 1971, 1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 19 DECEMBER 1971

Remimeo

C/S Series 71

D OF P OPERATES BY OCAs

A Director of Processing is a director of PROCESSING of cases.

All his functions are involved with this. He MUST understand his title and what its duties involve.

It is his job to get people PROCESSED.

To do this he has to KNOW (a) what people there are to be processed, (b) how much processing they will need, (c) what facilities can be maintained and expanded to get processing done and (d) to see that the processing is paid for and occurs.

The D of P does not have to be a C/S or to know C/Sing.

ALL HE HAS TO KNOW OF TECH IS HOW TO READ AN OCA, IQ, APTITUDE AND OTHER TESTS.

He does not even have to open a folder. If all he ever looked at was a pc's OCA (Oxford Capacity Analysis or by some other name) the D of P would win every time.

If the D of P considered his job as "To raise OCAs with paid for processing and to be sure the pc is happier" he would be performing his duties.

To raise OCAs one has to know how to "read" an OCA. That's easy. It says how right on its border. Unacceptable, Needing Improvement, Desirable, etc.

An OCA with any point on the left side of the graph in low or undesirable range means the pc is out of valence. Any low point on the right side of the graph means the pc is crazy.

If the graph is not in the desirable range and the pc happy and looking better, the HGC has not done its job yet.

The D of P goes wholly on the idea of MORE AUDITING when he wants to raise a graph or IQ.

It's not up to the D of P what is audited only that auditing is done. The C/S, if he knows his business, will say *what is* audited. The D of P just knows MORE AUDITING.

A D of P can tell by the OCA improvement and improvement of TONE and APPEARANCE of the pc and what the pc says in an interview whether the required high quality result has been achieved. If it has not, then it's MORE AUDITING.

The REGISTRAR can have very similar functions as to graphs and where there is no D of P the REGISTRAR must do these things.

A D of P who has a backlog is a dog. It means he isn't getting auditors or recruiting Academy students or getting people to Auditor Interne and isn't BEING by DEFINITION a D of P.

If there is an "ARC Broken field" look at the D of P. He didn't see that the OCA was raised and that the pc was happy before he left the org.

A good D of P has a potential processing line of EVERY OCA EVER GIVEN BY THE ORG.

He is in the business of raising graphs and making people happy with their auditing IN PAID VOLUME. If his HGC isn't turning out 700 well done hours a week, he's failing. If he is, he's a success. If he turns out more, a second HGC is needed.

The traffic cop is the D of P.

He has to know what traffic he will have and what traffic he does have.

He can be defeated by a poor registrar, a poor C/S and a poor Qual. Therefore he has the right to demand these people get hatted. But he only has the right if he himself is hatted and doing his job. Given that he can demand Comm Evs.

If a D of P exists, knows his job and does it an org will become prosperous.

The first thing he has to know is the meaning of his TITLE.

The second thing is that his job is getting OCA graphs raised IN PAID FOR VOLUME.

(By current US rates a D of P should be running at least a \$17,000 cash gross of auditing through an HGC each week to be considered a competent D of P.)

Any "field ARC Breaks" is a direct reflection on the D of P. He didn't raise graphs and see people were happy before leaving.

During periods when the post of D of P was empty or "not on the org board" or not filled, the org has slumped.

The post is very important.

It is also a very simple, direct post.

Its duties are covered in C/S Series 25 along with others. But his use of the OCA is not listed there.

Procurement of auditors is currently the weakest point of a D of P's duties. Without this he cannot deliver volume. I have known Ds of P to train auditors themselves to have auditors and others to train Academy Graduates after the course to have quality.

There are no limits on what a D of P can do—

So long as he is DIRECTING PROCESSING and RAISING OCAs *in paid volume.*

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 24 FEBRUARY 1972

Remimeo
Div 6 Personnel
Tech Personnel
Qual Personnel

C/S Series 71A

WORD CLEARING OCAs

An illegal practice has been uncovered in which the words on the Oxford Capacity Analysis, American Personality Analysis and other tests have been word cleared by testers and Directors of Processing.

Example: Pc does an OCA (or any test) that shows a state of case in July. He gets auditing. He takes another test that shows what the auditing did by August. If somewhere along this line a test I/C or D of P word clears him on the test, the test-will change. Entering this variable wipes out any possibility of establishing what the auditing did for the case.

Example: If a child is measured as to height and then fed certain foods to see if he will grow and then someone changes or stretches the tape by which he was measured, you can't find out if the food did any good.

In science this is known as holding a constant.

We don't give a hoot in hell if the pc understands the test or not. The next time he takes it he'll probably have the same misunderstandings but he'll have a change of opinion or even have a new cleverness or better memory and the test will change.

Therefore *none* of these things may ever be done:

1. Never tell the pc the right answers to a test.
2. Never tell a pc to look up words on a test he doesn't understand.
3. Never word clear the question sheet for a pc on *any* test.
4. Never answer a pc's question as to what a question means.

DO THESE THINGS

- A. Be sure any test person grasps this HCO B fully so he knows what a test is and why we test people.
- B. Never let a person who falsely reports routinely near a test line.
- C. Safeguard test answer sheets from being known or seen by unauthorized personnel.

- D. Use 2nd test and 3rd test question sheets, each different from the 1st one. (Tests are issued this way.)
- E. Give other tests (Aptitude or OTIS etc) to compare with the second or third OCA or APA if it is in doubt to see if the OCA has been “word cleared” or falsified.
- F. Groove in Examiners: Give a meter check on ALL ATTESTS at the Examiner. “Do you have any doubts or reservations concerning attesting to (whatever the attest is) ?” Note any INSTANT read (a latent surge can occur as a protest). This question is asked before the question asking him if he wants to attest. E.g. “Do you have any doubts or reservations concerning attesting to Word Clearing Method I complete?” No instant read. Then ask the attest question “Would you like to attest to _____?”

Never let an Examiner permit any attest or pass to even be asked for if the meter tone arm is high or low or not F/Ning. If an INSTANT read is gotten on the first question above, the Examiner does not ask the second question, and sends the folder back to the C/S.

- G. Require a meter check at Success with the TA position and needle behavior noted on the Success form. Those with high or low TA and/or not F/Ning are not valid success stories. The success person makes the meter check after the story is written, notes it without pc seeing it and smiles and acks. He does not refuse the story as it will ARC Break the pc. But he must call it to the attention of the Dist Sec and Qual Sec that a false attestation and poor result came from Div IV and it must be taken off Div IV’s stat.
- H. Both Examiner and Success must know of the False TA HCO Bs so they don’t put the pc on wrong cans or use cans when the auditor used footplates.

This safeguards our test line.

The test line is a check on C/S and auditing quality. We are not trying to find out if Dianetics and Scientology work. We *know* that. We are trying to find out by test, Examiner and Success if it is being *properly* taught and *applied* in Div IV and Dept of Pers Enhancement.

HONESTY is a primary requirement on test lines. PR types that falsify to attain status or seem good fellows need not apply for these posts and shouldn’t be on them.

THE PC OR STUDENT DEEP DOWN KNOWS WHETHER HE HAS MADE IT OR NOT.

If you or tests tell him he’s made it when he hasn’t he will get a false opinion of you and doubt you.

If you tell him he hasn’t made it when he has he will get a false opinion of you.

He will think you don’t know your business and blow.

SANITY is basically HONESTY and TRUTH.

When false data or altered data is entered this is ABERRATION.

So be *honest* and run a *sane* D of P, Examiner, Success and TEST line.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH: ne.rd
Copyright © 1972
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 20 DECEMBER 1971

Remimeo

C/S Series 72

USE OF CORRECTION LISTS

A current survey shows that the weakest point in C/Sing done in orgs is failure to use Prepared Lists for Case Correction.

There are some other points. For some reason C/Ses are being inventive instead of following the C/S Series and doing standard repairs and grades.

Probably the failure to use Prepared Correction Lists derails the use of standard actions.

There are very few actions which do not have their own Correction Lists.

THERE IS NOTHING IN DIANETICS AND SCIENTOLOGY AS MIRACULOUSLY WORKABLE AS CORRECTION LISTS.

The only things which prevent the list from working are

- (a) AUDITOR'S METERING
- (b) AUDITOR'S TRs.

METERING

When the auditor's meter is habitually placed where he cannot see (1) The meter needle, (2) The worksheet and (3) The pc WITH ONE DIRECTED LOOK, then he misses reads.

All three have to be seen at once.

The faults are

- i) Eyesight poor
- ii) Glasses rims obscure one while looking at another
- iii) Position of the meter.

It is a Standard Cramming action to look into these points WHENEVER A CORRECTION LIST IS SAID TO BE BLANK.

For example a GF is done by Auditor A on Monday. It is done again by Auditor B on Tuesday. Reads are found by B. This means Auditor A is missing reads.

THIS IS FAR MORE COMMON THAN BELIEVED.

TRs

When an auditor can't be heard or is overwhelming the pc the list won't be valid.

An auditor's TRs show up more quickly on a Correction List than anything else.

A pc ARC Broken by TRs 0 to IV will not read properly on a Correction List.

NUMBERS OF LISTS

The number of Correction Lists is large.

It is unthinkable to do Word Clearing without ever using a WC Corr List. Yet we find folders with bogged Word Clearing sessions where the list was never used.

There is the Green Form for general case upset, the Green Green Form for Solo, L 1 C for ARC Brks over a period, L3B for Dianetic bogs, L4B for listing and nulling goofs, Int RD Corr List for Int-Ext corrections, a Power Corr List for Power, GF 40R for resistive cases, C/S 53 and Hi Low TA for TA misbehavior, L7 for Clearing Course, and others.

C/Ses trying to "solve cases" without using Correction Lists is like trying to repair flat tires without puncture patches—it just CAN'T BE DONE.

THE PRIMARY TOOL OF A C/S IS PREPARED CORRECTION LISTS.

It is not inventive ways of "solving cases".

METHOD OF USE

Where you have inexpert auditors you always order Method 5, which is just a full rapid assessment. Then the C/S sorts out the reads and C/Ses what to do as very well covered on the lists themselves and the C/S Series.

Then the auditor does the C/S.

A Green Form is *always* done this way. It will bog on any other method like 3.

There are different methods of handling lists. L1C is always done Method 3, carrying each read as it is found Earlier Similar to F/N.

A GF 40R is done Method 3 and then the engrams are run for each read where engrams are indicated.

It's up to a C/S to use Correction Lists, to coach his auditors into proper list use and to get corrected any misuse.

A C/S who can't or doesn't use Prepared Correction Lists isn't a C/S at all but a "person puzzled about cases".

Correction Lists, standard programs and the Grade Chart and Grade Commands and materials.

These are the tools of the C/S.

There are NO others.

A C/S is one who uses these things. He is Supervising that they are used when they are supposed to be.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH: nt.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 23 DECEMBER 1971

Remimeo

Solo C/S Series 10

C/S Series 73

THE NO-INTERFERENCE AREA

From R6 Solo to OT III one does not do anything except keep the pc winning for R6 Solo to OT III.

This is the critical band of the Gradation Chart.

On Flag it was learned the hard way that you don't do other major auditing actions between these two points.

Example: Action—Completed R6, Clear and OT I, then a Dianetic Completion was attempted. Result—failure. Right Action—Complete Dianetics before R6. Right Action—let it go until OT III well begun, then complete Dianetics.

Example: Pre OT doing OT II. A new PTS RD is done. Failure. Right Action—do it before R6 or after OT III.

Example: R6 done. Drug RD given. Result. Poor. Right Action—Do Drug RD before R6.

EXCEPTION

It will be found that a pc cannot confront doing Solo Grades. The reason will be found to be Drugs. All pcs who “cannot run engrams” CAN run Drug Engrams. They are afraid because they get into the bank heavily when on Drugs. *Only* Drugs can be run.

So a pc who has “done R6 and Clearing Course but hasn't made it” will be found to be a rabbiting (frightened and running away) druggie. He can and will run Drug Engrams.

Thus the right action is to do a full Drug Rundown, then start the pc all over again at R6.

It is an exception only because he hasn't done his Solo anyway.

REPAIRS

Where a Pre OT hasn't made the grade of a Solo level (or gets sick afterwards) a full repair must be done and the failed grade must be completed before he goes on up.

It is possible to repair a Pre OT between R6 and OT III so long as you are not trying to handle his whole case but only repairing the grade he missed.

TRs

Never order TRs after Solo Materials study or before OT III is attested.

TRs should be done before or during Solo Auditing study but not after materials are issued. And the TR Course may not be done from then on to OT III.

A partially completed earlier TR Course found to be hanging up a pc on Solo Grades can be handled to completion and should be. This does not mean long additional hours of TR 0. It usually means word clearing on the TR materials and rehab.

MAJOR ACTIONS

It is a very losing game to throw a major rundown in between R6 and OT III. Such as L10 after Clearing and before OT I. The result is a mess.

The way to recover such a blunder is to get the pc rehabbed or to a rest point and then finish up the Solo Grades to OT III attest and then complete the rundown.

SET UP

It is therefore VERY important that a pc be fully set up including Dianetics before he is let onto R6 Solo materials study.

AUDITING SKILL

None of this states that you cannot improve a pc's auditing skill between R6 and OT III (excepting only TRs).

BIG wins are to be had by doing so.

THE MAJOR CAUSE OF FAILURE ON SOLO GRADES IS THE INABILITY TO AUDIT.

You can take a Pre OT who didn't really make Clear or OT I and move him back to R6 study and retread him as an auditor and then let him move back up the line and he'll win.

The sources of failure on Solo are

1. No Drug RD.
2. Dianetics Incomplete.
3. Case not set up.
4. Inability to audit.

SUMMARY

Realize that from R6 to OT III you have a closed band for other major actions.

So don't let people onto R6 Auditing who have points 1-4 out.

If it has happened, patch it up as you can and let the pre OT get on with it.

Then after the first OT III attest, do whatever you like or that needs to be done before sending him on to OT IV.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 16 FEBRUARY 1972

Remimeo
All Tech
Terminals
All Auditors
Franchise

C/S Series 74

TALKING THE TA DOWN MODIFIED

The expertise of talking the TA down should be preserved. It is a skill.

But we have had high and low TAs solved for nearly a year and don't have to talk them down anymore as a constant action.

Auditors SHOULD know how to do it, and then use it as a rare action.

The right way to handle a high TA is to:

Do HCO B 24 Oct 71, HCO B 12 Nov 71, HCO B 15 Feb 72, each named FALSE TA if it has not been done by the auditor on the pc.

THEN if TA is high don't talk it down or do unusual solutions, do a C/S Series 53 or a Hi-Lo TA Assessment and handle. The Int-Ext Correction List is done as indicated and so is the Word Clearing Correction List.

As far as a C/S is concerned, when the pc's TA is seen to be high at session start, he should order as follows: "Check as per False TA HCO Bs" then when that is done he orders "C/S Series 53 Assess and return to me". Or "Hi-Lo TA Assessment and return to me". He then rapidly C/Ses the required actions.

He should have a standing order with all his auditors:

IF TA IS HIGH OR LOW
AT SESSION START DO
NOT CONTINUE THE
SESSION BUT SEND FOR
A C/S.

An auditor should not in fact talk a TA down, we know now, as he may be auditing over an Out Interiorization Rundown, either not done or botched.

It therefore saves time if other auditing is not done when the TA is high.

In general practice it will now be considered standard for an auditor, Dianetic or upper class, to not start a session over a high TA but to call for a C/S.

And where there is no C/S it will be considered standard for an auditor, seeing a high TA, to at once do a C/S 53 Method 5 (assessing it all), and then handling.

THERE ARE EXACT
REASONS FOR A TA
BEING HIGH AND
THESE TODAY ARE

EASILY HANDLED.

There is no need to talk a TA down. It is faster to directly locate the reason it is up.

Smoothly handling such situations is the mark of an expert.

LRH:ne.bh
Copyright © 1972
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 10 APRIL 1972

A/Courses

(Cancels HCO B 31 July 71 Issue II
Corrected “Solo C/Sing”)

URGENT

C/S Series 75

Solo C/S Series 13

PREOTS DON'T C/S

HCO B 31 July 71 Issue II Corrected required PreOTs to C/S their folders for the next session.

I did not write this HCO B.

Research has proven that a Solo PreOT who is required by any C/S to write a C/S for his next session can be put into that next session action.

This C/Sing for himself his own next session violates the “continued session rule” wherein an auditor does not “finish” a session by telling the pc “the process will be continued in the next session”.

This puts the pc into continued sessions and in Solo *can* put the PreOT from Solo auditing to self auditing. There is a vast difference between the two. Solo auditing occurs in session with a meter. Self auditing is out of session wondering and chewing on bank.

A Solo PreOT must NOT self audit.

He ends the session he has done when he ends session on his worksheet.

He then goes to Examiner and gets his exam. The Examiner sends the completed Exam form to Solo Admin who puts it in the folder.

The Solo C/S, then, from his study of the folder, does the next C/S for the PreOT in proper C/S form. This is a diagonal 2 green stripes on the left-hand corner of the sheet, the PreOT’s name and date in black. The C/S itself is in black pen.

The PreOT takes this C/S and does it in his next session.

In rare instances when the PreOT is going really well, the C/S permits him to do several sessions. The C/S can tell from Exam forms that all is well. This MUST carry a notice “Come in at once to the D of P if you cease to audit or run into trouble. Do this

C/S in the next several sessions. Come in for a new C/S the moment you feel this C/S is complete and are ready for a new C/S.”

When no Exam forms come in the Solo D of P chases the pc up.

If a Solo Exam form is bad the *Examiner* must mark it “Urgent Attn Solo C/S.” IN RED.

Solo Admin must alert the D of P who chases up the pc.

Tab is kept on ALL Solo pcs on lines by the D of P and if one falls off lines the fact must be visible to the Solo D of P who keeps a board on sessions with all PreOTs' names on it !

The above is the correct C/Sing line.

The worst features of a PreOT doing his own C/Sing are:

1. He is not a trained C/S.
 2. Sudden ideas pop up he wants to handle instead of going on and he gets into an offline action when he should keep going.
 3. A PreOT can “rabbit” (run away from the bank) by proposing a C/S that does not make him confront it.
 4. And Last but far from least, a “C/S” by a PreOT is an invitation to the Solo Case Supervisor to Q and A with it. (Q and A means to just repeat whatever another says as a lazy way out.)
-

Pc + Auditor is greater than bank.

In Solo Auditing

C/S + PreOT is greater than bank.

PreOTs do NOT C/S their own folders!

THE PREOT *DOES* KEEP UP HIS SESSION SUMMARY EACH SESSION.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:mes.rd
Copyright © 1972
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 17 APRIL 1972

Remimeo

C/S Series 76

C/SING A PTS RUNDOWN

References: HCO B 9 Dec 71 PTS Rundown
 HCO B 20 Jan 72 PTS Rundown Addition
 HCO B 13 Feb 72 PTS RD Additional
 Issue II LRH Data
 HCO PL 5 Apr 72 PTS Type A Handling
 HCO B 16 Apr 72 PTS Correction List
 HCO B 17 Apr 72 C/S Series 76
 C/Sing a PTS RD (this HCO B)
 Any subsequent issues.

The whole point of a PTS Rundown is to make a person *not PTS any longer*.

The point is not to just run some processes. It is to have a person all right now.

To really understand this rundown, one would have to know what PTS is in the first place and why one was doing the rundown.

This would apply to the auditor as well as the C/S.

PTS means POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE. It means someone connected to a person or group opposed to Scientology.

It is a TECHNICAL thing.

It results in illness and rollercoaster and IS the CAUSE of Illness and rollercoaster.

When you do a PTS RD on a pc CORRECTLY he or she should no longer be ill or rollercoaster.

BUT THIS INCLUDES THE PERSON HANDLING HIS PTS CONDITION IN THE REAL UNIVERSE NOT IN JUST HIS BANK.

An auditor and C/S must see that the person is:

- (a) Handled properly in HCO or by the D of P if HCO isn't there so that the person handles the PTS Connection itself. (See HCO PL 5 April 72, "PTS TYPE A HANDLING".)
- (b) Do the RD correctly (see reference HCO Bs above).

- (c) D of P Interview the person AFTER the RD is “complete” to be sure the person is now all right (not PTS).
- (d) Watch the person’s folder for any new signs of illness and rollercoaster and if these occur find out what was missed by assessing PTS RD CORRECTION LIST. (See HCO B 16 April 72.)
- (e) Handling the PTS RD CORR LIST.
- (f) Re-interviewing to be sure the person is all right now.

DATA

Anyone handling or auditing or C/Sing PTS cases should have done the PACK “PTS, SP TECH” Pack I & Pack 2 which are based on HCO PL 31 May 71 which is the CHECKSHEET for available tech and policy on this subject.

To this checksheet (HCO PL 31 May 71) must be added these issues:

HCO B 9 Dec 71 PTS Rundown
 HCO B 20 Jan 72 PTS Rundown Addition
 HCO B 13 Feb 72 PTS RD Additional
 Issue II LRH Data
 HCO PL 5 Apr 72 PTS Type A Handling
 HCO B 16 Apr 72 PTS Correction List
 HCO B 17 Apr 72 C/S Series 76
 C/Sing a PTS RD (this HCO B)

Any subsequent issues.

PTS SITUATIONS

The hardest thing to get across about a PTS situation is that it IS the reason for continued illness and rollercoaster (loss of gains).

The condition *does* exist. It is in fact common.

We *do* have the auditing tech to handle now.

The material has to be applied correctly just like any other material.

The reason we do the rundown is not to do some sessions or sell some auditing or just explain why the person is like that. We do the rundown so the person will no longer be PTS.

The (EP) *End Phenomenon of the PTS RD is attained when the person is well and stable.*

As a C/S you MUST put a YELLOW TAB marked PTS on a PTS PC Folder that stays on until the person is NO LONGER PTS.

If you do NOT do this there will be about 25% of your pcs or more that YOU WILL BE IN CONTINUAL TROUBLE WITH! Because you will be C/Sing auditing for a person who is PTS, will be ill, will rollercoaster because the person has NOT been handled to EP on being PTS.

These people, by the way, will tell you, “Oh, I’m not PTS.” “But your father is suing the org.” “Oh yes, I know, but it doesn’t bother me. Besides my illness is from something I ate last year. And I rollercoaster because I don’t like the Examiner. But I’m not PTS.” The mystery is

solved when you find they haven't a clue what the letters mean or what the condition is, so give them a copy of HCO PL 5 Apr 72 and let them read it. If they still want to know more give them HCO PL 23 Dec 65. (Remembering it has to be Word Cleared Method 4 or he won't have a clue even if he reads it.)

We are on no campaign to rid the world of suppressives when we are handling a PTS pc. But facts are facts and tech is tech.

In handling a PTS person as a C/S you are on a borderline of policy violation unless you make the person do what it says in HCO PL 5 April 72 first. That handles the situation itself. Then you can handle the person with the PTS Rundown.

It is a great rundown. Like any other it has a standard way of going about it.

LRH:mes.rd
Copyright ©1972
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 19 APRIL 1972

Remimeo

C/S Series 77

“QUICKIE” DEFINED

The reason an auditor can say he doesn’t “quickie a rundown” (and none ever say they do) is because he has no definition for the word QUICKIE.

The word has been used to designate rundowns that were not completely and fully done.

It is not a slang word.

In the dictionary you will find “*Quickie* also *quicky*: something done or made in a hurry. Also: a hurriedly planned and executed program (as of studies).”

What happens in auditing, for instance, is a “Grade Zero Expanded” is “done” by just doing a single flow to its first F/N.

That is obviously “quickie”.

A more subtle one is to do a “PTS Rundown” with no Ethics action to begin and no check for stability, holding gain and not ill a week or two after the RD. Only if both these actions were done would one have a “Complete PTS Rundown” as it would give a PRODUCT = A PC no longer PTS.

So what makes a Quickie “completion” quickie?

Is it length of time? Not necessarily.

Is it fewness of processes? Not necessarily as Power can be done quickie simply by not hanging on for the EP and only going to F/N.

To define COMPLETE gives us the reverse of Quickie.

“COMPLETE: To make whole, entire or perfect; end after satisfying all demands or requirements. “ A Completion is “the act or action of completing, becoming complete or making complete”.

So “completing” something is not a loose term. It means an exact thing. “End after satisfying all demands or requirements” does not mean “doing as little as possible” or “doing what one can call complete without being detected”.

Anything that does not fully satisfy all requirements is QUICKIE.

So “quickie” really means “omitting actions for whatever reason that would satisfy all demands or requirements and doing something less than could be achieved”.

In short a quickie is not doing all the steps and actions that could be done to make a perfect whole.

Standard auditing actions required for ages that auditors cleared each word of each command. Yet when they went quickie they dropped this. When this was dropped, GAINS ON 75% OF ALL PCS LESSENED OR VANISHED. We are right now achieving spectacular wins on pcs just by clearing up commands and words on all lists. We are finding that these pcs did not recover and NEVER BEFORE HAD BEEN IN SESSION even though previously “audited” hundreds of hours.

By omitting an essential action of clearing commands, processing did not work because the pc never understood the auditing commands!

So quickie action did not save any time, did it? It wasted hundreds of hours!

Quickie Programs are those which omit essential steps like Vital lists or 2wcs to get data. FESs for past errors are often omitted.

To slow down the torrent of quickie actions on clearing commands HCO P/L 4 Apr 72 Issue III “Ethics and Study Tech” has Clause 4 “An auditor failing to clear each and every word of every command or list used may be summoned before a Court of Ethics. The charge is OUT TECH.”

Ethics has to enter in after Quickie Tech has gotten in. Because quickie tech is a symptom of out ethics. HCO P/L 3 April 72 (Est O Series 13) “Doing Work” and HCO P/L 4 Apr 72 (Est O Series 14) “Ethics” are vital know-how where a C/S is faced with Quickie actions—or flabby ones that will not cure.

Essential Quickie Tech is simply *dishonest*. Auditors who do it have their own Ethics out in some way.

To be sure their confront is down.

There are numerous remedies for the quickie impulse. The above mentioned Policy Letters and plain simple TR 0 are standard remedies. TR 0 properly done and completed itself usually cures it.

Quickie study in ‘67 and ‘68 almost destroyed auditing quality. LRH ED 174 Int which really pushes in Study Tech will achieve the primary reason for quickie—the auditor didn’t understand the words himself.

Wherever Quickie tendencies or false stats (the quickest quickie possible) show up, the above P/Ls had better be gotten into full use fast.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH: mes.rd
Copyright © 1972
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 20 APRIL 1972
Issue II

Remimeo

C/S Series 78

**PRODUCT PURPOSE AND WHY AND
WC ERROR CORRECTION**

Where untrained Auditors are finding Whys for a Danger Formula, or post purposes or post products as called for in the Est O System you will get a certain amount of error and case disturbance. Such upsets also come from word clearing by incompetent persons.

The C/S should look for these especially when such campaigns are in progress. He should suspect them as a possibility when a case bogs.

A C/S must be sure all such papers and worksheets get into pc's folders.

A common repair action is to

1. Do an assessment for type of charge.
2. Handle the charge found by the assessment done.
3. Fly all the reading items found on such assessments by 2wc or direct handling.
4. Suspect LISTING ERRORS on any Why or purpose or product found even though no list exists and reconstruct the list and L4B and handle it.
5. Handle word clearing of *any* type in or out of session with a Word Clear Correction List done in session by an Auditor.
6. When word clearing is too heavy on the pc or doesn't clean up suspect he has been thrown into implants which are mostly words or the words in some engram. As Implants are actually just engrams, handle it with an L3B.

LISTING

Any item found out of session or by a non-auditor is suspect of being a Listing and Nulling (L&N) error even though no list was made.

TODAY A CORRECT L&N ITEM MUST BD AND F/N.

So treat such items as you would list errors and try to reconstruct the list and either confirm the item or locate the real item (may have been invalidated and suppressed) or extend the list and get the real item.

The real item will BD F/N.

One can establish what the situation is with a post purpose, a Why or a product or any other such item by doing an L4B.

SELF AUDITING

The commonest reason for self auditing is a wrong or unfound L&N item.

People can go around and self list or self audit trying to get at the right Why or product or purpose after an error has been made.

REACTION

NOTHING PRODUCES AS MUCH CASE UPSET AS A WRONG LIST ITEM OR A WRONG LIST.

Even, rarely, a DIANETIC LIST can produce wrong list reactions. Ask the pc for his somatics and he blows up or goes into apathy. Or blows. Or attacks the auditor.

ALL of the more violent or bad reactions on the part of the pc come from out lists.

Nothing else produces such a sharp deterioration in a case or even illness.

OUT LISTS

Therefore when one gets a sharp change in a case (like lowered tone, violence, blows, “determination to go on in spite of the supervisor”, long notes from pcs, self C/Sing, etc, etc, the C/S SUSPECTS AN OUT LIST.

This outness can occur in regular sessions even when the item was said to BD F/N.

It can occur in “Coffee shop” (out of session auditing of someone), or by Est Os or poorly trained or untrained staff members or even in life.

PTS

When such actions as finding items by non-auditors are done on PTS people the situation can be bad, so one also suspects the person to be PTS to *someone* or *something*.

“PTS” does not communicate well in an assessment question so one says, “Someone or something is hostile to you” and “You are connected to someone or something that doesn’t agree with Dianetics or Scientology.”

REPAIRS

The main things to know when doing such repairs are (a) that such situations as wrong lists or upset people can occur in an org where untrained people are also using

meters and (b) THAT IT IS UP TO THE C/S TO SUSPECT DETECT AND GET THEM HANDLED IN REGULAR SESSION.

Do not ignore the possible bad influence.

As the good outweighs the bad in such cases, it is not a correct answer to forbid such actions.

It is a correct answer to require all such actions and worksheets become part of the folder.

One can also persuade the D of T or Qual to gen in the people doing such actions. And do not ignore the effect such actions can have on cases and do not neglect to include them in C/Ses before going on with the regular program.

They can all be repaired.

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1972
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 24 APRIL 1972
Issue I

Remimeo
D of P
Auditors
Ethics
Officers *C/S Series 79*
Expanded Dianetics Series 5

PTS INTERVIEWS

(Reference HCO B 17 April 72, C/S Series 76)

Interviews to discover a PTS condition are done on a meter with all reads marked.

The Interview asks (a) about persons who are hostile or antagonistic to the pc, (b) about groups that are anti-Scientology, (c) about people who have harmed the pc, (d) about *things* that the pc thinks are suppressive to the pc, (e) about locations that are suppressive to the pc and about *past* life things and beings suppressive to the pc.

In doing the Interview the Interviewer must realize that a sick person *is* PTS. There are no sick people who are not PTS to someone or a group or something somewhere.

A somewhat suppressive pc will find the good hats suppressive. This does not relieve his condition. He is PTS to SP people, groups, things or locations, no matter how SP he is.

He can have been audited by someone he knew in an earlier life and who goofed the session. A few auditors have since been declared. Not because they goofed but because they *were SP*.

However, some PTS pc will make trouble for good people because that is what PTS means (Potential Trouble Source). So do not buy all the good people he is PTS to.

Further, when you do get the person or group or thing or location the PTS person will F/N VGI and begin to get well.

The PTS condition is actually a *problem* and a mystery and a withdrawal so it is sometimes hard to find and has to be specially processed (3 S&Ds) to locate it. Usually it is quite visible.

Don't have a sick, rollercoaster pc appear for Interview and then say "not PTS". It's a false report. It only means the Interviewer did not find it.

The pc sometimes begins to list in such an Interview and such an Interview where a wrong item is found has to be audited to complete the list or find the right item. (See C/S Series 78, HCO B 20 Apr 72, Issue II.)

So Interview worksheets are VITAL.

The Interview should end on an F/N.

The Interview is followed by the Ethics action of HCO PL 5 April 72 or other Ethics actions such as handling or disconnection and posting as called for in policy. An Interviewer has to use good TRs and operate his meter properly and know 2-way comm and PTS tech.

Some Interviewers are extremely successful.

Such Interviews and handling count as auditing hours.

When properly done, plus good auditing on the PTS RD, well people result.

LRH:mes.rd
Copyright © 1972
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 15 JUNE 1972

Remimeo
Cramming

IMPORTANT

C/S Series 80

“DOG PCs”

AN AUDITOR WHO CANNOT AUDIT, WHOSE TRs ARE OUT, WHOSE METERING IS BAD AND WHO NEVER KEEPS THE CODE ALWAYS SAYS HIS PCs ARE DOGS.

When you find an auditor on this route, the remedy is:

1. Show him this HCO B and explain to him that an auditor is not likely to get any real results when he is so out of ARC with pcs.
2. P/L 3 May 72, 2 lists L & N by an auditor.
3. Get off his overts and omissions on pcs and pull his w/hs.
4. Check out his meter position so that he can see needle, paper and pc all in the same look without eye shift and drill him to do so.
5. Educate his left thumb so that he corrects a TA on BDs and catches the F/N and doesn't leave the needle stuck to the right of the dial while the pc F/Ns and corrects only after the F/N has been O/R.
6. Make him do an Electronic attest and get his TRs up to where the pc has a chance to be in session.
7. WC M4 him on his materials so he isn't swimming in misunderstandings.
8. Tell him there are no dog pcs now and get busy and help them out.

WHOLE HGC

An entire HGC can go bad this way. Shortly afterwards it will disintegrate and you will have few or no auditors left.

Some auditor who is covering up his overts, false bonuses or false stats begins it and it becomes “fashionable” to call various pcs dogs. Then other auditors, finding this an easy way to justify not trying hard, follow suit.

Next thing you have no HGC.

C/S ERROR

A C/S can err by being too critical of auditors. Or worse he can err by agreeing about what dogs the pcs are. If he does HE HAS NOT REALIZED THAT HIS C/S EFFORTS ARE BEING WASTED BY THE AUDITOR'S OVERTS, FALSE REPORTS, METERING, CODE AND TR FLUBS.

The way to handle this in the C/S is:

1. 3 May 72 P/L.
2. M4 on the C/S Series.
3. Require he listen to and okay ok to audit tapes.
4. Get him to come down on critical auditors with the above cramming action.

Suddenly this C/S will begin to get wins.

CASES

Every “dog pc” investigated traced to incompetent programming, C/Sing, out TRs, bad metering, Code breaks and bad lists.

By forcing an auditor to cool off his opinions and properly handle the pc, each one of these “dog pcs” has begun to fly.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH: ne.rd
Copyright © 1972
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 16 JUNE 1972R
REVISED 27 FEBRUARY 1975

Remimeo

C/S Series 81R

*(Revisions in this type style on next page
to make D of P and D of Ts stats very clear)*

AUDITOR'S RIGHTS MODIFIED

It occasionally (rarely) happens that an HGC's line stops and programs do not get finished and pcs go unaudited or sent to Ethics or Cramming instead of getting their programs completed.

It also happens that a D of P becomes incapable of getting auditors to audit per the schedule he writes.

12½ hour intensives drop out. Auditing falls back to the bit and piece game.

The C/S finds all his work in programming wasted as the programs stale date or just get abandoned.

Hours fall. Lines tangle. Tech Services cannot get assignments done.

THE MAJOR WHY OF THIS AND MANY SUCH CONFUSIONS CAN BE TRACED TO AN ABUSE OF "AUDITORS' RIGHTS" IN PICKING AND CHOOSING PCS ON THE GROUNDS OF "FEELING THEY CANNOT HELP THE PC".

This "right" is also abused by auditors seeking pcs who F/N easily at the Examiner.

See HCO B 15 June 72, C/S Series 80, "Dog Pcs".

The refusal to audit is in fact an admission, in most cases, of a feared inability to audit.

Therefore, an auditor may only refuse to audit a pc if a direct personal relationship exists such as husband and wife or some friend's wife or familial relationship.

An auditor advising others about this or that "dog case" or seeking to exclude pcs from auditing by abusing his "right to choose pcs" is SUBJECT TO COMM EV AND SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATES UNTIL RETREADED.

For the real why of it is his inability to handle TRs, meter, use the Code or apply Tech.

Nearly every “Dog Pc” has out lists or incomplete chains or is not being run on what needs to be handled. In other words they are simply problems in repair which modern tech handles easily. The drug case who is audited on grades but has had no drug rundown is an example of misprogramming.

The C/S can get many loses and the whole HGC go into a bedlam where you have auditors refusing to audit. Their reasons given are false. The real reasons involve fast F/Ns and bonuses or out TRs, metering, Code breaks and tech.

The D of P has a right, and so does Tech Services, to assign pcs to such and such auditors in the sequence listed without a lot of pick and choose by the auditors.

A C/S has a right to get his programs completed.

12½ hour intensive plans blow up where auditors choose their own pcs.

STATS

The stats of C/Ses and auditors may only be HOURS AUDITED with FES and admin hours separately noted.

The D of P’s *stat may only be fully completed cases.*

When the stats are this way the C/S can get his programs done without worry.

The D of P can get cases completed.

The D of Tech Services has only completed *cases and course completions-for a stat.*

HONESTY

Sanity is truth.

Truth is sanity.

The road to truth is begun with honesty.

There was the story of the “man who sold his soul for a mess of pottage” (soup). We could parallel this with the Auditor who sold his case gain for a mess of false stats.

An honest clean job and an honest clean line are the milestones of the road to truth.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.nt.rd
Copyright © 1972, 1975
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN

28 DECEMBER 1972RA

Revised 20 November 1973

Remimeo
Auditors
C/Ses
Revised & Reissued 25 July 1974 as BTB

CANCELS

HCO BULLETIN OF 28 DECEMBER 1972R
SAME TITLE

C/S Series 81-1RA

AUDITOR'S RIGHTS ADDITION REVISED

(Reference: HCO PL 8 Sept 70R, Rev. 18 Nov 73,
"Examiner's 24 Hour Rule", and HCO PL 13 Jan 71,
"Exam 24 Hour Rule".)

It is the established right of an Auditor to use the exact Correction List to repair a specific auditing action, when required.

An Auditor does not have to obtain C/S OK to do a Correction List for a specific auditing action so long as the Auditor has a legal Qual Okay to Audit that specific Correction List.

An Auditor is expected to take a Pc who has red tagged back into session immediately and handle with the right Correction List for that process or rundown, or as authorized in the original HCO B 23 Aug 71, "Auditor's Rights".

It is strictly forbidden for an Auditor or any other Auditor to take a Pc back into session without C/S clearance, after the fact of a second red tag. The Auditor has only one chance to repair the Pc with the right Correction List. If this does not handle, the Pc is still red tagged and the folder must be gotten to the C/S fast and the Out Tech corrected within 24 hours of the original red tag.

The earlier issue of this Bulletin which permitted Auditors to count auditing hours lost on a salvage red tag session is cancelled.

Additionally, if a red tag Pc is NOT handled immediately by the Auditor concerned, the existing penalty of loss of the auditing hours which resulted in the Red Tag session is DOUBLED. For example, if the Auditor audited a 2 hour session, he is penalized 4 hours if he fails to take his Pc straight back into session.

This DOUBLE penalty is purely for the Auditor concerned and does NOT affect or change other penalties connected—the Examiner's 24 Hour Rule per HCO PL 8 Sept 70R and the Paid Comps penalty per HCO B 30 Aug 71 RC, Rev. 6 Feb 74.

The intention here is to increase Auditor responsibility for the preclear and eradicate the incidence of Out Tech.

Qual Secs must get in on Policy daily HGC Auditor and Interne study, TRs and drills period. This will eradicate Out Tech and increase daily stats. Continuous restudy, TRs and drills, done on a daily basis, will create a crack team of Auditors. The datum that the number of times over the materials equals certainty and results still stands. If an Auditor is not flubless to his Class of training, Superliterate or not, he has areas of misunderstandings and nonapplication to be found and handled.

The first responsibility of an Auditor is his preclear and getting that preclear through, by application of flubless tech.

Written & Revised by
Ens. Judy Ziff
CS-5

Revised & Reissued as BTB
by Flag Mission 1234

I/C: CPO Andrea Lewis
2nd: Molly Harlow

Authorized by AVU
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:SW:AL:MH:JZ:mh;jh
Copyright © 1972, 1973, 1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 10 AUGUST 1972

(Amended & Reissued 28 March 1974
—only change is Series No.)

Remimeo

Expanded Dianetics Series 6

C/S Series 82

DIANETIC HCO B

INTEREST

On two certain subjects the “Interest?” question is omitted from Dianetic R3R patter.

On *drugs* and when running Evil Purposes or Intentions one does NOT ask the pc if he is interested in running the item.

The requirement on both drug items and intentions is that the item *read* on the meter (suppress and inval can be used) and has not been run by R3R previously.

Many pcs, it has now been found, have replied “No, no interest” on a drug item, the item has not been run and the pc then continued to have trouble with drugs.

Checking back pcs who returned to drugs after auditing showed “drug rundowns” that were so brief as to be nothing. One pc who had been on LSD for years had only a 1 hour quickie drug rundown. Later this person relapsed.

Tracing this, in each case the “Interest?” question had been used and the pc had replied “No interest” BUT MEANT “I'M NO LONGER INTERESTED IN DRUGS.”

So Drug items that have read are run R3R without asking for interest. The command is simply omitted.

In Expanded Dianetics the same thing has occurred in running Evil Purposes or Intentions. The Auditor asked the pc if he was interested in running the item and the pc said “No” and so it went untouched. But the pc had it confused with interest in doing the purpose and missed running it and then fell on his head later. Tracing the case back it was found that R/Ses and such had not been run due to the pc saying “No Interest”.

Nothing bad will happen if the item is run.

C/S RESPONSIBILITY

The C/S must keep telling his auditors, on drugs or Expanded Dianetics, “Omit asking for interest on R3R on these (drug) (intentions). Run them if they read on the meter.”

REPAIR

In repairing cases it is good sense to check this point on drugs and intentions to see if they were neglected in R3R due to “no interest”.

If so, then have them run and the case will suddenly do well.

LRH:nt.ntm jh
Copyright © 1972, 1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN

11 AUGUST 1972RA
Revised 18 September 1974
(*Revision in this type style*)

Remimeo

CANCELS
HCO BULLETIN OF 11 AUGUST 1972
SAME TITLE

C/S Series 83RA

CORRECTION LISTS

This BTB gives the major correction lists used in auditing with a brief statement of their use, EP and relation to Grade Chart.

“IMPORTANT NOTE: AUDITORS MUST BE EXCELLENT ON TRs AND METERING AND ASSESSMENT DRILLS BEFORE BEING PERMITTED TO TOUCH ONE OF THESE LISTS AS THEY OTHERWISE MISREAD, CALL WRONG READS, GET NO READS, DRIVE TA UP OR DOWN AND BOTCH THE CASE UP FURTHER. USE CRAMMING ON TRs AND METER BEFORE LETTING AN AUDITOR DO ONE OF THESE LISTS.” —LRH.

L1C: Used by auditors in session when an upset occurs, or as ordered by C/S to handle ARC Breaks, sad, hopeless or nattery pcs. It is assessed Method 3. It can also be done M5 on a very ARC Broken pc. EP is area of BPC handled with pc F/N and VGIs. The L1C is not continued beyond a good cog with VGIs and a wide F/N.

GREEN FORM: Used for general case clean-up particularly on an out rud type pc or *when ruds won't fly*. It is not used to handle high or low TA. Assessed M5 to provide data for the C/S then each read handled in accordance with C/S Series 44R. EP is each read handled to its EP. May be reassessed after handling all reading items if heavily charged on first assessment. *Can also be done M3 to a good win and F/N VGIs.*

FALSE TA CHECKLIST: (HCO B 29 Feb 72, Revised 23 Nov 73) Normally done early in auditing, especially if TA high or low. Prevents unnecessary repair due to wrong cans or grip. Is usually only done once. Do not suddenly interject this action into the middle of a session nor change from cans to footplates mid-session due to TA going high.

C/S 53RH: This is the basic list to get TA up or down into normal range. Assessed M5, reading items handled then reassessed, etc. to F/Ning assessment. Done well with good basic auditing this action should not need to be frequently repeated on a case. TA going high or low in later auditing after C/S 53RH already fully handled is normally handled with the correction list *for that action* (e.g. L4BR when TA high after listing or WCCL on word clearing, etc.). EP is C/S 53RH F/Ning on assessment with TA in normal range.

LIX HI LO TA LIST: (BTB 1 Jan 72) Normally used for further handling if high or low TA recurring after C/S 53RH completed. Does not supersede individual correction lists where TA went high or low on a specific auditing action. Assessed M5 and each reading item handled to its EP. EP of list is all reading items handled and TA in normal range.

INT RUNDOWN CORRECTION LIST: (HCO B 29 Oct 71, Revised 14 May 74) Used when Int Ext reads on any repair list and the Int RD has already been done or corrected, when a bog occurs on the Int RD itself, or if pc upset after Int RD and/or TA gone high or low immediately after. Don't re-run Int RD—use the correction list. EP is all reading items handled to F/N, EP of Int RD, and Int Ext no longer reading.

L4BR: (HCO B 15 Dec 68, Revised 2 June 72) Used for assessment of all listing errors, when trouble occurs on a listing process, when TA goes high or pc gets sick or upset after a session which included listing actions. Does not require C/S permission to use by an auditor within a session when trouble on listing occurs. Always assessed M5 and all reads handled (largest reads first). Used to handle individual lists or listing in general in which case the list can be reassessed after first handling if heavily charged on first assessment. EP is all reads handled to F/N with correct items found and indicated and pc no longer upset by the listing action. Should be taken to F/Ning list for full EP of List correction. There is no limit to the number of times it can be used but an auditor who requires frequent use of L4BR needs cramming on basic auditing and L&N so he does it right the first time.

L3RD: (HCO B 11 April 71 RA, Revised 8 March 74) Used for locating and handling all errors and trouble in R3R actions. Assessed M3 with each reading item handled in full per instructions and continued further only if TA or upset remains unhandled. Is not taken to F/Ning assessment except when used in Dianetic Track Repair RD. EP is difficulty handled with pc F/N VGIs and again running well on R3R.

GF40XRR: (HCO B 30 June 71, Corrected & Reissued 13 Jan 72) Used to handle resistive cases (TA in normal range but not responding well to auditing). Assess M3 with all reading items taken to F/N per instructions, then handled in depth with L&N and R3R processes. Normally done only once if done properly. EP is all reading items handled, pc no longer resistive and making good progress in auditing. Note that a pc can be made to appear resistive by poor basic auditing and failure to use the right correction list when needed.

PTS RD CORRECTION LIST: (HCO B 16 April 72) "This Correction List is assessed and handled after a PTS Rundown has been done on the pc. It also serves as a checklist of expected actions with the Rundown."—LRH. It is always assessed M5. EP is pc no longer upset, each reading item taken to EP.

WORD CLEARING CORRECTION LIST: (WCCL) (BTB 21 July 71, Revised 31 March 72, 30 Dec 72) Used to handle any upsets or high or low TA occurring during or shortly after word clearing. If a pc gets sick after word clearing, don't start running R3R, use the WCCL. If TA goes high during or shortly after word clearing, don't use a C/S 53RH, use the WCCL. This list can be overused by using every time the TA starts to go high in word clearing instead of simply completing the clearing of the word or subject started. Assessed M5. EP is all reading items handled to F/N and pc again running well.

STUDY CORRECTION LIST: (BTB 4 Feb 72, Revised 5 Oct 72) Used to handle outnesses in a person's earlier studies which prevent him from progressing well in current study or make him antipathetic towards study. Done as part of the Primary Correction Rundown. It is not used as a substitute for correct application of study tech on the person's current course. Assessed M5. EP is all reading items fully handled and an F/Ning list on final assessment. The full EP of pc willing and able to study well would require each step of Primary Correction RD completed in sequence if pc had been having study trouble. (Ref: HCO B 30 March 72, Revised 30 May 72.)

AUDITING TOOLS DRILL

It is vital that any auditor or C/S knows exactly which correction list to use and when to use it. This is particularly true of auditors in session who can and must use the L1C, L4BR, L3RD or WCCL in session when trouble occurs in order to quickly remedy the action and complete the session successfully without having to end off prematurely for C/S instructions.

For this purpose the auditing tools drill has been developed by LRH. In this drill the coach has a pile of the various correction lists, holds each up in any order and asks, "When do you use this?" "How do you use it?" Auditor must answer correctly without comm lag. When the auditor can do this without error coach then varies the drill by giving session situations and auditor must state the appropriate corrective action to be taken.

A flunk is always handled by having the student restudy the relevant HCO B (never by coach interpretation). Any disagreement or confusion is handled by appropriate word clearing on the materials concerned.

REPAIRING THE PC INSTEAD OF THE AUDITOR

Excessive use of repair lists and having to redo correction lists already done results from flubby auditing. Don't just carry on repairing the pc. Get the auditor crammed especially on basic auditing, especially TRs and metering. Then you can get the pc rapidly and effectively repaired and back onto the Gradation Chart.

"DO NOT LET AN AUDITOR TOUCH SUCH LISTS ON A PC UNTIL HE HAS BEEN CRAMMED ON TRs, METERING AND ASSESSING."—LRH.

HANDLING TROUBLE BEFORE IT OCCURS

To use a correction list in session every time the TA starts to go up or pc gets misemotional is Q&A and will slow up auditing tremendously. The correct action is to be an expert in basic auditing, to know the action you are running, and run the process to its EP. TAs do go high and low during processes. Pcs do sometimes get misemotional when running certain actions. This doesn't call for a correction list as there is nothing to correct. One simply completes the process.

GRADATION CHART

The EP of a Repair Program is stated in C/S Series 3 as "the pc feeling great and feeling he can get case gain". It does not say every correction list or every repair action ever devised having been run on the pc.

If one goes past the EP of repair you then *will* have to repair the pc.

THE CASE GAIN AVAILABLE TO THE PC IS CONTAINED IN THE PROCESSES OF THE GRADATION CHART WHICH IS THE BASIC AUDITING PROGRAM OF EACH PC.

Failure to repair a pc who does need repair denies that pc the gains obtainable from processes. Repairing a pc who is doing well or continuing to repair a pc beyond the EP of repair also denies the gains of auditing.

The solution is to be an expert in basic auditing, know the processes down cold, know uses of correction lists and use them only when required and then use them correctly and get the pc back onto the Gradation Chart with a minimum of delay.

BDCS:LRH:RS:MH:AL:BL:nt.rd
Copyright © 1972,1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Training & Services Aide
Revised & Reissued as BTB
by Flag Mission 1234
I/C: CPO Andrea Lewis
2nd: Molly Harlow
2nd Revision by CS—4
Approved by
L. RON HUBBARD
Founder
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 16 AUGUST 1972

Remimeo

C/S Series 84

FLUBLESS C/SING

A C/S cannot C/S flublessly while he has ANY Auditors flubbing.

The *standard* procedure is

1. The C/S makes sure Tech Courses are taught okay and raises hell until they are.
2. C/S makes sure Qual has a Cramming Officer and crams him until he gets flubless Cramming and can Supervise TRs, do WCing Method 7, Method 6, Method 4, can correct metering and has packs to hand for reference.
3. The C/S follows a *very* standard handling of auditors:
 - A. 1 error of any kind—*instruct by reference to HCO B.*
 - B. A second error of any kind—*send to Cramming and get the Auditor crammed at once, without any loss of auditing time but before the Auditor is allowed to audit further. (This is 2 hours, not 2 days!)*
 - C. A third error of any kind—*RETRAD, wherein the Auditor's weak areas are located and the Auditor has to M7, M6, M4 and restudy the materials of that area. This takes the Auditor back to Step A.*

A retread under a good Super takes 4 or 5 days.

Now if the Auditor again errs he goes to Step A.

If he goes the route again he hits RETRAIN and is retrained fully like any other student. His PRD is done or verified and he goes through the course starting with basic books. This puts the Auditor back to A.

But if he now lands at RETRAIN again he is given a full and complete RETRAIN from his earliest contacts with the subject.

It is highly unlikely he will flub further but if he does, he should not be on auditing at all.

FALSE REPORTS

A falsified Auditing report puts the Auditor at once at retrain as he is not sufficiently aware of the potentials of the subject to know he *can* get results and does not have to be dishonest.

TR 0

OT Zero and TR 0 are the keys to good auditing.

2 C/Ses were found in orgs who “wouldn't let the Auditors do TR 0 because of their cases”. Both orgs had horrible stats and bad results and ARC Broken fields.

OT Zero and TR 0 are a *routine* action for Auditors. They do TRs in spare time, not because they are being Crammed, just to get professional.

Every Cramming Order includes TRs, especially Zero, to also be done on the auditor's own time.

This gets the Auditor up to really Confronting. His errors come mainly from an inability to confront (and from faulty metering or misunderstandings or out ethics).

OT Zero and TR 0 are the keys to flubless auditing.

ELECTRONIC ATTEST

Auditors using LRH tapes and electronic attest (and with OT Zero, TR 0, metering, and Mis Us cleaned up and Ethics in) become very spectacular auditors in terms of results.

Results bring pride.

Auditors who get results are happy auditors. And the above is how, the standard how, to get them to get results.

EASY C/SING

Only if he spends some of his time TRAINING, as above, can a C/S ever get down to really C/Sing cases and getting programmes DONE.

SUMMARY

The above is the way I C/S and handle Auditors *as a C/S*.

I long since found that the flubby Auditors were the ones who consumed the C/S time. The ratio is 2½ hours to 6½ hours wherein it only takes me 2½ hours to C/S piles of folders when I have the auditors auditing honestly and flublessly and it takes me 6½ hours when I have some flubbers.

It is neither kind nor decent to let Auditors lose. Only when I (or MSH) have not been doing the C/Sing has auditing gone wrong in any area where I was.

This is traced directly to the drop-out of the above actions. So it is the above actions which give standard results and any C/S who omits them (to be a good fellow, or "these are my friends") is an Auditor killer.

Auditors sometimes achieve a high status and are "above being crammed". Well watch it, watch it because they will fall on their heads with a crash.

An auditor is not unlike a race horse. He needs a lot of care and handling. And he needs his periodic drills and exercises or he goes sloppy. Like a race horse, a good auditor is very, very valuable. And all good auditors are made by C/Ses!

The proof is that even the best go bad when they no longer have a tight C/S rein. Experience has taught that. The exceptions are very, very few and you don't have any of them.

It takes me about 3 or 4 weeks to get an auditor through his course and doing a good flubless job. The majority of Scientologists want to be auditors. So you have Auditor scarcity? That's a laugh.

It's the C/S! The Course Super, the Cramming Officer.

And it's done just exactly as above.

Given the materials, there is *no other answer*. So stop dreaming of hiring or getting perfect Auditors.

The ones you have are fine. Get more.

And do the above! ! !

The auditors must not blame the pc (nor must you), the C/S must not blame the auditor.

It's you, the Course Super and the Cramming Officer. And mainly you the C/S.

You can and must build a corps of good auditors.

Or you'll never make it as a C/S.

And listen, if you don't make it as a C/S, where's the world?

LRH:nt.bh
Copyright © 1972
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN

16 AUGUST 1972-1
Addition 24 October 1972

Remimeo
Missions

HCO B 16 August 1972
Reissued 16 July 1974 as BTB

CANCELS
HCO BULLETIN OF 16 AUGUST 1972-1
SAME TITLE

C/S Series 84-1

FLUBLESS C/SING IN MISSIONS

(Ref: HCO B 16 Aug 72, C/S Series 84, "Flubless C/Sing")

If an Auditor who is practising in a Mission reaches the point where he should be *retrained*, as per the bulletin, he is sent to the local Org for his retrain cycle.

Per HCO PL 23 Nov 69, "Allowed Technical Services", a Mission may not run Academy Levels, which necessitates the above statement.

Mike Davidson
Franchise Officer WW

Reissued as BTB by
Flag Mission 1234

I/C: CPO Andrea Lewis
2nd: Molly Harlow

Authorized by AVU
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:SW:AL:MH:MD:mh.rd
Copyright © 1972, 1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 13 SEPTEMBER 1972

Remimeo
All Dn & Ex Dn
Auditors
Class VIII
C/Ses

(Amended & Reissued 28 March 1974
—only change is Series No.)

DIANETICS

Expanded Dianetics Series 7

C/S Series 85

**CATASTROPHES FROM AND REPAIR OF
“NO INTEREST” ITEMS**

I have done a review of several failed cases which blew or went bad after auditing.

THE COMMON FACTOR IN EVERY ONE WAS *CASE BY-PASSED DUE TO “NO INTEREST”*.

The auditor finds a reading drug item or an evil purpose and proposes to run R3R on it. The auditor asks if the pc is interested in running it. The pc says, “No.” The auditor does not run it. BANG, we have a BY-PASSED CASE.

The pc will blow or go sour or not recover.

One of these cases was unchanged after “a drug rundown”. He had a pair of eyes that looked like blank discs. Check of folder showed all major drug items “not run due to no interest”. The solution was to recover the lists, run the items that had read R3R triple and complete the case.

Another one blew. His folder was examined. Every evil purpose had been left unrun! Of the items from the “Wants Handled Rundown” the intentions were mislisted. The drug rundown failed due to “no interest”.

Each flubbed case I am finding has had his drug items and evil purposes left unrun on R3R due to “no interest”.

So DON’T ASK FOR INTEREST ON INTENTIONS, EVIL PURPOSES AND DRUG ITEMS.

IF THEY READ, RUN THEM!

REPAIR

1. On any stumbling case that has had a “drug rundown” or Expanded Dianetics get the Folder FESed to see if reading items were left unrun on R3R Triple. List them chronologically, early to late.
2. Get the case back, with an R factor of “Incomplete”.
3. Run every one of those unrun drug items, intentions and Evil Purposes.
4. If the items don’t now read, then get in Suppress and Invalidate on them.
5. If the case bogs do L3RD Method 5 and Handle on that chain only.
6. Go on with the action and complete it.

LRH:sb.ntm.rd
Copyright © 1972,1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN

20 JANUARY 1973 RD

Pc Examiner

Revised 4 May 1976

Qual Sec

Tech Services

CANCELS

Senior C/S

BTB 20 JANUARY 1973RB

C/Ses

SAME TITLE

&

BTB 20 JANUARY 1973RC

(Piloted on Flag for 9 months)

SAME TITLE

C/S Series 86RD

THE RED TAG LINE

(Corrections in this type style)

Ref:	HCO PL	8 Sep 70RA	Examiner's 24 Hour Rule
	HCO PL	13 Jan 71	Exam 24 Hour Rule
	HCO PL	20 Jul 70	Cases and Morale of Staff
	BTB	6 Oct 71R	C/S Series 65R
			Auditing of Staff & Public

There is a precise line for handling Red Tags which must be put in and maintained.

A Red Tag is a large red card placed on the outside front cover of a Pc folder which indicates that a REPAIR SESSION must be done within 24 hours. *An FES may be called for but does not waive the 24 hr rule.*

A Red Tag is placed on the front of a folder by the Pc Examiner, C/S, Senior C/S or Qual Sec for one or more of the following reasons:

- A. No F/N at Exams after a session, word clearing, product or post purpose clearing or Why Finding or 3 May 72 PL or PTS Check.
- B. Roller-coaster bad exam report within a few hours of a session.
- C. Pc ill within a few days of any major case action, or word clearing, product or post purpose clearing or Why Finding or 3 May 72 PL or PTS Check.
- D. Flunked Declare of any major action or Grade, accompanied by a BER.

This pertains to staff and students as well as HGC Pcs.

The Red Tag Line is handled in the following manner:

1. PC RED TAGS, AS PER A—D ABOVE.

2. EXAMINER PAPER CLIPS A RED TAG TO THE EXAM FORM, LOGS THE EXAM IN THE EXAMS LOG BOOK IN RED AND BODY ROUTES (OR GETS IT BODY ROUTED BY QUAL PAGE) THE EXAM FORM INTO THE HANDS OF THE DTS FOR *IMMEDIATE HANDLING*. THE DTS NOTIFIES THE D OF P.
3. If red tagged after a session the Auditor is expected to take the Pc back into session for the appropriate correction list. If this has been done yet the Pc remains red tagged the Auditor must immediately write up the session for the C/S. The DTS in this case verifies that one or the other of these actions is occurring.
4. The D of P is responsible for seeing that an Auditor is assigned to the Pc.
5. The DTS is responsible for seeing that the folder gets to the C/S and that *all* necessary arrangements are made to get the Pc and Auditor into session as rapidly as possible.
6. The C/S is responsible to see that the folder is immediately C/Sed *and* the Auditor corrected. He puts the exam Red Tag on the folder.
7. Once the folder is C/Sed the DTS ensures that the session takes place.
8. After the session is given and Pc is now F/Ning, the Auditor, Pc and folder revert to routine traffic lines. The C/S would remove the red tag at this point.
9. *ALL red tags must be seen by the Snr C/S preferably before the next session. This may not always be possible in orgs where the Senior C/S has other duties.*

In no case should this take more than 24 hours and, in most, it should be handled the same afternoon or evening.

None of this, of course, relieves the Auditor (even if taken off the case by reason of retread, retrain or higher class Auditor needed) of his responsibility for seeing that *his* Pc is rapidly handled and F/Ning again.

As the HGC operates on Intensive Auditing, bit and piece repair actions would be disruptive of scheduling and delivery. For that reason an Org would do well to invest in a Qual Emergency Review Auditor to handle Word Clearing and Why Finding flubs, assists for loss, illness and injury, student review, etc. In that case the DPE and Qual Page would substitute for D of P and DTS in the line. The HGC would handle its own red tags as part of their intensives.

In order to ensure no red tagged Pcs get lost, on lines and not handled in 24 hours the following must be done:

Pc Examiner sends a daily list at the end of each day of all Red Tags to the Cramming Officer and Senior C/S. For the C/S this provides a confirmatory line against his own marked Red Tags for the day. For the Cramming Officer, this provides data on who should be sent for Cramming. If those persons do not report for Cramming within 24 hours, the Cramming Off must report to the Dir Correction or Qual Sec for investigation and handling. The Examiner must verify that any Red Tagged Pc has been

handled within 24 hours or report any not handled to the Senior C/S, Qual Sec and Dir I & R for investigation and handling. When handled he crosses off the Red Tag in his log.

AOs AND SOLO

All the above applies to Solo Auditing also and a Red Tagged Solo Auditor must keep himself available for a Cram, Solo Repair C/S or Review Session. His folder would get immediate C/S attention.

Regardless of whether the Red Tag was handled or not any non-F/N session logged by the Examiner is included in the Senior C/S F/N Percentage stat. The Pd Comps bonus for F/N percentage remains as per the Pd Comps BTB.

A D of P is well advised to have an Auditor on standby who is not assigned regular Pcs, to handle Red Tag repair sessions when the Auditor cannot complete the action, through retread or retrain required.

The Qual Sec and Senior C/S are responsible for getting this line in and drilled and the Qual Sec is responsible for maintaining it. A wall chart should be made up for drills and Chinese School.

PENALTY

“Penalty for violation of the 24 Hr Rule is loss of a day’s stats for the Division, the day being that day when the unrepaired flub occurred and subtracted at the time the flub is found”—HCO PL 8 Sep 70RA, EXAMINER’S 24 HOUR RULE.

If all on the line assume their share of responsibility for the well-being of Pcs, the penalty should never occur.

Revised by
Msm John Eastment
CS-5

Approved by
Guardian WW
FB Advisory Council
FB Exec Council
Commodore’s Staff Aides
The Board of Issues

Revisions Authorized by AVU
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 15 OCTOBER 1973

Remimeo

C/S Series 87

NULLING AND F/Ning PREPARED LISTS

A prepared list is one which is issued in an HCOB and is used to correct cases. There are many of these. Notable amongst them is C/S 53 and its corrections.

It is customary for the auditor to be required to F/N such a list. This means on calling it that the whole list item by item is to F/N.

Now and then you get the extreme oddity of a list selected to exactly remedy the case not reading but not F/Ning.

Of course this might happen if the list did not apply to the case (such as an OT prepared list being used on a Grade IV, heaven forbid). In the case of lists to correct listing, and in particular the C/S 53 series, it is nearly impossible for this situation to occur.

A C/S will very often see that the auditor has assessed the list on the pc, has gotten no reads, and the list did not F/N.

A "reasonable" C/S (heaven forbid) lets this go by.

Yet he has before him first-class evidence that the auditor

1. Has out-TRs in general,
2. Has no impingement whatever with TR-1,
3. Is placing his meter in the wrong position in the auditing session so that he cannot see it, the pc and his worksheet,
4. That the auditor's eyesight is bad.

One or more of these conditions certainly exist.

To do nothing about it is to ask for catastrophe after catastrophe with pcs and to have one's confidence in one's own C/Sing deteriorate badly.

An amazing number of auditors cannot make a prepared list read for one of the above reasons.

Putting in suppress, invalidation or misunderstood words on the list will either get a read or the list will F/N.

The moral of this is that prepared lists that do not read F/N. When prepared lists that do not read do not F/N or when the auditor cannot get a prepared list to F/N, serious auditing errors are present which will defeat a C/S.

In the interest of obtaining results and being merciful on pcs, the wise C/S never lets this situation go by without finding what it is all about.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:rhc.nt.rd
Copyright © 1973
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN

22 OCTOBER 1973R

Remimeo
Qual Hats
Snr C/S Hat
C/S Hat
Auditor Hats
LRH Comm Hat
HAS Hat
Ethics Officer
Hat

Revised & Reissued 25 August 1974 as BTB
(*Revision in this type style*)

CANCELS
HCO BULLETIN OF 22 OCTOBER 1973
SAME TITLE

C/S Series 88R

TECH DEGRADES

If it is found in investigating any situation in the Tech Division or Qual Division that a degrade of Tech has occurred—that the procedure and theory laid out in HCO Bs, Tapes or Books has been downgraded in any way—without effective action to eradicate it *at once*, the following Policy Letters should be made the subject of extensive and thorough checkouts and implementation programmes, and the basis of Ethics action for relevant Crimes or High Crimes as warranted.

They may be used for the same purpose if Tech or Qual stats are down and do not rise despite standard and routine actions to handle them—indicating hidden suppression of Tech which has not been located and indicated, and which should quickly come to light *if* these PLs are honestly checked out and accurately applied at once throughout Tech and Qual and Dept 3.

This would greatly assist any investigatory action to find a Why and a Who. When this investigation is complete, the programme to handle should include backing up these Policy Letters as an essential organizing action.

The local LRH Comm is primarily responsible for this action whenever it is needed but no other executive need wait for the LRH Comm to act on the matter if the situation brooks no delay (and *any* downgrade of Tech is an extremely serious matter) but must inform the LRH Comm who is counted on to support the action if any reasonable evidence is presented that it is necessary. A steep drop or continued Emergency in Tech or Qual GDSes are by themselves sufficient evidence.

Supplementary issues giving sample programmes for enforcement of these PLs will be forthcoming.

Since any situation involving downgrade of Tech implies the existence of Crimes and High Crimes (including the condoning of the downgrade), all personnel in Tech and Qual will be depended on to co-operate fully with actions to enforce these PLs so as to assist investigators to clear them of complicity in the downgrade if it is found to exist.

Misuse of this *BTB* to bring about loss of traffic in Tech or Qual would be the subject of Ethics action per this *BTB*. There must be evidence pointing to a definite suspicion of downgrade, so as not to handle something which isn't there. But the fact of ordering and enforcing these PLs is not itself actionable unless it results in loss of traffic, this loss not being caused by a degrade from other causes.

The HCO Policy Letters are:

14 Feb 65	“Safeguarding Technology” Reissued 7 June 67
1 July 65	“Ethics Chits”
18 Oct 67 III	“Policy and HCO B Alterations”
7 Feb 65	“Keeping Scientology Working” Reissued 15 June 70
17 Jun 70	“Technical Degrades”
26 Oct 71	“Tech Downgrades”

LRH Pers Comm

Revised & Reissued as BTB
by Flag Mission 1234

I/C: CPO Andrea Lewis
2nd: Molly Harlow

Authorized by AVU
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:SW:AL:MH:KU:mh.rd
Copyright © 1973, 1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 20 NOVEMBER 1973
Issue II

Remimeo
All Levels
Flag Internes

C/S Series 89

F/N WHAT YOU ASK OR PROGRAM

Ref: HCO B 23 Dec 72 Integrity Processing Series 20
HCO B 21 Nov 73 The Cure of Q and A

When an Auditor asks one question but F/Ns something else it is simply a version of Q and A.

Example: AUDITOR: Do you have a problem? PC: (ramble-ramble) I was thinking of last night's dinner. AUDITOR: That F/Ns.

Every few folders you pick up, if you can find examples of this:

The Auditor is not trained not to Q and A.

He is NOT getting answers to his questions.

When the Auditor starts something (such as a question or process) he MUST F/N what he started EVEN THOUGH HE DID SOMETHING ELSE DURING IT AND GOT AN F/N ON SOMETHING ELSE. HE MUST F/N THE ORIGINAL ACTION.

The result can be:

- (a) Missed W/H phenomena.
- (b) High or low TA an hour after the pc "F/Ned at Examiner".
- (c) A stalled case.
- (d) An undone program.
- (e) An unhandled pc.
- (f) Continual need for repair programs.

To get this disease out of an HGC requires that Auditors go through an Anti-Q and A handling.

C/S Q AND A

C/Ses can also Q and A. They simply handle whatever the pc originates to the Examiner or Auditor, over and over and on and on.

The result is:

- A. Incomplete Programs.
- B. Tripled or quadrupled C/S effort as the case never seems to get solved.
- C. Loads of repair programs.

Yet a C/S who does it will never look for it as THE primary error being committed.

The remedy is to have the C/S do an Anti-Q and A program.

LRH: nt.jh
Copyright © 1973
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

[IP Series 20 has been converted to BTB 23 Dec 72R, IP Series 17R, Volume IX, page 289.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 6 DECEMBER 1973

Remimeo

C/S Series 90

THE PRIMARY FAILURE

References: HCO B 28 Feb 1971, C/S Series 24,
"Metering Reading Items", and
HCO B 15 Oct 1973, C/S Series 87,
"Nulling and F/Ning Prepared Lists".

A C/S who cannot get a result on his pcs will find the most usual biggest improvement by getting the offending Auditors' ASSESSING handled.

We used to say that "the Auditor's TRs were out" as the most fundamental reason for no results.

This is not specific enough.

THE MOST COMMON REASON FOR FAILED SESSIONS IS THE INABILITY OF THE AUDITOR TO GET READS ON LISTS.

Time after time I have checked this back as the real reason.

It became evident when one could take almost any "null" (no read) list in a pc's folder, give it and the pc to an Auditor who COULD assess and get nice reads on it with consequent gain.

Example: Pc has a high TA. C/S orders a C/S 53RF. List is null. Pc goes on having a high TA. C/S gets inventive, case crashes. Another C/S and another Auditor takes the *same* pc and the same list, gets good reads, handles. Case flies again.

What was wrong was:

- (a) The Auditor's TR 1 was terrible.
- (b) The Auditor couldn't meter.

REMEDY

One takes the above two reference HCO Bs and gets their points fully checked on the flunking Auditor.

The C/S gets the Auditor's TR 1 corrected. In doing the latter one may find a why for the out TR 1 like a notion one must be soft-spoken to stay in ARC or the Auditor is imitating some other Auditor whose TR 1 is faulty.

QUAL CRAMMING

It can happen that these actions are reported done in Qual and the Auditor still flubs.

In this case the C/S has to straighten out Qual Cramming by doing the above reference HCO Bs on the Cramming Officer and getting the Cramming Officer's TR I ideas unscrewed and straight.

REQUIREMENTS

It takes correct metering and IMPINGEMENT to make a list read.

If the auditor does not have these, then drug lists, Dianetic lists, correction lists will all go for nothing.

As the prepared list is the C/S's main tool for discovery and correction an auditor failure to get a list to respond or note it then defeats the C/S completely.

SUMMARY

THE ERROR OF AN AUDITOR BEING UNABLE TO GET A LIST TO READ ON A METER IS A PRIMARY CAUSE OF C/S FAILURE.

To win, correct it!

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.jh
Copyright © 1973
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 17 FEBRUARY 1974

Remimeo

C/S Series 91

MUTUAL OUT RUDS

It has been known for many many years that the phenomenon of "Mutual Out Ruds" existed.

This means TWO OR MORE PEOPLE WHO MUTUALLY HAVE RUDS OUT ON THE WIDER GROUP OR OTHER DYNAMICS AND DO NOT GET THEM IN.

Example: A husband-wife co-audit team never run O/Ws on the rest of the family because both of them have similar overts and so consider it usual.

Example: Prisoners engaged in co-auditing (as in Narconon) may have similar overts, withholdings, ARC Brks and/or problems with the rest of society and so do not think of handling them as out-ruds.

Example: Two top class auditors co-auditing, have similar overts on the junior auditors and the org and so never think to get them in.

THIS CAN STALL CASES!

A C/S has to take this factor into account wherever he has a possibility of its occurring.

In one instance mutual out ruds went so far as four auditors, co-auditing, agreeing never to put their overts down on W/Ses "so they would not lose reputation". Needless to say all four eventually blew.

If the C/S had done a *routine* check for mutual out ruds, this whole scene would have been prevented and four beings would not have ruined each other.

IN ANY SITUATION WHERE A SMALL PORTION OF A LARGER GROUP IS ENGAGED IN CO-AUDIT THE C/S MUST CHECK ROUTINELY FOR MUTUAL OUT RUDS.

This could even apply to an org or vessel which was separate from the rest of society around it: its members could develop mutual out ruds from the rest of society and cases could fail on this point.

Be alert to MUTUAL OUT RUD SITUATIONS AND HANDLE BY GETTING THEM IN ON THE REST OF THE SURROUNDING PEOPLE OR SOCIETY.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ams.rd
Copyright © 1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 8 JULY 1974R
Issue II
REVISED 24 JULY 1974

Remimeo

C/S Series 92R
(Revisions in this type style)

WORD CLEARING ERRORS

(Applies to Methods 1, 2, 4 and 5
done on a meter.)

The attention of the C/S is called to the revised Word Clearing Series 32RA which requires words be F/Ned and to HCO B 8 July 74 of the Word Clearing Series which requires word clearing errors be RED TABBED and that all Word Clearing worksheets be placed in folders.

Case troubles have occasionally been traced to *metered* W/Cing over a High TA or failure to F/N words.

This is a hidden area from the C/S unless W/C worksheets are included in folders and the RED TAB system for non-F/N at conclusion is used. Only in this way is a C/S able to get all the data.

Correction of W/C errors is done by a Word Clearing Correction List.

High TA or Low TA at start of a W/C session is usually handled by C/S 53RG.

All "non-session" worksheets such as why finding, contact or touch assists and Word Clearing should go into the pc's folder.

None of this can be used as an excuse not to word clear somebody. Make a C/S handle that TA fast and Red Tab the folder until handling occurs. Then do the Word Clearing.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 31 AUGUST 1974

Remimeo
Tech Secs
C/Ses
Auditors
Registrars

URGENT

C/S Series 93

NEW GRADE CHART

The "NEW" thing to do is the Grade Chart. Everything you are doing should contribute to getting the pc up the Bridge. THIS is the Bridge.

There is a new Grade Chart being prepared which has some changes in it, based on recent discoveries. It is urgent that you know of these in advance.

DRUG RUNDOWN

The effects of an omitted or incomplete Drug RD are severe enough to deny a person any lasting case gain.

This is covered in HCO B 31 May 74, "Unhandled Drugs and Ethics". Some orgs have taken this HCO B so literally however, that they have taken pcs off Adv Cses Grades, refused to do Assists on ill pcs and some showed pcs the HCO B and invaded their gains.

This was not the intention of the HCO B. The C/S Series remain valid.

The Drug RD belongs on the Grade Chart after Life Repair. A Drug RD cannot be done over out ruds and a Life Repair may be necessary to get in a pc's ruds.

Life Repair is not a prerequisite for the Drug RD, however, and if done is not to be dragged out intensive after intensive. In some cases a pc could not complete Life Repair without a Drug RD.

Following the Drug RD is ARC S/W, then the rest of Dianetics to completion.

EXPANDED DIANETICS

Ex Dn by the way belongs after Grade IV Expanded.

Some pcs R/S and have Evil Purposes to do others in. But no Grade 0 or Grade I or Grade II. What others? Martians?

"Got to secretly do everybody in" probably applies to Apeville some long date ago and he's never come up to PT.

The answer is to bring the pc up the Grade Chart to Expanded Grade IV *then* do his Ex Dn.

The prerequisites for Ex Dn are covered on HCO B 23 April 74, Ex Dn Series 22, "Expanded Dianetics Requisites". Add to that Expanded Grades up to IV and you have it.

GRADE II

Some orgs specialize in Grade II, especially on org staff. The pc is always getting Integrity Processing or his O/Ws pulled on so and so.

If you look on the Grade Chart you will find Withholds and Overts are Grade *TWO*.

Below Grade TWO lies Grade I (Problems) and Grade Zero (Communications). And below that is Dianetics and at the bottom end of Dianetics is the Drug Handling.

Now how do you expect a fellow who has unhandled drugs (or omitted drug items because of "no interest") to even know (no Grade 0) that other people are around or that (Grade I) he is caved in with problems he's never cognited on?

And he's supposed to have enough responsibility to answer up on Grade II? With real overts and withholds?

This does not mean you must never Sec Check. It does mean that Sec Checks are no substitute for auditing or guarantee of innocence.

Grades are Grades and the Grade Chart sequence is correct.

SOLO SET-UPS

Set-ups for Solo are fully covered on HCO B 8 Jan 72R, Revised 8 July 74, Solo C/S Series 11 R.

This will be included as part of Solo on the Grade Chart as it is a vital step.

Pcs won't make it on Solo if they aren't set up.

FULL LIST

Here's the full list of Grades showing where the various RDs now offered fit.

GROUP PROCESSING—Not mandatory or a prerequisite.

LIFE REPAIR—As needed but not prerequisite for Drug RD. To get ruds in on Life.

DRUG RD, means:

TRs 0-4, 6-9—Mandatory for a Druggie currently on Drugs, FLAT.

Full C/S-1—Where not done. To fully educate pc.

Objectives—Full battery to full EPs per basic books and early HCO Bs on them.

Class VIII Drug Handling—List and rehab all drugs, 3 way Recalls, Secondaries and Engrams of Taking and Giving Drugs.

AESPs on each reading Drug—Listed separately and handled with R3R, each drug to full F/N assessment of Drug List.

“No Interest” Drug Items—All reading ones run where they exist.

Prior Assessment—AESPs listed separately and run R3R, prior to first drug or alcohol taken.

ARC S/W EXPANDED.

DIANETICS, means:

C/S 54—Complete handling of Pc Assessment Form begun with Drug RD.

Health Form—Fully handled to full F/N Assessment.

EXPANDED GRADE 0—As issued.

EXPANDED GRADE I—As issued.

EXPANDED GRADE II—As issued, including Integrity Processing.

EXPANDED GRADE III—As issued.

EXPANDED GRADE IV—As issued.

EX DN—Not mandatory except where pc is a low OCA, an R/Ser (2%, chronically ill or psycho. Means:

Set-ups—Per HCO B 23 April 74, Ex Dn Series 22.

Introspection RD—Where pc ill, introverted or in a psychotic break.

R3R all E. Purps.

OCA Left-hand Side Handling—As issued.

OCA Right-hand Side Handling—As issued, with PTS RD as necessary.

POWER PROCESSING GRADES V & VA—Only prerequisites are Drug RD and Grade IV.

SOLO GRADE VI, means:

Solo Set-ups—Done at SH or AO per Solo C/S Series 11 R.

Solo Auditor's Course.

Solo Audit Grade VI materials.

CLEARING COURSE

OT I

OT II

OT III

OT VII PROCESSES

OT III EXPANDED

OT IV

OT V

OT VI

FULL OT VII VERIFICATION

OT VIII—When issued.

PROGRAMMING

The C/S Series, especially the early HCO Bs, numbers 1-13R, fully cover the use of the Grade Chart in programming.

THE GRADE CHART IS THE BASIC PROGRAMME OF A PC.

This datum has been neglected in some orgs, who have specialized in the new RDs developed since '71.

With refinement of repair and corrective actions and the release of new RDs, some may have forgotten that repair is only done to get off the overwhelm so that you can put the pc back on the Grade Chart.

SUMMARY

I thought I'd better fill you in on these changes and how the new Grade Chart lines up.

Make full use of this Chart with C/S Series programming tech in and your pcs will fly.

Here's to lots of case gain and rave success stories.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rs.rd
Copyright © 1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 25 SEPTEMBER 1974

Remimeo
All Execs
All Tech and
Qual Divs

URGENT—IMPORTANT

C/S Series 94

**REDUCTION OF REFUNDS
C/Ses AND OVERLOAD**

When a C/S is overloaded, he is a potential cause of OUT TECH.

He may try to make up time by not reading worksheets of Auditors, by failing to do Folder Error Summaries, by not taking time to write Cramming Orders and neglecting other C/S duties.

Recent evaluation has shown that OVERLOADED C/Ses CAN BE THE REASON FOR A HUGE REFUND RATIO IN THE ORG'S GI-CGI.

Any non-tech person such as the Ethics Officer can tell at once when a C/S is either not working or overloaded. THE HANDWRITING IN THE WORKSHEETS CAN'T BE READ, WORDS ARE NOT CLARIFIED IN RED, NO FESes ARE SEEN IN FOLDERS AND NO CRAMMING ORDERS EXIST TO MAKE AUDITORS DO HANDWRITING DRILLS TO WRITE FAST AND WELL.

Proper C/S posting was piloted by me on Flag years ago. The existing technical executives failed to export it to orgs.

The irreducible minimum C/S postings are:

SENIOR C/S who handles bugged cases and very upper level actions and keeps the other C/Ses functioning well. He is the highest classed C/S in the org. He is responsible for proper handling and results on all cases. (This is a hat I usually wore in an area.)

EXPANDED DIANETIC C/S who does only Expanded Dianetics.

GRADE C/S who C/Ses Grade pcs.

DIANETIC C/S or C/Ses who handle all routine C/Sing of Dianetics including Drug Rundowns.

There are several other C/S posts. In AOs additionally there are Solo C/Ses. In Saint Hills there are Power (Class VII) C/Ses.

As an org expands it can have additional *types* of C/Ses. Some of these are:

REVIEW C/S who reviews tech case failures, taking this load off the Senior C/S.

STAFF CASES C/S who C/Ses for audited staff.

STUDENT AUDITING C/S who C/Ses student sessions.

AO REVIEW C/S who C/Ses for fast review on Adv Cse Students.

CO-AUDIT C/S where a Co-Audit exists separate from HGC lines.

WHAT IS OVERLOAD?

When a C/S can't read every worksheet and study and program *every* case he has, due to time, he is overloaded.

WASTED C/Ses

To get a Class VI or even a Class IV to C/S lower action folders is a waste of C/Ses since it is easy to *train* Dianetic C/Ses.

SUMMARY

TRAIN AND POST enough C/Ses and watch the GI go up and refunds go down.

It is not enough just to get Auditors and more and more Auditors.

DON'T OVERLOAD C/Ses. GET MORE OF THEM!

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH: nt .rd
Copyright © 1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 26 OCTOBER AD25

Remimeo
All Students
All HGC Auditors
All C/Ses
All Internes

C/S Series 95

“FAILED” CASES

There are no failed cases. There are only failed C/Ses and Auditors.

In a recent test; this was proven conclusively. A number of no-case-gain, slow-case-gain, sickie and “failed cases” were rounded up. Using well trained Flag Auditors and the most basic of lists, every one of these cases was soon flying.

At another time, lists which had been “nulled” by a group of trainee Auditors were then taken over, on the same pcs, same lists, and renulled by Class Xs. Over half the reading items had been missed by the trainees—they simply couldn’t make the list read on the pcs. Yet the lists were as alive as skyrockets. The pcs, under the trainee Auditors, had accumulated all manner of by-passed charge by having reading items ignored. And in some cases, having non-reading items given attention.

To a trainee, all this seems incredible and mysterious. He does not realize how very bad his metering can be, how faint and fainting his TR 1. He has numerous tricks which defeat him—such as keeping his sensitivity on 32 for a pc who only requires sensitivity 1, whereas the Auditor misses all his F/Ns as he can’t keep the needle at set. He doesn’t put his meter so he can see pc, paper and meter dial all in the same scope of vision and misses the reads. His Auditor presence is so poor and his attitude so unprofessional that the pc isn’t really in session. His own introversion prevents him from really observing the pc’s tone or reaction.

All these faults can be cured and HAVE to be before an Auditor can call himself a real Auditor. Short of that he is just a fooling-about dilettante. And he has “failed pcs”.

It takes hard sweating work to get good enough to be a real Auditor. It takes hours and hours and hours of TRs the hard way. It takes a high degree of honesty that includes never faking and going by misunderstandings in his materials, always being honest in his auditing reports, constant practice with his metering, drills with the tone scale and a large degree of self-discipline.

It isn’t “talent” that makes the good Auditor. It is practice and more practice until he himself knows first that he didn’t know and then knows that he really knows.

The source of out tech is only laziness and dishonesty. Someone who is afraid of work thinks he can PR the C/S and the pc, fumble his way through and succeed out of fakery. That route is failure. And it ends in “failed cases”. Don’t be a psychologist or psychiatrist. That was their route.

In the hands of a thoroughly trained and drilled Auditor, Scientology works and works splendidly.

There are no dog cases, no “ncgs”, no failed cases.

But there are “Auditors” who don’t study and drill hard enough to become real Auditors. And there are C/Ses who don’t know their business and who don’t keep up their study and are too lazy to FES or read sessions or cram their Auditors.

There are an awful lot of excellent Auditors and many very fine C/Ses. But in some local areas, where verbal tech gets going and ethics is out, the quality sags. And there you have ncgs and slow pcs and “failed cases”.

Want to know how lazy your C/Ses and Auditors are? How many ncgs and failed cases do you have around? If you have *any* at all, tech in your area is out.

A C/S 53RJ taken to F/Ning list and a GF40X taken to an F/Ning list will cure any ncg or failed case. BUT it has to be done by an Auditor who has sweated it out doing the checksheets of Qual required to make a list read.

So do not send to find the real who when cases bog or “fail”. Don’t blame and repair cases. Repair the Auditors and C/Ses.

It not only can be done. It is easier to do it than wrestle around with an “ARC Broken field”.

And it not only can be done, it MUST be done.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd
Copyright © 1975
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 24 OCTOBER 1976

Remimeo

(LRH ED 257 INT of 1 December 1974
Revised and Reissued as an HCOB)
(*Revisions in this type style*)

C/S Series 96

DELIVERY REPAIR LISTS

THERE'S NOTHING WRONG WITH YOUR CF, YOUR PC, YOUR STUDENT, STAFF MEMBER OR YOUR OWN DELIVERY THAT A PREPARED LIST WON'T HANDLE.

"ARC Broken CFs," blown students, demanded refunds, low success stories, withdrawn auditors, ineffective staffs are pretty silly problems to have these days.

Many years ago I developed a system called "Prepared Lists."

These isolated the trouble the pc was having in auditing without taxing anyone's imagination and sending the auditor into a figure-figure on the pc.

These prepared lists were assessed on an E-Meter. One took up the biggest read first and then cleaned up all other reads.

Time has gone on. The system of prepared lists has been expanded to include not only pcs but students and staff.

It may have gone overlooked that such lists now include anything that could happen to a pc or student. In other words, prepared lists have become very thorough.

WHO CAN USE

The only reason ever found for prepared lists not working was an auditor's weak TR 1 and inability to read a meter.

Even this difficulty has been handled by "Qual Okay to Audit" Checksheets.

Before an auditor should be let near a prepared list he should be put through at least six “Okay to Audit” short Checksheets in Qual.

Qual is *not fast* flow. Things done in Qual are Method 4 Word Cleared and starrated, with all demos and drills. *Only* if this is done can you have some certainty that a prepared list will read on the pc and that the pc or student will get handled.

These Qual “Okay to Audit” Checksheets are done AFTER a student has been trained and classed as an auditor. The “Okay to Audit” is for auditing in an org whether staff or interne.

The checksheets are:

- (1) Board Policy Letter 14 Nov 74R Issue I
QUAL OKAY TO OPERATE AN E-METER
- (2) Board Policy Letter 14 Nov 74 Issue II
QUAL OK NO. 2R, QUAL OK TO ASSESS PREPARED LISTS
- (3) Board Policy Letter 14 Nov 74 Issue III
QUAL OK NO. 3, QUAL OK TO AUDIT LISTING AND NULLING
- (4) Board Policy Letter 14 Nov 74 Issue IV
QUAL OK NO. 4, QUAL OK TO CORRECT LISTING AND NULLING
- (5) Board Policy Letter 8 Nov 71RB
QUAL OK NO. 5R, INTERNSHIPS ELECTRONIC ATTESTATION FORM
- (6) Board Policy Letter 20 July 70R Issue III Revised 25 Nov 74
TWO WAY COMM CHECKSHEET

Only when these have been thoroughly and honestly studied, drilled and done should an auditor be permitted to assess prepared lists on pcs and students.

It takes standard auditor training to handle the points found reading on a list.

CASE SUPERVISING

A C/S who is trained as a C/S must know what lists to use. And he must see to it that his auditors are trained via the above checklists. Otherwise the lists just won’t read and the C/S, the pc and the org are left up the creek!

LOTS of “lists that didn’t read” are found in folders. I used to make a practice of just having them nulled again by an auditor whose metering and TRs were good and THEY READ AND THE CASE RESOLVED.

PC LISTS

1. HCO BULLETIN 24 NOVEMBER 1973RB, C/S SERIES 53RJ” SHORT HI-LO TA ASSESSMENT C/S.” This is a famous list. It solved the long long problem of high and low TAs and really solved it. Unfortunately it has a name of being done for high

and low TAs. In truth it practically handles the whole repair of any difficult case today! One assesses it Method 5. One handles the reads from the top down. It can also be reassessed several times until it F/Ns on a whole M5 assessment. It is quite remarkable what it will do for a case that has been running badly or is bogged, quite in addition to handling high and low TAs!

2. HCO BULLETIN 1 JANUARY 1972RA, "LIX HI-LO TA REVISED." This is the same list as C/S 53RJ above. It has been brought up to date. It gives the *whole question* for each subject as in C/S 53RJ and the same handling. It is easier to use on a pc whose attention wanders or who is not very familiar with terms.

3. HCO BULLETIN 29 OCTOBER 1971R, "INT RUNDOWN CORRECTION LIST REVISED." As Interiorization-Exteriorization problems (when they exist) have to be handled before any other thing is handled, an auditor sometimes assesses another list and then finds himself doing this list, "Int" appears on many other lists and when it reads one does this list. One has to go back and complete the original list of course. "Int" problems cause high TA, headaches and general upset. I've begun to think after seeing a lot of headache cases that maybe only Int-Ext problems cause headaches! Instead of repairing Int, sometimes auditors will run it again and again. Also Int can go flat to Cog VVGIs on an early flow, even a recall flow. Then if one insists on finishing the Int RD, one has trouble and I mean trouble. So this is a valuable list.

4. HCO BULLETIN 15 DECEMBER 1968R, "L4BR" "FOR ASSESSMENT OF ALL LISTING ERRORS." An out list (meaning one done by Listing and Nulling, not a prepared list) can raise more concentrated hell with a pc than any other single auditing error. The amount of misemotion or illness which a wrong list generates has to be seen to be believed. When a pc is ill after a session or up to 3 days after, always suspect that a listing action done on the pc had an error in it. It MUST be corrected. The *prepared* list L4BR corrects lists of the Listing and Nulling variety. It can be run on old lists, current lists, general listing. There has been no reason to revise this since 2 June 1972. It really works!

5. HCO BULLETIN 19 MARCH 1971, "LIST 1-C." This is the updated version of the earliest list ever compiled. It is used during sessions at the auditor's discretion and in other ways. It also prevents some pc from insisting "it's an ARC Brk" (which never clears) when it's really a withhold, a common error. It can also be addressed to life. Usually when a session blows up, an L1C is used fast rather than just sit and ack!

6. HCO BULLETIN 11 APRIL 1971RA, L3RD "DIANETICS AND INT RD REPAIR LIST." This is the key list of Dianetic Auditing and is the Dianetic standby in case of trouble. As the Int RD is also Dianetics, while doing it, one uses L3RD for trouble.

7. HCO BULLETIN 2 APRIL 1972RB ISSUE II, EXPANDED DIANETICS SERIES 3 RB, "L3 EXD RB." This is the prepared list for Expanded Dianetics.

8. HCO BULLETIN 29 FEBRUARY 1972R, "FALSE TA CHECKLIST." This was a very important discovery about TAs. One uses this when another list indicates a False TA or one is suspected. Auditors have been known to get so desperate about a pc's TA that they falsified worksheets. This (and C/S 53RJ) make that totally needless. I've seen this change a case from despair to VVVVGIs!

9. HCO BULLETIN 16 APRIL 1972, "PTS RD CORRECTION LIST." It also gives the expected actions of a PTS Rundown. Doing PTS Rundowns without this prepared list handy can be risky.

10. HCO POLICY LETTER 7 APRIL 1970RA, "GREEN FORM." This was the earliest Qual Saint Hill weapon (26 June 65) for case cracking. It is modernized up to 29 Sept 74 in the above issue. *Used for general case clean-up particularly on an out rud type pc or when ruds won't fly. It is not used to handle high or low TA.*

11. HCO BULLETIN 30 JUNE 1971R, "EXPANDED GF 40RB." Called "GF 40X" This is the "7 resistive type cases" at the end of the Green Form expanded out. This is how you get those "earlier practices" and other case stoppers. This done well gives a lot of extensive work in Dianetics. It's lengthy but really pays off.

If you were to do a C/S 53RJ Method 5, all handled, and to an F/Ning list and then do a GF 40XRB, all handled, reassessed to an F/Ning list you would "crack" most cases to a point where they ran well.

12. BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN 28 MAY 1974R, "FULL ASSIST CHECKLIST FOR INJURY AND ILLNESS." While you don't put the pc on the cans for this one, you mark it as to the state the pc is in and it says what you do for illness and injury. This one, done correctly, is how the minister runs the medico out of business.

STUDENT LISTS

13. HCO BULLETIN 15 NOVEMBER 1973R, "FEAR OF PEOPLE LIST—R." This is for the handling of timid tech staff who back off from handling rough pcs.

14. HCO BULLETIN 15 NOVEMBER 1974, "STUDENT REHABILITATION LIST." This is the one that gets a bogged student sailing, gets a blown student back, gets an auditor back auditing. It even cures the revolutionary student! This is the master list for students—even students in grammar schools and colleges! A real winner.
15. BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN 27 MARCH 1972R ISSUE I, "STUDENT CORRECTION LIST, STUDY CORR LIST- I ." A list for correcting students on course.

STAFF LISTS

16. HCO BULLETIN 27 MARCH 1972R ISSUE II, "COURSE SUPERVISOR CORRECTION LIST, STUDY CORR LIST 2R." This is to get the Course Supervisor going well.

17. HCO BULLETIN 27 MARCH 1972RA ISSUE III, "AUDITOR CORRECTION LIST, STUDY CORR LIST 3." This one corrects Auditors who are having a rough time.

18. BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN 27 MARCH 1972RA ISSUE IV, "CASE SUPERVISOR CORRECTION LIST, STUDY CORR LIST 4." This one corrects Case Supervisors, gets them back on the rails.

19. *BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN 27 MARCH 1972RC ISSUE V*, "EXECUTIVE CORRECTION LIST, STUDY CORR LIST 5." This prepared list locates an executive's troubles and indicates handling.

20. *BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN 4 FEBRUARY 1972RD*, "STUDY SERIES 7." A real long workout for a person who won't study or who is having real trouble on a course. Goes after it in depth. Can be used as a second list to Student Rehab list above or by itself.

21. HCO BULLETIN 21 JULY 1971RD, WORD CLEARING SERIES 35RD, "WORD CLEARING CORRECTION LIST REVISED." Usually written "WCCL." This is the famous list that goes with Method 1 Word Clearing or with any Word Clearing bog. Also corrects high and low TA WHEN it occurs in a Word Clearing session. This is the Word Clearer's friendly friend.

22. HCO POLICY LETTER 9 APRIL 1972, "ETHICS, CORRECT DANGER CONDITION HANDLING." Locates the trouble area that got him into a Danger Condition. Goes with the famous "3 May P/L" HCO PL 3 May 1972.

23. HCO POLICY LETTER 13 MARCH 1972, "ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER SERIES NO. 5." An invaluable text and list for PRODUCT CLEARING. It's a list of what you do to clear products. From it a prepared list can be made.

24. HCO POLICY LETTER 23 MARCH 1972, ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER SERIES 11, "FULL PRODUCT CLEARING LONG FORM."

25. HCO POLICY LETTER 12 JUNE 1972, DATA SERIES 26, ESTO SERIES 18. A list you assess to locate trouble an evaluator might be having. Also for slow evaluators or slow students on a Data Series Course.

26. HCO BULLETIN 28 AUGUST 1970RA, "HC OUT-POINT—PLUS-POINT LISTS RA." This is a prepared list that locates the outpoints in a person's own thinking. When people can't seem to evaluate (or think brightly) this list will do wonders. Some Data Series Course students make no progress at all until they are assessed on this list and handled.

27. HCO BULLETIN 2 DECEMBER 1974, "DYNAMIC SORT OUT ASSESSMENT." (Revised from BTB 4 Dec 71 Issue II, Replacing HCOB 4 Dec 71 Issue II R-1C Assessment by Dynamics.) This gets those dynamics that are charged and handles them. Increases social personality and even can shift valences.

WORD LISTS FOR PREPARED LISTS

Nearly every prepared list has all its words on a separate sheet, ready for word clearing on the pc. All the words on a list are cleared on a pc without repeating the same word or asking the list question. Such lists are issued for auditor convenience.

A list of these word lists is being issued as HCOB I Dec 74 so that you can match them to the prepared lists in this *Bulletin*.

OTHER LISTS

There is a whole package of processing, mainly by prepared lists, in Integrity Processing, issued as its own series and now being reissued.

There are great Solo Lists for Solo Repair used on Advance Courses.

And from time to time when a need for prepared list is found new ones will be issued on different subjects.

One can REPAIR a pc or student or staff member. One can also FORWARD a case into new areas with other prepared lists.

MIMEO

Some orgs backlog their mimos.

The AVAILABILITY of lists to auditors is something which should NOT be neglected. It is highly uneconomical as one loses re-signs and students and staff when prepared lists are in non-existence in an org or even short supply.

Tech is the atomic fuel an org runs on.

KEEP PREPARED LISTS IN SUPPLY FOR USE.

TRANSLATED ISSUES

In non-English speaking orgs lists must be very carefully translated and mimeoed for use. In such orgs, more than any others, great care must be taken to have and use lists as they keep tech straight where it tends to go hearsay and verbal.

So, that's quite an array of prepared lists, isn't it?

If they are not in full use in your org don't wonder about your Delivery Stats Why. Or your org and CF problems. It's a lack of full use of this tech.

Hidden in these prepared lists is a wealth of tech that explodes into wins for your org, your CF, your pcs and students.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

All revisions by
Materials Chief FB

As approved by
L. Ron Hubbard

LRH:RS.nt
Copyright © 1976
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 26 OCTOBER 1976

Remimeo
All HCOs
All Tech Divs
All Courses

Issue I

(Also issued as HCO PL 26 Oct 76
Issue I, same title.)

C/S Series 97

AUDITING REPORTS, FALSIFYING OF

Probably the most covert and vicious crime in auditing is falsifying an auditing report.

At first glance, to someone who is trying to PR himself as an auditor or to escape consequences of session goofs, this might not seem to be the huge crime that it is.

When an auditing report is falsified, means of repairing the pc are denied, out tech and a need for re-study or re-drilling of materials is covered up, out tech is spread about and the reputes of the org and Scientology are at risk.

There are many ways of falsifying an auditing report. Chief amongst them is omission of vital data in the report. Another is faking the things run or the pc's actions or reactions.

To the person doing this it may seem that he has covered up his incompetence but in actual fact it is eventually detected.

A twice declared person recently messed up the cases of several VIPs by simply omitting some of their disagreements with what was being done.

Three SPs, now declared, some years ago had a mutual understanding that they would not put down each other's withholdings. These three also falsified auditing reports to the effect that they had run certain things on pcs "and there was nothing on them," when in fact they either had not run them or there was reaction which they did not put into the report. They messed up about a dozen people before they were caught and it took many, many hours of careful C/Sing and auditing to salvage those cases (and it also took about two years). They made several hundred serious enemies for themselves and today I doubt any Scientologist would even speak to them and their names are remembered with scathing contempt.

It is not only easy to detect a falsified auditing report, it is also inevitable that it will be detected.

The person whose auditing reports have been falsified is easy to spot in folders and records. The auditor marks “VGIs, F/N” and the examiner notes by-passed charge and Bad Indicators. An auditor seeking to prevent this being detected has been known to take the examiner report from the folder but that there is no examiner report would be the first thing a C/S would notice. Examiner reports have been forged and exchanged with the actual one but this too is very visible.

Lack of a proper success story points directly to out tech and if it is not visible in the folder then that folder contains falsified auditing reports.

The pc in the midst of his auditing, refuses to re-sign for more. An inspection of folder either finds the out tech in the auditing reports or it doesn’t. If the Folder Error Summary finds no out tech, the next thing that is looked for is falsified auditing reports and this is extended to looking at the other cases this auditor has handled to see if there is any similarity of reaction.

A D of P interview with the pc will reveal falsified auditing reports. It will contain data that does not appear in the auditing reports. The first thing suspect is the auditing reports.

Basically, correct tech applied by a competent auditor who has been trained and interned, works and works every time. When it “doesn’t work,” a C/S begins to look for the real scene. There are many ways he can ascertain the actual scene. Amongst these are outside-the-door session taping, monitors, interviews, lack of success stories, failures to declare, failures to re-sign, examiner reports at variance with the session reports, personal check up into the case and many others.

The only thing which temporarily misleads a C/S is a falsified auditing report. But in all our experience with these, the detection of such reports is inevitable even if it occurs a long time afterwards.

The person who would falsify an auditing report is usually found to be a suppressive with abundant R/Ses and evil intentions who never should have been trained in the first place.

Therefore, the penalty for knowingly falsifying an auditing report in order to make oneself seem more competent than one is or to hide departures from the C/S or to omit vital data necessary to C/Sing, resulting in upsets to a case and time spent in investigation by seniors, is actionable by a Committee of Evidence and if the matter is proven beyond reasonable doubt, a cancellation of all certificates and awards, a declare and an expulsion order are mandatory.

Should the person perpetrating the falsification of auditing reports run away (blow) before action can be taken, the result is the same and is enforceable even if the person is not present.

A green auditor may look upon the offense as slight. If he is too untrained to realize that proper application of tech works every time and that improper application is a gross overt act, he may not realize the seriousness of his action. This however cannot

be pleaded as a defense. It is not a light thing to end the hopes and close the door on a pc just because one is trying to cover up his blunders. The blundering auditor can be repaired by cramming and retraining. But only if it is known how he has blundered. That in itself is nowhere near as serious as hiding the fact.

Honesty is the road to truth.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:lf
Copyright © 1976
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 28 OCTOBER 1976

Remimeo
All HCOs
All Tech Divs
All Courses

(Also issued as HCO PL 28 Oct 76,
same title)

C/S Series 98

**AUDITING FOLDERS,
OMISSIONS IN COMPLETENESS**

(Ref: HCO PL 26 OCT 76 Issue I
HCO B 26 OCT 76)

Omissions from folders and complete loss of folders is a very serious matter.

A Case Supervisor, as well as a Folder Error Summary Auditor and the Auditor himself can be impeded greatly by folder omissions. Loss of folders entirely is a much greater catastrophe.

While cases and even folders can be reconstructed and eventually handled (at enormous trouble and time to the pc and technical people) this does not minimize the offense.

Usually Folder Pages are regarded too lightly as a post and are subject to much transfer even when posted. The Director of Tech Services is often far too lax in posting a Folder Archives I/C even as a double hat. Space restrictions often impede the careful preservation of folders in orgs. But all these posts and spaces are vital to a smooth delivery of auditing and should not be lightly looked upon.

The commonest (and most senseless) omissions from folders are:

1. WORD CLEARING WORKSHEETS. These are done in Academies or training or Interne areas as well as the HGC and it is often an omitted action to forward them to the person's pc folder. Often the lines to do so are unknown or completely missing. Yet *every* metered word clearing action should not only be the subject of a worksheet but also must be included in the person's pc folder in date order. Word clearer can fail to F/N a chain or even fail to clear a word as a chain when it doesn't F/N. Such goofs can mess up cases and leave a C/S perplexed as to how the pc was running well one day and badly the next—yet there is no word clearing worksheet there, so the fact of ANOTHER AUDITOR on the case is hidden.

2. **QUAL WHY FINDING ACTIONS.** As why finding also includes listing, possibly the most vicious omission is the failure to include Why Finding worksheets in the person's folder or even do a worksheet on it. Yet at least one org has been temporarily wrecked by indiscriminate "why finding" in Qual that resulted in wrong items and wrong lists and messed up the cases of whole staffs. This poor why finding has led at times to why finding becoming a restricted or forbidden practice. Qual worksheets of why finding MUST be included in the person's folder along with any list made which itself must include the question asked.

3. **HCO WHY FINDING.** These actions must also be the subject of worksheets and must also be included in the person's folder.

4. **ALL SEC CHECKS AND INTEGRITY PROCESS LISTS AND ACTIONS.** It doesn't matter who or what is doing the sec check, the resulting action is NOT the property of the department or branch or person doing the sec checking. A full worksheet must be made and ALL such actions done MUST be included in the routine pc folder of the person.

As it is very vital that a pc's folder be COMPLETE as well as exist, hereinafter the loss of a pc's folders and the failure to make worksheets and include them in the person's pc folder shall be actionable by a Committee of Evidence, to be convened by the Senior C/S of an org, and applies to any person or Auditor whether staff, mission or field.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt
Copyright © 1976
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN

25 APRIL 1971R

Revised & Reissued 22 November 1974 as BTB

Remimeo
HSDC
Dianetic
Auditors
C/Ss

CANCELS
HCO BULLETIN OF 25 APRIL 1971
SAME TITLE

THE DIANETIC CASE SUPERVISOR'S INDEX

This C/S's Index is for use in Case Supervising Dianetic Auditing.

See also the Dianetic references in:

BTB 18 Dec 71R	C/S Series Zero R "Index of C/S Series HCO Bs & BTBs by Title and Subject"
BTB 18 Dec 71-1R	C/S Series Zero Updated "Chronological Index of C/S Series HCO Bs and BTBs by Title and Subject"
BTB 18 Dec 71-2R	C/S Series Zero A "Subject Index of C/S Series by Alphabetical List of Subjects"

Dianetic C/Sing is its own zone of technology.

Dianetic and Scientology C/Sing Technologies are different in many respects and must not be mixed. These technologies are complementary to each other in the long overall view of case handling. The rule is simply that whenever a preclear is being run on Dianetics, at any case or Grade level, the rules of Dianetic Case Supervision apply.

Dianetics can be run on any Grade of preclear or Pre-OT if necessary. It can even be run on a preclear who has had only a C/S No. 1 and no other auditing. The need for Dianetic Auditing can and does occur at any case level.

The advent of "Expanded Grades" and the C/S Series of HCO Bulletins and Triple Flow Dianetics does not cancel the basics of Dianetics Case Supervision; these developments clarify and complement Dianetic Case Supervision.

Dianetics is Dianetics. It is for use.

The use of this Dianetic C/S's Index will help you to achieve the maximum gains attainable with Dianetics.

THE DIANETIC CASE SUPERVISOR'S INDEX

This index lists categories of preclear “situations” and HCO Bulletins and BTBs that give the proper handling for the situations.

Preclear situations are listed in the left-hand column.

HCO Bulletins and BTBs giving the proper handling of the situations are listed in the right-hand column.

There are spaces provided for additional HCO Bs to be added to each category as they may be issued in the future. It is expected that a person using this index would keep it up to date himself.

SECTION I: USUAL SITUATIONS AND ACTIONS

Starting a preclear

- = HCO B 5 Apr 69 (reissued 26 May 70),
“New Preclears”
- = HCO B 12 June 70, “Programming of Cases”
- = HCO B 23 Aug 71, “Auditor’s Rights”
- = HCO B 28 July 71, C/S Series 54, Dianetics, Beginning a Pc On”
- = HCO B 19 Apr 72, C/S Series 77, “‘Quickie’ Defined”
- = BTB 24 Apr 69R, “Preclear Assessment Sheet”
- = BTB 12 July 69, Issue IV, “Starting Dianetics on Pcs Who Have Had Scientology Auditing”
- = BTB 8 Jan 71 R, “Auditing CS-1 for Dianetics and Scientology”
- =

Health Form and R3R

- = HCO B 19 May 69, “Health Form, Use of”
- = “Pastoral Counselling Health Form”—Revised 22 July 69
- = HCO B 9 Aug 69, “Case Folder Analysis, Dianetics” (section under Health Forms)
- = HCO B 28 Feb 71, “Metering Reading Items”

- = HCO B 28 July 71, C/S Series 54, "Dianetics, Beginning a Pc On"
- =
- =
- Pc has had Dianetic Auditing on*
- = See Section III of this Index
- Flow 1 or Dianetic Triples but not on all items*
- = HCO B 7 Mar 71 RA, C/S Series 28RA "Use of Dianetics"
- = HCO B 4 Apr 71 RA, C/S Series 32RA, "Use of Dianetics"
- = HCO B 5 Apr 71RA, C/S Series 33RA, "Triple Reruns"
- = HCO B 21 Apr 71RB, C/S Series 36RB, "Dianetics"
- =
- =
- Assessment of existing lists for any regular Dianetic Auditing*
- = HCO B 29 Apr 69, "Assessment and Interest"
- = HCO B 21 May 69, "Assessment"
- = HCO B 26 Apr 69, "Somatics"
- = HCO B 27 Jan 70, "Narrative Items Explained"
- = HCO B 29 Jan 70, "Null Lists in Dianetics"
- = HCO B 28 Feb 71, "Metering Reading Items"
- = HCO B 24 July 69, "Seriously Ill Pcs"
- = "Pastoral Counselling Health Form"
Revised 22 July 69
- = HCO B 14 Mar 71R, "F/N Everything"
- = HCO B 14 Sept 71, C/S Series 59, "Dianetic List Errors"
- = HCO B 20 Apr 72, Issue II, C/S Series 78, "Product Purpose and Why and WC Error Correction"
- = HCO B 10 Aug 72, C/S Series 82, "Dianetic HCO B—Interest"
- = HCO B 13 Sept 72, C/S Series 85, "Dianetics—Catastrophes from and Repair of 'No Interest' Items"
- = HCO B 6 Dec 73, C/S Series 90, "The Primary Failure"

- = BTB 24 Nov 71 R, “Pressure Somatics in Dianetics”
 - =
 - =
 - = Same as above for assessment of existing lists for any regular Dianetic Auditing.
 - = Item found last session
 - = HCO B 28 Feb 71, “Metering Reading Items”
 - = HCO B 14 Mar 71 R, “F/N Everything”
 - =
 - =
 - =
 - =
 - = *Trouble with a Specific Area* = HCO B 24 July 69, “Seriously Ill Pcs”
 - (Chronic Somatic)
 - = HCO B 9 Aug 69, “Case Folder Analysis, Dianetics” (section under Special Cases)
 - = HCO B 16 June 70, C/S Series 6, “What the C/S is Doing”
 - = HCO B 16 Aug 70 (corrected & reissued 3 Nov 70), C/S Series 15, “Getting the F/N to Examiner”
 - = HCO B 5 July 71 R, C/S Series 49R, “Assists”
 - = HCO B 11 July 73, “Assist Summary”
 - = HCO B 6 Jan 74, “Assist Summary Addition”
 - = HCO B 15 July 70 (corrected & reissued 25 Nov 70), “Unresolved Pains”
 - = HCO B 19 July 69, “Dianetics and Illness” (especially second page re specific area)
 - = HCO B 16 Dec 71RA, C/S Series 35RA, “Interiorization Errors”
 - =
 - =
 - = Pc Exterior
 - = HCO B 4 Jan 71 (corrected & reissued 3 Oct 71), “Exteriorization and High TA”
 - = HCO B 17 Dec 71R, C/S Series 23RA, “Interiorization Summary”
 - = BTB 24 July 73, “Pregnancy and Auditing”

SECTION II: DIANETIC REMEDIES

- Pc Physically ill*
- = HCOB 12 Mar 69, “Physically Ill Pcs and Pre OTs (with a note on Drugs)”
 - = HCO B 19 July 69, “Dianetics and Illness”
 - = HCO B 27 July 69, “Antibiotics”
 - = HCO B 17 Oct 69, “Drugs, Aspirin and Tranquilizers”
 - = HCO B 24 July 69, “Seriously Ill Pcs”
 - = HCO B 9 Aug 69, “Case Folder Analysis, Dianetics” (re: Physically Ill Pcs and Special Cases)
 - = HCO B 28 June 69, “C/S—How to Case Supervise Dianetics Folders”
 - = HCO B 15 Mar 71, “Assists—A Flag Expertise Subject” [revised & replaced by 23 July 71, same title]
 - = = HCO B 13 June 70, C/S Series 3, “Session Priorities—Repair Pgms and their Priority”
 - = HCO B 5 July 71R, C/S Series 49R, “Assists”
 - = HCO B 23 July 71 (corrected 4 May 72), “Assists—A Flag Expertise Subject”
 - = HCO B 23 Aug 71, C/S Series 1, “Auditor’s Rights”
 - = HCO B 24 Aug 71, Issue II, “Assists Addition”
 - = HCO B 11 July 73, “Assist Summary”
 - = HCO B 6 Jan 74, “Assist Summary Addition”
 - =
- Pc Stuck in this Lifetime*
- = HCO B 19 May 69, “Drug and Alcohol Cases—PRIOR Assessing”
 - = HCO B 3 Oct 69R, “Dianetic Remedies”
 - = HCO B 23 Aug 71, C/S Series 1, “Auditor’s Rights”
 - =
- Pc out of valence*
- = HCO B 13 May 69, “Peculiarities”

Also folder getting fat with little gain

(See HCO Bs listed for Pc Physically Ill in addition to these)

- = HCO B 9 Aug 69, "Case Folder analysis, Dianetics"
- = HCO B 28 June 69, C/S—How to Supervise Dianetics Folders
- = HCO B 17 July 71, C/S Series 51, "Out of Valence"
- = BTB 26 Nov 71 (corrected 30 Dec 71), "Out of Valence—220H"
- =
- = HCO B 23 Aug 71, C/S Series 1, "Auditor's Rights"
- = HCO B 16 June 70, C/S Series 6, "What the C/S is Doing"
- = HCO B 19 June 70, "C/S Q and A"
- = HCO B 16 Aug 70 (corrected & reissued 3 Nov 70), C/S Series 15, "Getting the F/N to Examiner"
- = HCO B 28 June 69, "C/S—How to Case Supervise Dianetics Folders"
- = HCO B 9 Aug 69, "Case Folder Analysis, Dianetics"
- = HCO B 16 July 69, "Urgent—Important"
- = HCO B 8 June 70, "Low TA Handling"
- = HCOB 11 Apr 71RA, "Important—L3RD Dianetics and Int RD Repair List"
- = HCO B 8 Mar 71, C/S Series 29, "Case Actions, Off Line"
- = HCO B 5 Apr 71RA, C/S Series 33RA, "Triple Reruns"
- = HCO B 6 Apr 71, C/S Series 34, "Non F/N Cases"
- = HCO B 21 Apr 71RB, C/S Series 36RB, "Dianetics"
- = HCOB 3 June 71, C/S Series 37R, "High and Low TA Breakthrough"
- = HCO B 24 Nov 73RA (cancels 31 Dec 71RC), C/S Series 53RI, "Short Hi-Lo TA Assessment C/S"
- = HCO B 16 Feb 72, "Talking the TA Down Modified"
- = HCO B 20 Nov 73, C/S Series 89,

“F/N What You Ask or Program”

- = HCO B 6 Dec 73, C/S Series 90,
“The Primary Failure”
- = HCO B 16 Dec 71RA, C/S Series 35RA,
“Interiorization Errors”
- = HCO B 27 Mar 71, “Dianetic Erasure”
- = HCO B 23 May 69, “Auditing Out Sessions—
Narrative Versus Somatic Chains”
- = HCO B 22 July 69, Issue II, “High TA Assessment”
- = HCO B 1 Jan 72RA (revised 20 Nov 74),
“LIX HI-LO TA List Revised”
- = BTB 26 Apr 69, “Bad Indicators”

=

Out-Ruds Situation

- = HCO B 23 Aug 71, C/S Series 1,
“Auditor’s Rights”
- = HCO B 17 May 69, “TRs and Dirty Needles”
- = HCOB 17 Apr 69, “Dianetic Case Supervision”
- = HCO B 9 Aug 69, “Case Folder Analysis,
Dianetics”
- = Scientology List Actions such as L1 C List
(Class III or above) for handling Out Ruds.
- = HCO B 11 Apr 71RA, “L3RD—Dianetics
and Int RD Repair List”
- = HCO B 26 Apr 71, “TRs and Cognitions”
- = HCO B 14 Sept 71, C/S Series 59, “Dianetic
List Errors”

Something Not Handled

- = HCO B 23 Aug 71, C/S Series 1,
“Auditor’s Rights”
- = HCO B 16 Aug 70 (corrected & reissued 3
Nov 70), C/S Series 15, “Getting the F/N to
Examiner”
- = HCO PL 7 Apr 70RA (revised 29 Sept 74)
Scientology “Green Form” Method 5 Assess
ment (Class III or above) for finding the
trouble.

=

Chains Left Unflat

(Also see TA High or Low cate-

- = HCO B 22 July 69, “High TA Assessment”
- = HCO B 17 Apr 69, “Dianetic Case Super

gory above)

vision”

- = HCO B 23 Aug 71, C/S Series 1,
“Auditor’s Rights”
- = HCOB 11 Apr 71RA, “L3RD—Dianetics
and Int RD Repair List”
- = HCO B 27 Mar 71, “Dianetic Erasure”
- = HCO B 13 June 70, C/S Series 3,
“Session Priorities—Repair Pgms and their
Priority”
- = HCO B 16 Aug 70 (corrected & reissued 3 Nov 70),
C/S Series 15, “Getting the F/N to Examiner”
- = HCO B 6 Apr 71, C/S Series 34,
“Non F/N Cases”
- = HCO B 20 Nov 73, C/S Series 89,
“F/N What You Ask or Program”
- = HCO B 16 June 70, C/S Series 6,
“What the C/S is Doing”
- = BTB 3 Oct 69R, “Dianetic Remedies”
- = BTB 10 June 72R, “The L3RD Rundown—
Dianetic Track Repair”

=

Pc Anaten In Session

- = HCO B 23 Aug 71, C/S Series 1,
“Auditor’s Rights”
- = BTB 3 Oct 69R, “Dianetic Remedies”

=

Child Not Running Well

- = BTB 8 Jan 71 R, “Auditing CS-1 for Dia
netics and Scientology”

=

=

“Assists—A Flag Expert
(See also: Physically Ill)

= *Pc Physically Injured* = HCO B 15 Mar 71,

ise Subject” [revised & replaced by 23 July
71, same title]

- = HCO B 23 May 69, “Auditing Out Sessions—
Narrative Versus Somatic Chains”
- = HCO B 14 May 69, “Dianetic Assists”
NOTE: This HCO B is not to be used as the
source of R3R procedure.

- = HCO B 13 June 70, C/S Series 3, “Session Priorities—Repair Pgms and their Priority”
- = HCO B 28 Nov 70, C/S Series 22, “Psychosis”
- = HCO B 8 Mar 71, C/S Series 29, “Case Actions, Off Line”
- = HCO B 5 July 71 R, C/S Series 49R, “Assists”
- = HCOB 23 July 71 (corrected 4 May 72), “Assists—A Flag Expertise Subject”
- = HCO B 24 Aug 71, Issue II, “Assists Addition”
- = BTB 22 July 70, “Touch Assist—An Improvement on Spinal Adjustment for Medical Doctors and Practitioners”
- = BTB 7 Apr 72R, “Touch Assists—Correct Ones”
- =
- =

Area of Physical Injury Not Fully

(See also: Trouble with a Specific Area)

- = HCO B 19 July 69, “Dianetics and Illness”
- = HCO B 16 Aug 70 (corrected & reissued 3 Nov 70), C/S Series 15, “Getting the F/N to Examiner” (for handling Chronic Somatic)
- = HCO B 13 June 70, C/S Series 3, “Session Priorities—Repair Pgms and their Priority”
- = HCO B 7 Sept 71, C/S Series 58, “Programming Cases Backwards”
- =
- =

Drugs and/or Alcohol

- = HCO B 19 May 69, “Drug and Alcohol Cases—PRIOR Assessing”
- = HCO B 12 Mar 69, “Physically Ill Pcs and Pre OTs (with a note on Drugs)”
- =
- =
- =
- = HCO B 8 Mar 71, C/S Series 29, “Case Actions, Off Line”
- = HCO B 15 July 71, Issue III, C/S Series 48R,

“Drug Handling”

- = HCO B 28 July 71, C/S Series 54,
“Dianetics, Beginning a Pc On”
- = HCO B 25 Oct 71, “Drug Drying Out”
- = HCO B 23 Dec 71, C/S Series 73,
“The No Interference Area”
- = HCO B 23 Sept 68 (reissued 22 Jan 72),
“Drugs & Trippers”
- = HCO B 10 Aug 72, C/S Series 82,
“Dianetic HCO B—Interest”
- = HCO B 13 Sept 72, “Dianetics—Catastrophes
from and Repair of ‘No Interest’ Items”
- = BTB 7 June 69, “How to Make a Person Sober”
- = BTB 7 July 71 R, “Resistive Cases—
Drug Handling”
- = BTB 25 Oct 71R, “The Special Drug Rundown”
- =

Pc Having Difficulty with Study

- = HCO B 23 Nov 69R (revised 26 June 73),
“Student Rescue Intensive”
- = BTB 9 Aug 70R, “Dianetic Student Rescue
Intensive”
- = BTB 8 Jan 71 R, “Auditing CS-I for Dianetics
and Scientology”

SECTION III: TRIPLE DIANETICS

Starting or Running Triple Dianetics

- = HCO B 5 Oct 69, “Triple Flows”
- = HCO B 23 Aug 71, C/S Series 1, “Auditor’s
Rights” (re: High TA at start of session)
- = HCO B 11 Apr 71RA, “Important—L3RD—
Dianetics and Int RD Repair List”
- = HCO B 7 Mar 71 RA, C/S Series 28RA,
“Use of Dianetics”
- = HCO B 4 Apr 71RA, C/S Series 32RA,
“Use of Dianetics”
- = HCO B 5 Apr 71RA, C/S Series 33RA,
“Triple Reruns”
- = HCO B 12 Apr 71, “Exteriorization Errors”
- = HCO B 21 Apr 71RB, C/S Series 36RB,
“Dianetics”

- = BTB 1 Dec 70R, “Dianetics—Triple Flow Action”
- = *False TA*
 - = HCO B 24 Oct 71, “False TA”
 - = HCO B 12 Nov 71R, “False TA Addition”
 - = HCO B 15 Feb 72, “False TA Addition 2”
 - = HCO B 18 Feb 72, “False TA Addition 3”
 - = HCO B 29 Feb 72R, “False TA Checklist”
 - = HCO B 23 Nov 73, “Dry and Wet Hands Make False TA”

SECTION IV: C/S HANDLING OF THE GOOFING AUDITOR

- = *Auditor Goofing*
 - = HCO B 10 Nov 70, “C/S Responsibility for Training”
 - = HCO B 16 July 69, “Urgent—Important”
 - = HCOB 15 Nov 69, Issue II, “Case Supervision, How it Goes Non-Standard”
 - = HCO B 15 Nov 69, “Case Supervision Auditing and Results”
 - = HCO B 19 Mar 71, “C/Sing Auditor-C/Ses”
 - = HCO B 5 Mar 71, C/S Series 25, “The Fantastic New HGC Line”
 - = HCO B 26 Apr 71, “TRs and Cognitions”
 - = HCO B 28 Apr 71, “Okays to Audit in HGCs”
 - = HCO B 19 June 71, C/S Series 45, “C/S Rules”
 - = HCO B 19 July 71, C/S Series 52, “Internes”
 - = HCO B 23 Aug 71, C/S Series 1, “Auditor’s Rights”
 - = HCO B 1 Sept 71, Issue I, C/S Series 57, “A C/S as a Training Officer—A Program for Flubless Auditing”
 - = HCO B 22 Sept 71, C/S Series 61, “The Three Golden Rules of the C/S”
 - = HCO B 20 Dec 71, C/S Series 72, “Use of Correction Lists”
 - = HCO B 20 Nov 73, Issue I, “Anti-Q&A TR”

- = HCO B 6 Dec 73, C/S Series 90, "The Primary Failure"
- = HCO B 27 Jan 74, "Dianetics—R3R Commands Have Background Data"
- = HCO B 16 Dec 71RA, C/S Series 35RA, "Interiorization Errors"
- = HCO B 9 June 71, C/S Series 41, "C/S Tips"
- = HCO B 21 Aug 70, C/S Series 16, "Session Grading—Well Done, Definition of"
- = HCO B 30 Apr 71, "Auditing Comm Cycle"
- = CRAMMING ON THOSE ACTIONS WHICH ARE BEING GOOFED!
- = BTB 16 Mar 71, "Student and Course Morale —Tough Checkouts & Coaching"

Flag Org Correction Chief

Revised & Reissued as BTB

by Flag Mission 1234

I/C: CPO Andrea Lewis
2nd: Molly Harlow

Authorized by AVU
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:SW:AL:MH:DM:nw.mh rd
Copyright © 1971, 1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SUBJECT INDEX

CASE SUPERVISOR SERIES

A

A to B programming, 154 (C/S 47)
ability attained, 7 (C/S 1)
 invalidated, 8 (C/S 1)
accepting,
 a C/S, 2 (C/S 1)
 the pc, 1 (C/S 1)
accident prone, 12 (C/S 2)
accidents, if reads run out narrative R3R
 Triple, 168 (C/S 54)
action, ordering a major, 145 (C/S 42)
admin, auditor, 81 (C/S 25)
administration, definition of, 172 (C/S 56)
administrative function and excellent case
 results, 172 (C/S 56)
Advance Program, 48 (C/S 12), 88 (C/S 27),
 13940 (C/S 39R), 145 (C/S 42);
 see also Return Program
age, symptom of the—there is no time, 40 (C/S 9)
alcohol included as a drug, 156,157,158 (C/S 48R)
All Flows Rundown, 110 (C/S 33RA-1)
analyzing folders, 45 (C/S 11)
ancient law—pc who “knows” what is wrong,
 32 (C/S 7)
anti-Q & A handling, 243 (C/S 89)
AO confidential materials, 10 (C/S 2)
apathy, handling, 184 (C/S 59)
apparent behavior and the insane, 74 (C/S 22)
application, C/Ses for exact tech, 152 (C/S 45)
apprenticeships, auditor, 163 (C/S 52)
assess flows slowly, 134 (C/S 37R Add. 3)
assessing, low TA, 132 (C/S 37R Add. 2R)
assessment,
 form 37R, 134 (C/S 37R Add. 3)
 Hi-lo TA rules, 131 (C/S 37R Add.)
 low TA, 141 (C/S 40)
 repeated, 131 (C/S 37R Add.)
 Sheet, Pc, 168 (C/S 54)
assists, 159 (C/S 49R)
 and Exams, 159, 160 (C/S 49R)
 Contact, 159 (C/S 49R)
 Dianetic, 159 (C/S 49R)
 interrupting auditing, handling of, 94-95
 (C/S 29)
 Touch, 160 (C/S 49R)
 Touch and Contact, 94 (C/S 29)
 worksheets, 247 (C/S 92R)
attest, pc to, when he’s made it, 153 (C/S 46)
auditing, blow downs,
 and Ethics, 46 (C/S 11)
 and TRs, 136 (C/S 38)

auditing (*cont.*)
 grade processes to EP, 30 (C/S 6)
 of staff and public, 194 (C/S 65R)
 quality, 99 (C/S 31)
 skill, improvement of, between R6 and
 OT III, 212 (C/S 73)
 standard, 57 (C/S 15)
auditor(s)('s),
 Admin Room, 83 (C/S 25)
 Board, 83 (C/S 25)
 checkout of Quad Dianetics, 92
 (C/S 28RA-1)
 Cramming and flubless, 183 (C/S 58)
 data, 147,148 (C/S 43)
 errors, 97 (C/S 30),122 (C/S 36RB-1R)
 flubs, 43 (C/S 10), 90 (C/S 28RA),
 92-93 (C/S 28RA-1)
 handling, 61 (C/S 16)
 inexperienced, 191 (C/S 63)
 inval, 147,148 (C/S 43)
 leaving Cramming go through Examiner, 193
 (C/S 64)
 minimum hours of, 85 (C/S 25)
 morale depends on honest completions, 180
 (C/S 57)
 opinion, 171 (C/S 55)
 responsibility, 1 (C/S 1), 228 (C/S 81-1RA)
 rights, 1, 9 (C/S 1)
 rights, abuse of, 225 (C/S 81R)
 rights addition revised, 227 (C/S 81-1RA)
 rights and correction lists, 227 (C/S 81-1RA)
 rights modified, 225 (C/S 81 R)
 worksheets, 196 (C/S 66)
 writing up C/Ses, 200, 201, 202 (C/S 69R)
Azimuth meter, use of, to see reads, 80 (C/S 24)

B

backtrack, getting the pc to go, 7 (C/S 1)
backwards C/Sing (towards significance), 29-30
 (C/S 6)
bad exam reports, 96 (C/S 30)
Basic Program, 11 (C/S 2), 22 (C/S 4)
begin Dianetics with Pc Assessment Sheet, 168
 (C/S 54)
behavior—mannerisms as an index to change, 35
 (C/S 8)
blank periods, 156 (C/S 48R)
blind repair, when no FES is done, 66 (C/S 19)
 and falls, 20 (C/S 3), 29 (C/S 6)
 and length of reads, 149 (C/S 44R)

SUBJECT INDEX—CASE SUPERVISOR SERIES

blow up, changing the pc, 36 (C/S 8)
item, 131 (C/S 37R Add.)
F/N item, 141 (C/S 40)
blue sheet, the Return Program is on, 14
(C/S 2), 21 (C/S 4)
boggy cases, 86 (C/S 26)
breakthrough, high and low TA, 127 (C/S 37R)
broad shooting, C/S can give alternatives
in a C/S, 189 (C/S 62)
bug, C/Sing and finding the case, 112 (C/S 34)
bullbait using processes or implants forbidden,
95 (C/S 29)
buttons,
using restimulative materials to push
someone's, 95 (C/S 29)
suppress and invalidate, 3 (C/S 1)
by-passed,
case and "no interest" items, 236 (C/S 85)
charge of last session, 18,19 (C/S 3)

C

case (s),
actions, off line, 94 (C/S 29)
auditors don't have, 8-9 (C/S 1)
bogs, how to repair, 220 (C/S 78)
can be repaired, 137 (C/S 38)
completed, 63 (C/S 17)
disturbance and whys, 220 (C/S 78)
dog; *see* dog cases
errors, 4 (C/S 1)
gain, 151 (C/S 44R Add.), 161 (C/S 50)
has somatics, 22 (C/S 4)
non-F/N, 112 (C/S 34)
not handled, 6 (C/S 1)
people talking about their, 95 (C/S 29)
resistive, 156, 157 (C/S 48R), 189 (C/S 62)
study, find the right Why, 112, 113, 114
(C/S 34), 147 (C/S 43)
supervision errors, gross, 47 (C/S 11)
tech errors on a, 59 (C/S 16)
that don't run well, 114 (C/S 34)
trouble and WC errors, 247 (C/S 92R)
ways to bog a, 136-37 (C/S 38)
way to solve a, 145 (C/S 42)
catastrophes from and repair of "no interest"
items, 236 (C/S 85)
CCHs, to handle accident proneness, 12 (C/S 2)
ceiling WDAH, 82 (C/S 25)
chain(s),
engram, 28 (C/S 6), 56-57 (C/S 15)
failed to flatten, 69 (C/S 21)
flubbed, 119 (C/S 36RB), 123 (C/S 36RB-1R)
rehabbing, 118-19 (C/S 36RB), 123
(C/S 36RB-1R)

charge, by-passed, last session, 17,18, 19
(C/S 3)
Chart,
Classification, 49 (C/S 12)
Gradation, 211 (C/S 73), 232 (C/S 83RA)
new Grade, 248-51 (C/S 93)
of Human Evaluation, 35 (C/S 8)
checking for,
meter reading items, 79 (C/S 24)
reads, 56 (C/S 15)
reads while clearing the idea of lists, 66
(C/S 19)
checklist, mandatory C/Sing, 200 (C/S 69R)
checkout on materials by auditors, 179
(C/S 57)
choosing pcs, 225 (C/S 81R)
chronic aches and pains, 183 (C/S 58)
chronic somatic(s), 28 (C/S 6), 57 (C/S 15)
Dianetic handling of, 64 (C/S 18)
Class Chart, 21 (C/S 4), 248-51 (C/S 93)
in every folder, 14 (C/S 2)
Classification and Gradation Chart is the
master program, 10 (C/S 2), 250 (C/S 93)
clearing,
commands, reads gotten on, 142 (C/S 41)
words in tests forbidden, 207 (C/S 71A)
words on GF, 86 (C/S 26)
code of a C/S, 197-98 (C/S 67)
coffee shop auditing, 94 (C/S 29)
cognitions, chopping, abuses indicator of F/N,
30 (C/S 6)
complete,
cycles on a case, 145 (C/S 42)
definition of, 218 (C/S 77)
completion, quickie, 218 (C/S 77)
conference, daily auditors', 70 (C/S 21)
confront, processes aimed at further, 31 (C/S 6)
Contact Assist, 159 (C/S 49R)
Continue Process, 128 (C/S 37R)
copying lists or worksheets, 5 (C/S 1)
correcting of an Int RD, 77 (C/S 23RA)
correction lists, 209 (C/S 72), 230 (C/S 83RA)
and red tags, 227 (C/S 81-1RA)
auditor Okay to Audit, 227 (C/S 81-1RA)
C/S OK to do, 227 (C/S 81-1 RA)
drill for, 231-32 (C/S 83RA)
L3RD, 119 (C/S 36RB), 123 (C/S 36RB-1R)
method of use, 209-10 (C/S 72)
PTS Rundown, 216 (C/S 76)
TRs and metering, 230 (C/S 83RA)
use of, 230-32 (C/S 83RA)
corrective actions, when done, 250 (C/S 93)
course graduate becomes an auditor, 163
(C/S 52)

SUBJECT INDEX—CASE SUPERVISOR SERIES

- courses with no materials, 178-79 (C/S 57)
cramming,
 and auditor errors, 233 (C/S 84)
 and auditors, 233 (C/S 84)
 and excellent checkouts, 84 (C/S 25)
 and the C/S, 233 (C/S 84)
 auditors who flub to, 142 (C/S 41)
 chit, 178 (C/S 57)
 C/S, 164 (C/S 52)
 cycles and the C/S, 199 (C/S 68)
 finding the misunderstood, 98 (C/S 30)
 Hi-1o TA assessment, 131 (C/S 37R Add.)
 order, 199 (C/S 68)
 order, how to write up a, 204 (C/S 70R)
 raises auditing quality, 99 (C/S 31)
 to get flubless auditors, 183 (C/S 58)
C/S, C/Ses, C/Sing,
 53, use of, 230 (C/S 83RA)
 and auditor admin, 82 (C/S 25)
 and cramming cycles, 199 (C/S 68)
 and Cramming Officers, 233 (C/S 84)
 and Exam reports, 96 (C/S 30)
 and flabby auditors, 233 (C/S 84)
 and overload, reduction of refunds, 252-53
 (C/S 94)
 and publics, 194 (C/S 65R)
 and tech courses, 233 (C/S 84)
 as a training officer, 176 (C/S 57)
 auditor, 83 (C/S 25)
 auditor-C/Ses, 96-98 (C/S 30)
 auditors writing up, 201 (C/S 69R)
 backwards (towards significance), 29-30
 (C/S 6)
 case gain, 161 (C/S 50)
 checklist, 203 (C/S 69 Add.)
 data, 44 (C/S 11)
 easy, 234 (C/S 84)
 error, 223 (C/S 80)
 errors, 98 (C/S 30)
 expertise, 144 (C/S 41)
 failure, 39 (C/S 9)
 failure, primary cause of, 24445 (C/S 90)
 firm rule for, 45 (C/S 11)
 first lesson, 14 (C/S 2)
 folder handling, 4546 (C/S 11)
 for new auditors or veterans, 191 (C/S 63)
 for non-veterans, 191 (C/S 63)
 genius, 10 (C/S 2), 19 (C/S 3)
 glossary of terms, 48 (C/S 12)
 handles post fast flow, 96 (C/S 30)
 handling auditors, 61 (C/S 16)
 handling auditors, 3 rules, 186 (C/S 61)
 hard work, 77 (C/S 23RA)
 in the chair, 2 (C/S 1)
 Int, 77 (C/S 23RA)
- C/S, C/Ses, C/Sing (*cont.*)
 invalidation, 60 (C/S 16), 147 (C/S 43)
 long, 87 (C/S 27)
 next, 81 (C/S 25)
 Org, 96 (C/S 30)
 postings, irreducible minimum, 252 (C/S 94)
 preOTs don't, 214 (C/S 75)
 PTS Rundown, 216 (C/S 76)
 purpose, 31 (C/S 6)
 Q & A, 27 (C/S 5), 32-34 (C/S 7),
 243 (C/S 89)
 Q & A, results from, 243 (C/S 89)
 Quad Dianetics, 91 (C/S 28RA-1)
 quality, 99 (C/S 31)
 responsibility, 121 (C/S 36RB), 125
 (C/S 36RB-1R)
 responsibility and checking interest on
 drug items, evil purposes or intentions,
 229 (C/S 82)
 responsibility for training, 69 (C/S 21)
 rules, 14546 (C/S 42), 14748 (C/S 43),
 152 (C/S 45)
 rules—programming from prepared lists,
 149-50 (C/S 44R)
 rules—the sequence of programs, 151
 (C/S 44R Add.)
 short, 87, 88 (C/S 27)
 stable datum, 114 (C/S 34)
 standard handling of auditors, 233 (C/S 84)
 standing order to auditors, 213 (C/S 74)
 supreme test of a, 154-55 (C/S 47)
 thorough, 88 (C/S 27)
 three golden rules of the, 186 (C/S 61)
 tips, 14244 (C/S 41)
 tools of a, 183 (C/S 58)
 Triple Dianetics, 89 (C/S 28RA)
 twenty-four hour rule, 194 (C/S 65R)
 two-way comm, 54-55 (C/S 14)
 types of, 252 (C/S 94)
 variables, 144 (C/S 41)
 via, 14344 (C/S 41)
 vital action, 153 (C/S 46)
 wander on repairing a repair, 42 (C/S 10)
 with all folders to hand, 45 (C/S 11)
 written instructions, 44 (C/S 11)
 current program inside pc folder, 145 (C/S 42)

D

- daily study, 227 (C/S 81-1RA)
data,
 for C/S, 183 (C/S 58), 189 (C/S 62)
 HCO Bs and tapes are stable, 148 (C/S 43)
deaths are run out, 168 (C/S 54)
decay of tech, 148 (C/S 43)

SUBJECT INDEX—CASE SUPERVISOR SERIES

- Declare(s),
 C/S's responsibility, 153 (C/S 46)
 pc to, 153 (C/S 46)
delicate cases, pcs needing lots of repair
 are, 43 (C/S 10)
delivery, C/S halting, 65 (C/S 19)
Dept 10, 37R Process done in, 129 (C/S 37R)
destimulate, takes 3-10 days to, 56 (C/S 15)
Dianetic(s),
 Assist, 159 (C/S 49R)
 auditor and ruds, 3 (C/S 1)
 beginning a pc on, 168 (C/S 54)
 Case Supervisor's index, 257
 Clear, 48 (C/S 12)
 C/S 1 , for unindoctrinated pc, 117
 (C/S 35RA)
 C/Sing, 90 (C/S 28RA), 91 (C/S 28RA-1)
 HCO B—interest, 229 (C/S 82)
 list errors, 184 (C/S 59)
 pcs, 49 (C/S 12)
 person doesn't like, 157 (C/S 48R)
 Ouad; *see* Ouad Dianetics
 remedies, 90 (C/S 28RA), 93 (C/S 28RA-1)
 results, 90 (C/S 28RA), 93 (C/S 28RA-1)
 Triples, 7 (C/S 1); *see also* Triple(s)
 unable to run standard, 78 (C/S 23RA)
 unflat on, 13-14 (C/S 2)
Director of Processing; *see* D of P
discharged process, 29 (C/S 6)
discovery,whycasesweren'tmakingit, 158
 (C/S 48R)
dispersal (on programming), 12 (C/S 2)
Dn C/S 1 for unindoctrinated pc, 117
 (C/S 35RA)
D of P,
 Interview, 188 (C/S 62)
 operates by OCAs, 205 (C/S 71)
 pressures on, 33 (C/S 7)
 schedule, 83 (C/S 25)
 Solo, keeps tabs on pcs falling off lines,
 214-15 (C/S 75)
dog cases, 97 (C/S 30), 225 (C/S 81 R);
 see also dog pcs
 can be handled, 146 (C/S 42)
 locating the bugs, 177 (C/S 57)
 many are just unsolved cases, 171 (C/S 55)
 the Why behind, 224 (C/S 80)
dog pcs, 223 (C/S 80); *see also* dog cases
don'ts regarding 37R, 134-35 (C/S 37R Add. 3);
 see also thirty-seven R (37R)
double,
 actions, 145 (C/S 42)
 folder, 45 (C/S 11)
 Int, 112 (C/S 34)
 major grades, 112 (C/S 34)
double (*cont.*)
 major rundowns, 5 (C/S 1)
 Power, 97 (C/S 30)
downgrade, departure from exact processes, 152
 (C/S 45)
dramatizes = R6EW unflat, 22 (C/S 4)
dropped OCA graph, 162 (C/S 51);
 see also OCA(s)
drug(s),
 and cannot run engrams, 211 (C/S 73)
 and roller coaster, 156 (C/S 48R)
 and TRs, 157 (C/S 48R)
 done first, 157 (C/S 48R)
 engrams and alcohol, 156 (C/S 48R)
 former user, 156 (C/S 48R)
 full auditing rundown, 157 (C/S 48R)
 handling, 156-58 (C/S 48R)
 reads on, 168 (C/S 54)
 Rundown and Grade Chart, 248, 249
 (C/S 93)
 Rundown and Life Repair, 248 (C/S 93)
 use engram running on, 86 (C/S 26)
dummy run, HGC line should be, 85 (C/S 25)

E

- eight (VIII),
 actions, 50 (C/S 13R)
 auditing for OTband, 51 (C/S 13R)
end phenomena of,
 37R Process, 131 (C/S 37R Add.)
 a process, 30 (C/S 6)
 repair, 17 (C/S 3)
 TA Handling RD, 129 (C/S 37R)
engrams,
 cannot run, and drugs, 211 (C/S 73)
 chain unflat, 28 (C/S 6)
 chains unflat, 56 (C/S 15)
 drug, 157 (C/S 48R)
 list, 89 (C/S 28RA), 91-92 (C/S 28RA-1)
 secondaries, locks, 29 (C/S 6)
 words and phrases, 28 (C/S 6)
EP; *see* end phenomena
error(s),
 auditor, and Cramming, 97, 98 (C/S 30)
 C/S, 98 (C/S 30)
 Dianetic and Int, 115 (C/S 35RA)
 gross, in programming, 99 (C/S 31)
 in an Int RD, 115 (C/S 35RA)
 program, 97 (C/S 30)
Ethics,
 action after PTS Interview, 222 (C/S 79)
 enters after quickie tech, 219 (C/S 77)
 record, C/S should watch for, 46 (C/S 11)

SUBJECT INDEX—CASE SUPERVISOR SERIES

- evaluation,
and the C/S, 189 (C/S 62)
auditor, 25 (C/S 5)
Chart of Human, 35-36 (C/S 8)
telling the pc is, 10 (C/S 2)
evil impulse, checking, 73 (C/S 22)
Exam, Examiner,
and meter checks, 207 (C/S 71 A)
F/Ns after flubs, 143 (C/S 41)
getting the F/N to the, 56 (C/S 15)
pattern at, 57 (C/S 15)
reports, bad, 96 (C/S 30)
reports, no, 59 (C/S 16)
sour forms, 17-18 (C/S 3)
unchanging natter at, 114 (C/S 34)
Expanded Dianetics,
and the Grade Chart, 248, 250 (C/S 93)
prerequisites, 248, 250 (C/S 93)
Expanded Lower Grades, 48 (C/S 12)
experience and internships, 163 (C/S 52)
Ext, exterior, exteriorization,
do Int RD if check reveals, 43 (C/S 10)
in session is end phenomena for that
process or action, 116 (C/S 35RA)
pc going, handle by Int-Ext, 13 (C/S 2)
pc will go, 31 (C/S 6)
run twice, 112 (C/S 34)
eyesight should be tested, 80 (C/S 24)
- F**
- fads in areas where tech is bad, 69 (C/S 21)
failed, flubless,
cases and “no interest” items, 236 (C/S 85)
cases are auditor failures, 254 (C/S 95)
cure for, 255 (C/S 95)
sessions, most common reason for and
remedy, 244 (C/S 90)
failure, C/S, 39 (C/S 9)
fall and BD in 2-way comm, 20 (C/S 3)
false,
reports, 233 (C/S 84)
TA Checklist, 230 (C/S 83RA)
TA HCO Bs, 208 (C/S 71A)
falsely gotten to R6EW, 22 (C/S 4)
family,
don’t listen to, about a case, 171 (C/S 55)
insanity, run out, 169 (C/S 54)
fantastic new HGC line, 81 (C/S 25)
fast flow, C/S handles post, 96 (C/S 30)
FES(es); *see* Folder Error Summary
finding the bug on a case, 113 (C/S 34)
firefights and unrun or overrun chains, 120
(C/S 36RB), 124 (C/S 36RB-1R)
- firm rule for C/S, 45 (C/S 11)
first error correction is Int, 115 (C/S 35RA)
fixation, one life, 73 (C/S 22)
flatten chain, failed to, 69 (C/S 21)
flow (H), additional, 134 (C/S 37R Add. 3)
flows,
assess slowly, 134 (C/S 37R Add. 3)
by-passed, 105 (C/S 33RA), 108 (C/S 33RA-1)
by-passed, and repair, 105 (C/S 33RA),
108 (C/S 33RA-1)
clearing, 131 (C/S 37R Add.)
definition of, 100 (C/S 32RA), 103
(C/S 32RA-1 R)
missing, and mass, 100 (C/S 32RA), 102
(C/S 32RA-1R)
note, 129-30 (C/S 37R), 133 (C/S 37R Add. 3)
overrun, 107 (C/S 33RA), 110 (C/S 33RA-1)
unrun, 105,106 (C/S 33RA), 108,109
(C/S 33RA-1)
Flow Zero, 100 (C/S 32RA), 102,103
(C/S 32RA-1R), 107 (C/S 33RA),
110 (C/S 33RA-1)
and Int-Ext RD, 92 (C/S 28RA-1)
command, 103 (C/S 32RA-1R), 109
(C/S 33RA-1)
command for Introspection RD, 101
(C/S 32RA)
flubbed,
cases and “no interest” items, 236
(C/S 85)
R3R, 76 (C/S 23RA)
flubby auditors, 163 (C/S 52)
Flub Catch System, 65 (C/S 19)
auditors, 176 (C/S 57)
C/Sing, 233 (C/S 84)
C/Sing in Missions, 235 (C/S 84-1)
flubs,
auditor, 43 (C/S 10), 90 (C/S 28RA),
92-93 (C/S 28RA-1)
best answer is no, 63 (C/S 17)
cramming, 69 (C/S 21)
Exam F/Ns after, 143 (C/S 41)
flunk(s),
and retrain, 60 (C/S 16)
TA producing action left incomplete is a,
2 (C/S 1)
tech not by the book is a, 152 (C/S 45)
when given, 60 (C/S 16)
F/N,
abuse, 30 (C/S 6)
and word clearing, 247 (C/S 92R)
at Exam, 152 (C/S 45)
at Examiner and session grading, 59
(C/S 16), 82 (C/S 25)

SUBJECT INDEX—CASE SUPERVISOR SERIES

F/N (*cont.*)

- gradual widening, 67-68 (C/S 20)
 - persistent, 67 (C/S 20)
 - same, 67 (C/S 20)
 - to Examiner, 56 (C/S 15)
 - what you ask or program, 243 (C/S 89)
- F/Ning auditors, 193 (C/S 64)
- Folder Error Summary(ies), 4 (C/S 1),
65 (C/S 19), 81, 85 (C/S 25)
and admin time, 85 (C/S 25)
cost borne by pc, 65 (C/S 19)
current, 97 (C/S 30)
- folders, analyzing, 45 (C/S 11)
- Folder Summary, 5 (C/S 1), 173 (C/S 56)
- force,
is made up of, 31 (C/S 6)
run out the, 28 (C/S 6)
- foreign language cases need GF items cleared,
86 (C/S 26)
- Four (IV) Rundown, OT, 52 (C/S 13R)
- Full Flow Dianetics, 100 (C/S 32RA), 103
(C/S 32RA-1R)
and OTs, 120 (C/S 36RB), 125 (C/S 36RB-1R)
offering, 101 (C/S 32RA), 104 (C/S 32RA-1R)
repair, 101 (C/S 32RA), 103-04
(C/S 32RA-1R)
requires flawless C/Sing and auditing, 121
(C/S 36RB), 125 (C/S 36RB-1R)
result, 101 (C/S 32RA), 104 (C/S 32RA-1R)
- Full Flow Table, 100 (C/S 32RA), 103
(C/S 32RA-1R)

G

- gain(s),
case, and drugs, 156 (C/S 48R)
holding, 218 (C/S 77)
negative, 31 (C/S 6)
no case, 138 (C/S 38)
pc becoming more himself, 162 (C/S 51)
physical, 26-27 (C/S 5)
rapid, 3 (C/S 1)
solid, 14 (C/S 2)
study gives case gain, 138 (C/S 38)
- genius,
in C/Sing, 10 (C/S 2)
of a C/S, 19 (C/S 3)
- getting the F/N to the Examiner, 56 (C/S 15)
- GF 40 for resistive cases, 51-52 (C/S 13R)
- GF 40XRR, 231 (C/S 83RA)
- glasses obstructing seeing the meter, 80
(C/S 24), 209 (C/S 72)
- glossary of C/S terms, 48 (C/S 12)
- goofs are few in type, 42 (C/S 10)

Grade(s),

- II, 24849 (C/S 93)
 - II and the Grade Chart, 249-50 (C/S 93)
 - definition of, 6 (C/S 1)
 - Expanded Lower, 48 (C/S 12)
 - incomplete cycle of the, 62 (C/S 17)
 - Lower, processes, 53 (C/S 13R)
 - Ouickie, 49 (C/S 12)
 - Ouickie, and actions, 62-63 (C/S 17)
 - use all processes, 13 (C/S 2)
 - violations, 7 (C/S 1)
- Grade Chart, 232 (C/S 83RA)
new, 248-51 (C/S 93)
- gradient scales, 39 (C/S 9)
- grading, session, 59-60 (C/S 16)
- graphs, OCA, 162 (C/S 51); *see also* OCA(s)
- green,
Advance Program, 87 (C/S 27)
auditor, 191-92 (C/S 63)
Form, 86 (C/S 26), 149 (C/S 44R),
230 (C/S 83RA)
Form and method of use, 210 (C/S 72)
paper, Advance Program, 88 (C/S 27)
- group processing and Grade Chart, 249 (C/S 93)

H

- handle Int first on the case, 149 (C/S 44R)
- handling auditors,
3 rules, 186 (C/S 61)
by C/S, 61 (C/S 16)
- handwriting,
c/s insists on legible, 196 (C/S 66)
order to practice, 186 (C/S 61)
- hasn't made it, pc who, 153 (C/S 46)
- HDC,
Cl IV auditors can repair a messed-up Int,
115 (C/S 35RA)
pcs after going Ext do, 117 (C/S 35RA)
- Health Form,
after Pc Assessment Form, 169 (C/S 54)
part of chronic somatic program, 57
(C/S 15)
- HGC,
a whole new, 84 (C/S 25)
disintegration, 225 (C/S 81R)
fantastic new line, 81-85 (C/S 25), 96
(C/S 30)
how to get results in, 172 (C/S 56)
splendid sessions, 146 (C/S 42)
- Hidden,
Data Line, decay of tech, 148 (C/S 43)
Data Line, stamping it out, 179-80 (C/S 57)
- Standards, process for, 86 (C/S 26)

SUBJECT INDEX—CASE SUPERVISOR SERIES

- High Crime for a C/S not to write C/S instructions, 44 (C/S 11)
- high TA,
and ARC Breaks, 143 (C/S 41)
and exteriorization, 4 (C/S 1), 106 (C/S 33RA), 109-10 (C/S 33RA-1)
and flows, 105 (C/S 33RA), 108 (C/S 33RA-1), 129-30 (C/S 37R)
and illness, 58 (C/S 15)
and low TA breakthrough, 127 (C/S 37R)
and word clearing, 247 (C/S 92R)
- chronic, 28 (C/S 6)
or low, 117 (C/S 35RA)
or low on Q & A, 33 (C/S 7)
right way to handle, 213 (C/S 74)
same action or Grade done twice, 145 (C/S 42)
source of, 105 (C/S 33RA), 108 (C/S 33RA-1)
usual reasons for, 56 (C/S 15)
- higher levels, assessing pcs to, 144 (C/S 41)
- Hi-1o TA assessment,
and Int RD, 4 (C/S 1)
rules, 131 (C/S 37RA Add.)
Short, 165-67 (C/S 53RJ)
- honesty,
and test lines, 208 (C/S 71A)
of an auditor, 226 (C/S 81R)
of Scientology, 153 (C/S 46)
- hours, (C/S 32RA-1R)
not counted on a salvage red tag session, 227 (C/S 81-1RA)
successfully audited, 59 (C/S 16)
- how to,
get results in an HGC, 172 (C/S 56)
write up a cramming order, 204 (C/S 70R)
- human,
emotion and reaction, 170 (C/S 55)
- Evaluation Chart, 35 (C/S 8)
- I**
- ideal folder-C/S line, 82 (C/S 25)
- if it isn't written it isn't true, 9 (C/S 1), 148 (C/S 43)
- ill, invalidation,
pc physically, 94 (C/S 29)
pcs becoming, 16 (C/S 3)
- illegal patch-ups, 95 (C/S 29)
- illness, item(s),
cause of, 216 (C/S 76)
high TA and, 58 (C/S 15)
run out narrative R3R Triples, 168 (C/S 54)
- incomplete cases, 62 (C/S 17)
- indicators,
reliable, TA and cognitions, 30 (C/S 6)
untruths and auditor bad, 186 (C/S 61)
- inexperienced auditor, 191 (C/S 63)
- insane behavior, apparent pattern of, 74 (C/S 22)
- insanity, 169 (C/S 54)
definition of, 73 (C/S 22)
higher percent of, 72 (C/S 22)
- insecurity, Advanced Course material, 95 (C/S 29)
- institutional cases, steps IX to XVII work on, 26 (C/S 5)
- instruct by reference to HCO B, 233 (C/S 84)
- Int; *see* interiorization
- intensives, 12½ hour, 139 (C/S 39R)
- interest,
on drug items, 229 (C/S 82)
on drugs, 236 (C/S 85)
on evil purposes or intentions, 229 (C/S 82), 236 (C/S 85)
- interiorization,
errors, 115 (C/S 35RA)
handled first, 149 (C/S 44R)
isaremedy, 77 (C/S 23RA)
remedy, 109 (C/S 33RA-1)
Rundown,
a Dianetic action, 120 (C/S 36RB), 125 (C/S 36RB-1R)
and Flow Zero, 92 (C/S 28RA-1), 102
- Corr List, 116 (C/S 35RA), 230 (C/S 83RA)
possible exceptions to, 19 (C/S 3)
- procedure, 130 (C/S 37R)
repair, 185 (C/S 60)
when handled, 90 (C/S 28RA), 92 (C/S 28RA-1), 151 (C/S 44R Add.)
summary, 76-78 (C/S 23RA)
- interne(s), 163 (C/S 52)
definition of, 163 (C/S 52)
doing FESes, 65 (C/S 19)
- Interviews, PTS, 222 (C/S 79)
- invalidate button, use of, 3 (C/S 1)
- invalidated, repairing handled repairs makes case feel, 62 (C/S 17)
- auditor, by C/S, 147 (C/S 43)
kills auditors, 180 (C/S 57)
remarks by C/S, 60 (C/S 16)
- blow up F/N, 141 (C/S 40)
confusions on reading, 80 (C/S 24)
Dianetic, never run twice, 5 (C/S 1)
flows of, 129-30 (C/S 37R)
- found out of session, 220 (C/S 78)
giving the pc the, 133 (C/S 37R Add. 3)
metering reading, 79-80 (C/S 24)

SUBJECT INDEX—CASE SUPERVISOR SERIES

item(s) (*cont.*)

running an unreading item and Int, 76 (C/S 23RA)
suppress and invalidate on an, 3 (C/S 1)
unreading, 3 (C/S 1), 56, 58 (C/S 15), 80 (C/S 24)
wrong, and upset case, 221 (C/S 78)
Ivory Tower, 170 (C/S 55)

J

judgment in, low TA(s), 28, 29 (C/S 6), 141 (C/S 40)
C/Sing for auditors, 191 (C/S 63)
ending session, 2 (C/S 1)

K

key out, engrams or secondaries or locks, 56 (C/S 15)
know before you go, 188 (C/S 62)
knowledge, a C/S's, 183 (C/S 58)

L

L1 C, 230 (C/S 83RA)
L3RD, 119 (C/S 36RB), 123-24 (C/S 36RB-1R), 231 (C/S 83RA)
L4BR, 231 (C/S 83RA)
L9S,
 using, 135 (C/S 37R Add. 3)
 works on all cases, 133 (C/S 37R Add. 3)
L IX Hi-1o TA List, 230 (C/S 83RA)
Library, Cramming must have a, 148 (C/S 43)
life,
 interjections, reasons for intensives, 137 (C/S 38)
 pc's, if not audited before, 147 (C/S 43)
 Repair and Drug Rundown, 248 (C/S 93)
 Repair and Grade Chart, 249 (C/S 93)
 Repairs (Progress), 63 (C/S 17)
lighter not heavier action regarding Effect Scale, 18 (C/S 3)
list(s), medicine, treat like drugs, 168 (C/S 54)
 Dianetic, and wrong list reactions, 221 (C/S 78)
errors, Dianetic, 184 (C/S 59)
handle after Int, 149 (C/S 44R), 151 (C/S 44R Add.)
numbers of, 210 (C/S 72)
out, 221 (C/S 78)
out of valence, 162 (C/S 51)
outness, 86 (C/S 26)
prepared, 149 (C/S 44R), 151 (C/S 44R Add.)
prepared, and C/S data, 188 (C/S 62)
question not reading, 3 (C/S 1)

list(s) (*cont.*)

reconstruct the, 220 (C/S 78)
repair, 185 (C/S 60)
trouble and C/S directions, 3 (C/S 1)
trouble and prepared lists to handle, 3 (C/S 1)
use of correction, 209 (C/S 72), 230-32 (C/S 83RA)
listing out of session, 220 (C/S 78)
long C/Ses, 87 (C/S 27)
lost folder, 66 (C/S 19)

K

and flows, 129 (C/S 37R)
and word clearing, 247 (C/S 92R)
assessing, 129 (C/S 37R), 132 (C/S 37R Add. 2R)
assessment, 141 (C/S 40)
case, thorough job must be done on, 131 (C/S 37R Add.)
overwhelming flow and out TRs can cause, 129 (C/S 37R)
pc in apathy, overwhelmed or run on flat or unreading item, 58 (C/S 15)
quits, 143 (C/S 41)
same action will bring it up again, 143 (C/S 41)

M

major action(s),
 and case set-ups, 6 (C/S 1)
 and No-Interference Area, 212 (C/S 73)
 definition of, 6 (C/S 1)
mixing, 136 (C/S 38)
major auditing actions, 211 (C/S 73)
mandatory C/Sing checklist, 200-02 (C/S 69R)
mannerism changes, C/S request for, 36 (C/S 8)
mass and overrun, 127 (C/S 37R)
massy thetans, 105-06 (C/S 33RA), 109 (C/S 33RA-1)
meaning of things secondary to forces in processing, 28 (C/S 6)
mental,
 masses-forces-energy, 29 (C/S 6)
 treatment, run out, 168 (C/S 54)
meter check at Success, 208 (C/S 71A)
metering,
 and correction lists, 209 (C/S 72)
 and failed sessions, 244 (C/S 90)
 reading items, 79-80 (C/S 24)
 reading items, data unknown can cost case failures, 80 (C/S 24)
Method 3, 210 (C/S 72)
Method 5, how to do GF, 86 (C/S 26)

SUBJECT INDEX—CASE SUPERVISOR SERIES

method of use of correction lists, 210 (C/S 72)
mighty weapon—new uses for the Green Form, 86 (C/S 26)
mimicry and repair, 20 (C/S 3)
misprogramming and programming, 99 (C/S 31)
mixing major actions, TRs Course and auditing, 136 (C/S 38)
more auditing, pcs who haven't made it sign up for, 153 (C/S 46)
motivator, pc will not recover fully if only run, 74 (C/S 22)
mutual out ruds, handling, 246 (C/S 91)
routine check for, 246 (C/S 91)

N

nature of man, basically good, 73 (C/S 22)
never, overload, what is, 253 (C/S 94)
blame the pc, 146 (C/S 42)
make trouble, 147 (C/S 43)
new,
Grade Chart, 248 (C/S 93)
items from worksheets for C/S, 27 (C/S 5)
uses for the Green Form, 86 (C/S 26)
no,
materials on tech courses, 178-79 (C/S 57)
mention, session grading, 59-60 (C/S 16)
read auditors, 142 (C/S 41)
variables in what the pgms are, 27 (C/S 5)
no-case-gain, remedy for, 255 (C/S 95)
no interest,
and Exp Dn on evil purposes or intentions, 229 (C/S 82), 236 (C/S 85)
items and Drug Rundowns, 229 (C/S 82), 236 (C/S 85)
No-Interference Area, 211 (C/S 73)
non-confront and the C/S, 154 (C/S 47)
non-F/N, indicates need of Repair and Return, 51
at Exam, flagrant out tech, 112 (C/S 34)
cases, 112 (C/S 34)
note on VIII auditing, 25 (C/S 5)
not making it, pc who is, 157 (C/S 48R)
nulling and F/Ning prepared lists, 240 (C/S 87)

O

objection to force by thetans, 28 (C/S 6)
OCA(s),
D of P operates by, 205 (C/S 71)
graph, dropped, 162 (C/S 51)
graph, out of valence, 162 (C/S 51)
word clearing, 207-08 (C/S 71A)
OK to Audit, 163-64 (C/S 52)

operations, run out if reads, 168 (C/S 54)
opinion, auditor, not important, 171 (C/S 55)
optimum rate of change and standard processes, 36 (CjS 8)
order, C/S standing, 213 (C/S 74)
Org C/S responsible for all cases, 96 (C/S 30)
out,
of ARC, 128 (C/S 37R)
of valence, 162 (C/S 51)
points, a case is a collection of, 21 (C/S 4)
points, a C/S should spot, 199 (C/S 68)
program plays havoc with pcs, 16 (C/S 3)
ruds, mutual, 246 (C/S 91)
tech, flagrant, and non-F/Ning pcs, 112 (C/S 34)
TRs, 129 (C/S 37R)
TRs and failed sessions, 244 (C/S 90)
TRs, remedy for, 244 (C/S 90)
overrepair, 147 (C/S 43)
and thorough C/Ses, 88 (C/S 27)
overrun(s),
and Full Flow Dianetics, 119-20 (C/S 36RB), 124 (C/S 36RB-1R)
and Int, 77 (C/S 23RA)
flagrant, 113 (C/S 34)
listing for, 128 (C/S 37R)
listing questions, 128 (C/S 37R)
reverse action is continue, 128 (C/S 37R)
TAs go high on, 56 (C/S 15)
to audit, 127,128 (C/S 37R)
overshooting defined, 62 (C/S 17)
overt-motivator, running, 74 (C/S 22)
overts on pcs, critical auditor, 8 (C/S 1)
overwhelm,
at Grade IV, 38 (C/S 9)
earlier Grades out, 32 (C/S 7)
handling the pc in, 17,18-19 (C/S 3)
(C/S 13R)
pc generally right when says he's overwhelmed or upset, 33 (C/S 7)
too steep a gradient or heavy a process, 28 (C/S 6)

P

pc,
Assessment Form, 4 (C/S 1)
Assessment Sheet, begin Dianetics with, 168 (C/S 54)
assignment, 226 (C/S 81R)
doing well, 65 (C/S 19)
in trouble, 106-07 (C/S 33RA), 110 (C/S 33RA-1)

SUBJECT INDEX—CASE SUPERVISOR SERIES

- pc (*cont.*) procurement,
in trouble and TA high, 116 (C/S 35RA)
not in trouble, 106 (C/S 33RA), 110
(C/S 33RA-1)
reality and no change, 35 (C/S 8)
search, 29 (C/S 6)
too wild to audit, 20 (C/S 3)
when he's made it sent to attest by C/S,
153 (C/S 46)
who knows what is wrong, 32 (C/S 7)
perception,
improves on flows, 169 (C/S 54)
reduces in ratio to overts, 154 (C/S 47)
persistent F/N, 67 (C/S 20)
personal relationships and auditor's rights,
225 (C/S 81 R)
pink paper, Progress Program is on, 88
(C/S 27)
plus points, the big, 98 (C/S 30)
points on case supervision, 4445 (C/S 11)
Potential Trouble Source; *see* PTS
Power,
done twice, 97 (C/S 30), 145 (C/S 42)
repair, 24-25 (C/S 5)
PRD and auditor flubs, 233 (C/S 84)
preOTs don't C/S, 214-15 (C/S 75)
prepared lists,
and auditor eyesight, 240 (C/S 87)
and metering, 240 (C/S 87)
and misunderstood words, 240 (C/S 87)
and out TRs, 240 (C/S 87), 244 (C/S 90)
and the C/S, 240 (C/S 87)
and use of suppress and invalidate
buttons, 240 (C/S 87)
combine finding out with handling, 189
(C/S 62)
failure to use, 209 (C/S 72)
F/Ning, 240 (C/S 87)
give C/S new data, 189 (C/S 62)
not reading and not F/Ning, 240 (C/S 87)
requirements, 245 (C/S 90)
prepcheck, 2wc lighter than, 43 (C/S 10)
pressures on D of P, 33 (C/S 7);
see also D of P
primary,
failure, 244 (C/S 90)
record is the pc's folders, 190 (C/S 62)
process(es),
37R; *see* thirty-seven R (37R)
jumping, 14 (C/S 2)
misprogrammed lower level, 17 (C/S 3)
short-cut, 40 (C/S 9)
should not be extracted, 151 (C/S 44R Add.)
unflat, repair has priority, 16 (C/S 3)
use all for each Grade, 13 (C/S 2)
letters, 85 (C/S 25)
new pc, 85 (C/S 25)
product purpose and Why and WC error
correction, 220 (C/S 78)
program(s), programmed, programming,
Advance; *see* Advance Program
and misprogramming, 99 (C/S 31)
and the C/S Series, 250 (C/S 93)
and the Grade Chart, 250 (C/S 93)
case incorrectly, 16, 17 (C/S 3)
cases backwards, 182-83 (C/S 58)
chronic somatic, 57 (C/S 15)
crash training of auditors, 70 (C/S 21)
cross, 137-38 (C/S 38)
current, on inside of folder, 145 (C/S 42)
definition of, 6 (C/S 1), 10 (C/S 2)
Dianetic, and drugs, 158 (C/S 48R)
Dianetics, correct, 169 (C/S 54)
dispersing away from, 11 (C/S 2)
EP, 147 (C/S 43)
errors, 97 (C/S 30)
from prepared lists, 149-50 (C/S 44R)
from White Form, 169 (C/S 54)
for flubless auditing, 176-81 (C/S 57)
hopeful, 99 (C/S 31)
intelligently, 190 (C/S 62)
interjected by pc, 137 (C/S 38)
length of, 87 (C/S 27)
long, saves C/S time, 37 (C/S 9)
major errors in, lay case open to
goofed sessions, 16 (C/S 3)
necessity of working on a case by, 13
(C/S 2)
of cases, 10 (C/S 2)
of fat folder cases cover lists, 65 (C/S 19)
principal six errors of, 99 (C/S 31)
Progress; *see* Progress Program
quality, 99 (C/S 31)
quickie, 219 (C/S 77)
recovery, 48 (C/S 12)
Repair; *see* Repair Program
Return; *see* Return Program
sequence of, 151 (C/S 44R Add.)
short-cutting, 40 (C/S 9)
standard 121h hour intensive, 139 (C/S 39R)
three types, 11 (C/S 2)
TRs are a major, 137, 138 (C/S 38)
visual idea, 138 (C/S 38)
violations, 7 (C/S 1)
winning, 147 (C/S 43)
Progress Program, 44 (C/S 11), 48 (C/S 12),
87, 88 (C/S 27), 145 (C/S 42), 151
(C/S 44R Add.); *see also* Repair Program
sample, 139 (C/S 39R)

SUBJECT INDEX—CASE SUPERVISOR SERIES

protest and high TA, 150 (C/S 44R)
psychiatrist is fading, 75 (C/S 22)
psychiatry descended into insane barbarism,
14 (C/S 2)
psychosis, description of, 72-73 (C/S 22)
psychotic,
 being, 74 (C/S 22)
 motivation of, 74 (C/S 22)
PTP, 57 (C/S 15)
PTS,
 alternative wording, 221 (C/S 78)
Interviews, 222 (C/S 79)
Rundown,
 Correction List, 231 (C/S 83RA)
 makes a person not PTS, 216 (C/S 76)
 product is a pc no longer PTS, 218
 (C/S 77)
situation is the reason for illness and
 loss of gains, 217 (C/S 76)
SP tech, 217 (C/S 76)
staff, 194 (C/S 65R)

Q

Q and A,
 and F/Ns, 243 (C/S 89)
 C/S, 27 (C/S 5), 32-34 (C/S 7)
 C/S, and programs, 243 (C/S 89)
 C/Sing a win, 33 (C/S 7)
 next Grade please, 33 (C/S 7)
 with F/Ns, the results of, 243 (C/S 89)
 with significance, 34 (C/S 7)
Quad Dianetics,
 and Dianetic remedies, 93 (C/S 28RA-1)
 and Int RD, 102 (C/S 32RA-1R)
 and OTs, 104 (C/S 32RA-1R)
 and upper level auditors, 93 (C/S 28RA-1)
 auditor checkout of, 92 (C/S 28RA-1)
 auditor errors in running, 172 (C/S 36RB-1R)
 cancelled, 76 (C/S 23RA)
 C/Sing, 91 (C/S 28RA-1)
 dangers of, 122-26 (C/S 36RB-1R)
 flows, 103 (C/S 32RA-1R)
 getting in all flows, 102 (C/S 32RA-1 R),
 109 (C/S 33RA-1)
 and firefights, 110 (C/S 33RA-1)
 and repair, 103-04 (C/S 32RA-1R)
 rehab or run, 110 (C/S 33RA-1)
 multiple somatic items, 103 (C/S 32RA-1 R)
 narrative items, 103 (C/S 32RA-1R)
 promotion of, 93 (C/S 28RA-1)
 requirements to run, 122 (C/S 36RB-1R)
 reruns, triple and, 108 (C/S 33RA-1)
 results of, 93 (C/S 28RA-1), 110
 (C/S 33RA-1)

Quad Dianetics (*cont.*)
 safe actions, 125 (C/S 36RB-1R)
 use of, 91-93 (C/S 28RA-1), 102-04
 (C/S 32RA-1R)
Quadruple Dianetics, dangers of, 122
 (C/S 36RB-1R)
Qual,
 Cramming and auditor flubs, 244 (C/S 90)
 library, 98 (C/S 30)
qualifications, auditor, 130 (C/S 37R)
quality,
 C/S, 99 (C/S 31)
 of auditing raised, 99 (C/S 31)
 programming, 99 (C/S 31)
questions,
 reading, 79-80 (C/S 24)
 unreading, 3 (C/S 1)
quickie, 38 (C/S 9)
 defined, 218-19 (C/S 77)
Drug Rundown, 229 (C/S 82)
Grades and action, 62-63 (C/S 17)
Grades crashed whole of Scientology
 network, 38 (C/S 9)
Grades, technical bug behind, 68 (C/S 20)
lower Grades, 26 (C/S 5)
 Power technical bugs, 68 (C/S 20)

R

R3R,
 commands, used on Quad Dianetics, 103
 (C/S 32RA-1R)
 commands, used on Triple Dianetics, 101
 (C/S 32RA)
 flubbed, 76 (C/S 23RA)
R6EW, falsely gotten to, 22 (C/S 4)
rabbit, a preOT can, 215 (C/S 75)
rabbiting druggie, 211 (C/S 73)
reach and withdraw, 20 (C/S 3)
read,
 no, suspected by C/S, 80 (C/S 24)
 the most stopped, 128 (C/S 37R)
reading items, 149-50 (C/S 44R)
 data unknown can cost case failures, 80
 (C/S 24)
 metering, 79-80 (C/S 24)
reads gotten on clearing commands, 142
 (C/S 41)
red sheet, Repair Program is on, 14 (C/S 2),
 44 (C/S 11)
red tab word clearing errors, 247 (C/S 92R)
red tag,
 and use of correction lists, 227 (C/S 81-1 RA)
 auditor is expected to handle, 237
 (C/S 86RD)

SUBJECT INDEX—CASE SUPERVISOR SERIES

- red tag (*cont.*)
 daily action, 238 (C/S 86RD)
 line, 237-38 (C/S 86RD)
 Pc Examiner makes a daily list of all
 red tags, 238 (C/S 86RD)
 penalty for not handling, 227 (C/S 81-1RA),
 239 (C/S 86RD)
 second, 227 (C/S 81-1RA)
 when a folder is red tagged, 237 (C/S 86RD)
 who takes it off, 238 (C/S 86RD)
reduction of refunds—C/Ses and overload,
 252-53 (C/S 94)
refusing to audit pcs, 1 (C/S 1)
 reason why, 225 (C/S 81 R)
Registrar sells auditing not “Repair Pgm”,
 26 (C/S 5)
rehab, handled, 156 (C/S 48R)
 correction action on wins is rehab, not
 repair, 33 (C/S 7)
 of chains, 118-19 (C/S 36RB), 123
 (C/S 36RB-1R)
 of chains left unflat, 113-14 (C/S 34)
 on Grade done twice, 112 (C/S 34)
 past major action, 105 (C/S 33RA),
 108 (C/S 33RA-1)
remedy, auditors, 69 (C/S 21)
 for auditor who says his pcs are “dogs”,
 223 (C/S 80)
 for C/S who agrees with auditor about
 “dog pcs”, 223-24 (C/S 80)
 for org, 174-75 (C/S 56)
 Int is a, 77-78 (C/S 23RA)
 lighter for the worse off case, 18 (C/S 3)
repair(s), repairing, 221 (C/S 78)
 a repair, 4243 (C/S 10)
 action, product purpose and Why and word
 clearing error correction, 220 (C/S 78)
 an auditor, 232 (C/S 83RA)
 and case gain, 232 (C/S 83RA)
 and Full Flow Dianetics, 101 (C/S 32RA)
 and high TA, 116 (C/S 35RA)
 and “no interest” items, 229 (C/S 82),
 236 (C/S 85)
 and preOTs, 211 (C/S 73)
 definition and data on, 6 (C/S 1)
 delays in, 16 (C/S 2)
 Dianetic, of flubs by L3, 169 (C/S 54)
 for pc running badly, 4 (C/S 1)
 of Int, 77 (C/S 23RA)
Program, 62 (C/S 17), 145 (C/S 42);
 see also Progress Program
 accepting a new, 2 (C/S 1)
 and their priority, 16 (C/S 3)
 dated session by session, 14 (C/S 2)
 EP of, 17 (C/S 3), 232 (C/S 83RA)
Repair Program (*cont.*)
 example, 24-25 (C/S 5)
 gets off overwhelm, 21 (C/S 4)
 programming, BPC, 18 (C/S 3)
 the case, 17 (C/S 3)
 using lists and errors in current life, 13
 (C/S 2)
 when done, 250 (C/S 93)
report(s),
 after session Examiner’s, 46 (C/S 11)
 auditor’s, 46 (C/S 11)
 out admin—liability, 4647 (C/S 11)
resistive cases,
 an VIII development now on GF, 51
 (C/S 13R)
 won’t make case gains until drugs are
resistive, tagged by C/S, 189 (C/S 62)
result(s),
 honest C/Sing gives honest, 41 (C/S 9)
 orgs didn’t attain result on the pc, 38
 (C/S 9)
 reorganize to get, when only 65% F/Ning
 sessions occur, 173 (C/S 56)
retrain, retraining, 233 (C/S 84)
 auditors from Missions, 235 (C/S 84-1)
 flunk and, 60 (C/S 16)
retread, 233 (C/S 84)
Return Program(s), 11, 14 (C/S 2), 21 (C/S 4);
 see also Advance Program
 definition and example, 22 (C/S 4)
 is for return to the false point, 22 (C/S 4)
 now called Advance Programs, 44 (C/S 11)
 old, 22 (C/S 4)
Review C/S looks over the sessions, 83 (C/S 25)
reviewing,
 folders, 4546 (C/S 11)
 reviews, 8 (C/S 1)
R-factor, never give future or past, 142
 (C/S 41)
ridges and flows, 129 (C/S 37R)
rise, use of in 37R on low TAs, 141 (C/S 40)
Rising Scale, 40 (C/S 9)
risk of FFD, Int-Ext RD and Power, 121
 (C/S 36RB), 125 (C/S 36RB-1 R)
roller-coaster, 72 (C/S 22)
 and drugs, 156 (C/S 48R)
rudiments, ruds,
 and GF, 3 (C/S 1)
 and high TA, 4 (C/S 1)
 and long C/Ses, 87 (C/S 27)
 and sessions far apart, 3 (C/S 1)
 auditing over out, 2-3 (C/S 1), 149, 150
 (C/S 44R)

SUBJECT INDEX—CASE SUPERVISOR SERIES

- rudiments, ruds (*cont.*)
definition and data, 6 (C/S 1)
getting one's own in, 8 (C/S 1)
going out and handling, 5-6 (C/S 1)
handle after Int and lists, 149 (C/S 44R),
151 (C/S 44R Add.)
in 2-way comm, 54-55 (C/S 14)
inability to fly, 3 (C/S 1)
life knocking out, 94 (C/S 29)
mutual out, 246 (C/S 91)
out, don't audit with, 2-3 (C/S 1), 149,
150 (C/S 44R)
out during 37R, 133 (C/S 37R Add. 3)
put in after Int and list repair, 185
(C/S 60)
suppress and false, 3 (C/S 1)
- rule; *see also* rules
auditor, F/N before next C/S action, 136
(C/S 38)
blow up and 37R, low TAs, 141 (C/S 40)
broad, and C/Sing, 189 (C/S 62)
continued session, 214 (C/S 75)
firm, C/S only with all folders to hand,
45 (C/S 11)
general, return to where case was running
well, 113 (C/S 34)
mandatory, Cramming Of ficer in all
HGCs, 199 (C/S 68)
the Ivory Tower, 170 (C/S 55)
- rules; *see also* rule
c/s; *see c/s* rules
exact tech application, 152 (C/S 45)
firm, on auditing the insane, 74 (C/S 22)
first aid, 160 (C/S 49R)
Hi-1o TA assessment, 131 (C/S 37R Add.)
major C/S, for TRs Course, 136 (C/S 38)
of C/Sing 2-way comm, 54-55 (C/S 14)
three golden, of the C/S, 186-87 (C/S 61)
to improve tech results you must improve
administration, 172 (C/S 56)
TR Course and auditing, 136 (C/S 38)
two, complete and incomplete actions on
a case, 63 (C/S 17)
- S**
- sanity is basically honesty and truth, 208
(C/S 71A)
- self-auditing,
and handling, 94 (C/S 29)
manifestation of overwhelm, 35 (C/S 8)
reason for, 220 (C/S 78)
symptom of session or study or life
overwhelm, 16-17 (C/S 3)
- seniors,
C/S (for tech) and D of P (for auditors
and bodies), 84 (C/S 25)
in tech, 178 (C/S 57)
- sequence,
new, Tech Services lines, 82-84 (C/S 25)
of programs, 51 (C/S 44R Add.)
overt-motivator, 74 (C/S 22)
- session(s),
by-passed charge, 18,19 (C/S 3)
continued, rule, 214 (C/S 75)
C/S for several, 214 (C/S 75)
Dianetic, 87 (C/S 27)
economical, 87 (C/S 27)
ending the, 2 (C/S 1)
grading by C/S, 59-60 (C/S 16)
grading form, 81 (C/S 25)
grading—Well Done, definition of, 59
(C/S 16)
logged, 81 (C/S 25)
priorities-Repair Programs and their
priority, 16 (C/S 3)
running badly, 4 (C/S 1)
scheduling and programs, 3 (C/S 1)
splendid HGC, 146 (C/S 42)
starts, don't mix them, 143 (C/S 41)
that went wrong, 9 (C/S 1)
violent, ARC Break, 184 (C/S 59)
- set up(s),
definition, 6 (C/S 1)
for next major action, 146 (C/S 42)
when Repair Program concluded case is,
21 (C/S 4)
- seven flows, 131 (C/S 37R Add.)
- Sheet, Pc Assessment, 168 (C/S 54)
- short-cutting,
processes, 40 (C/S 9)
programs, 40 (C/S 9)
- short Hi-1o TA assessment C/S,
165 (C/S 53RJ)
- sickly and feeble cases, 87 (C/S 27)
- sick pcs,
a lot of things to do for, 39 (C/S 9)
an indicator of wild program, C/S and
auditing error, 113 (C/S 34)
- sick person is PTS, 222 (C/S 79)
- significances, no change when only
addressed, 35 (C/S 8)
- significance, the search of the pc is for, 29
(C/S 6)
- simplicity of running Int, 117 (C/S 35RA)
- skill,
and talking the TA down, 213 (C/S 74)
- auditing, improvement of, between R6
and OT III, 212 (C/S 73)

SUBJECT INDEX—CASE SUPERVISOR SERIES

- solo,
D of P keeps tabs on all solo pcs, 214-15
(C/S 75)
failure on, 212 (C/S 73)
pcs on lines, 214 (C/S 75)
set-ups, 249 (C/S 93)
somatics, chronic; *see* chronic somatics
speed liability, 4041 (C/S 9)
stable data, HCO Bs and tapes are the, 148
(C/S 43)
staff is the public of a Staff C/S, 194
(C/S 65R)
stale-dated,
C/S, 2 (C/S 1)
pgm, 2 (C/S 1)
stalled cases and mutual out ruds, 248
(C/S 91)
standard,
12½ hour intensive programs, 139 (C/S 39R)
auditing, 57 (C/S 15)
auditing actions, 218 (C/S 77)
tech, was it applied, 46 (C/S 11)
standing order from C/S to his auditors, 213
(C/S 74)
stats of,
auditors, 226 (C/S 81R)
C/S, 226 (C/S 81R)
the D of P, 226 (C/S 81R)
stop, effort to, 127 (C/S 37R)
study,
Correction List, 231 (C/S 83RA)
rundowns, 95 (C/S 29)
success,
meter check at, 208 (C/S 71A)
stories, real stat of an org, 38 (C/S 9)
Summaries, Folder Error; *see* Folder Error
Summaries
summary, three golden rules of the C/S—handling
each session, 145 (C/S 42)
session, and preOTs, 215 (C/S 75)
superficial actions and fast quick results, 37
(C/S 9)
suppress button, use of, 3 (C/S 1)
suppressive,
pc, 222 (C/S 79)
person, 72 (C/S 22)
supreme test of a C/S, 154 (C/S 47)
symptoms of insanity are from the same cause,
73 (C/S 22)
- T**
- TA(s),
goes up after 37R, 133 (C/S 37R Add. 3)
high; *see* high TA
- TA(s) (*cont.*)
Hi-Lo, assessment rules, 131 (C/S 37R Add.)
low; *see* low TA
masses and ridges, 127 (C/S 37R)
short Hi-Lo, assessment C/S, 165
(C/S 53RJ)
talking the TA down modified, 213 (C/S 74)
team activity, auditing is a, 172 (C/S 56)
tech,
action regarding repair, 26 (C/S 5)
advice, giving, 178 (C/S 57)
degrades, 241 (C/S 88R)
degrades and down stats, 241 (C/S 88R)
degrades, handling, 24142 (C/S 88R)
degrades, policy covering, 24142 (C/S 88R)
exactness, 152 (C/S 45)
out, flagrant and non-F/Ns, 112 (C/S 34)
pages, 84 (C/S 25)
Services, 82 (C/S 25)
Services, new sequence, 82-84 (C/S 25)
suppressive person, 162 (C/S 51)
technical point, sending pc to attest, 153
(C/S 46)
testing for read, 54 (C/S 14)
test person, 207 (C/S 71A)
tests,
and D of P, 205-06 (C/S 71)
OCA, etc., 207 (C/S 71A)
thirty-seven R (37R),
don'ts regarding, 134-35 (C/S 37R Add. 3)
Hi-Lo TA assessment rules, 131
(C/S 37R Add.)
low TA assessing, 132 (C/S 37R Add. 2R)
process commands, 128 (C/S 37R)
rudis, 133 (C/S 37R Add. 3)
special, 135 (C/S 37R Add. 3)
steps, 134 (C/S 37R Add. 3)
- auditors, 186 (C/S 61)
tick, note, 79 (C/S 24)
tone,
emotional, 72 (C/S 22)
improvement of, 205 (C/S 71)
lowered, 221 (C/S 78)
tools of,
a C/S, 183 (C/S 58)
auditing, 182 (C/S 58)
Touch Assist, 160 (C/S 49R)
and reach and withdraw, 20 (C/S 3)
exception to Repair Pgm, 7 (C/S 1)
- training,
a pc who has trouble needs, 49 (C/S 12)
C/S responsibility, 69-71 (C/S 21)
of ficer of auditing, 176 (C/S 57)
stages, 69 (C/S 21)

SUBJECT INDEX—CASE SUPERVISOR SERIES

Triple(s),

- always run Dianetic, 74 (C/S 22)
- and OTs, 101 (C/S 32RA)
- and Ouad reruns, 108 (C/S 33RA-1)
- C/Sing, 89 (C/S 28RA)
- Dianetic, 7 (C/S 1)
- Flow Dianetics, 89 (C/S 28RA)
- Flows, 100 (C/S 32RA)
- getting in all flows, 106 (C/S 33RA)
 - and firefights, 107 (C/S 33RA)
 - and repair, 101 (C/S 32RA)
 - rehab or run, 107 (C/S 33RA)
- multiple somatic items, 101 (C/S 32RA)
- narrative items, 101 (C/S 32RA)
- PTP for C/S, 161 (C/S 50)
- reruns, 105 (C/S 33RA)
- safe actions, 120 (C/S 36RB)
- TRs, 118 (C/S 36RB), 122-23 (C/S 36RB-1R)
 - and correction lists, 209-10 (C/S 72)
 - and Cramming, 20 (C/S 3)
 - and drugs, 20 (C/S 3), 157 (C/S 48R)
 - and No-Interference Area, 211-12 (C/S 73)
- Course and auditing—mixing major actions, 136 (C/S 38)
- major program, 137, 138 (C/S 38)
- trust earned by great results, 170 (C/S 55)
- truth and declares, 153 (C/S 46)
- two-way comm,
 - in repair, 16 (C/S 3)
 - on BD items in repair, 87 (C/S 27)
 - ruds in, 54-55 (C/S 14)
 - rules of C/Sing, 54-55 (C/S 14)

U

- unconscious pc, audited off a meter, 160 (C/S 49R)
- undershooting, a defeating error, 62 (C/S 17)
- unflat, yellow tabs on folder of PTSSs, 217 (C/S 76)
- chain left, 69 (C/S 21)
- engram chains, 28 (C/S 6), 56 (C/S 15)
- on Dianetics, 13, 14 (C/S 2)
- process has priority, 16 (C/S 3)
- R6EW, 22 (C/S 4)
- unreading question, 3 (C/S 1)
- unrun flows, 113 (C/S 34)
- use of,
 - correction lists, 209 (C/S 72)
 - Dianetics, 89 (C/S 28RA), 100 (C/S 32RA)
 - Quad Dianetics, 102 (C/S 32RA-1R)
 - Quadruple Dianetics, 91 (C/S 28RA-1)

V

- valence,
 - out of, 162 (C/S 51)
 - shifter, LX1 LX2 LX3 can be done triple, 52 (C/S 13R)

W

- waiver, 33 (C/S 7)
- well done auditing hour, 81 (C/S 25)
- “well done”, definition of, 59, 61 (C/S 16)
- what the C/S is doing, 28 (C/S 6)
- Why, Cramming finds the real, 199 (C/S 68)
- widening of F/N, 67-68 (C/S 20)
- wide vision in session, 80 (C/S 24)
- win, let the pc have his, 67 (C/S 20)
- wins,
 - a C/S wants, 152 (C/S 45)
 - as items, 27 (C/S 5)
 - org, 174 (C/S 56)

- word clearing,
 - and F/Ning each word, 247 (C/S 92R)
 - Correction List, 231 (C/S 83RA)
 - each word of each command, 218 (C/S 77)
 - errors, 247 (C/S 92R)
 - OCAs, 207 (C/S 71A)
 - on auditors, 178, 179-80 (C/S 57)

- worksheets,
 - auditor's, 196 (C/S 66)
 - Contact Assist, 247 (C/S 92R)
 - “non-session”, 247 (C/S 92R)
 - PTS Interview, 222 (C/S 79)
 - Touch Assist, 247 (C/S 92R)
 - Why finding, 247 (C/S 92R)
 - word clearing, 247 (C/S 92R)
- worst tangle, 185 (C/S 60)

Y

- Zero Flow, 100 (C/S 32RA), 102, 103 (C/S 32RA-1R), 107 (C/S 33RA), 110 (C/S 33RA-1)
- and Int-Ext RD, 92 (C/S 28RA-1)
- and Introspection RD, 101 (C/S 32RA)
- command, 103 (C/S 32RA-1R), 109 (C/S 33RA-1)

Z

- 381

CASE SUPERVISOR SERIES

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF TITLES

Assists (5 July 71R, C/S 49R)	159	Dangers of Quadruple Dianetics (21 Apr. 71-1 R, C/S 36RB-1 R)	122
Auditing of Staff & Public (BTB 6 Oct. 71R, C/S 65R)	194	Declares (19 June 71, C/S 46)	153
Auditor's Rights (23 Aug. 71, C/S 1)	1	Dianetic Case Supervisor's Index, The (BTB 25 Apr. 71R)	255
Auditor's Rights Addition Revised (BTB 28 Dec. 72RA, C/S 81-1 RA)	227	Dianetic Handling of Chronic Somatic (11 Sept. 70, C/S 18)	64
Auditor's Rights Modified (16 June 72R, C/S 81R)	225	Dianetic HCO B—Interest (10 Aug. 72, C/S 82)	229
Auditor's Worksheets (3 Nov. 71, C/S 66)	196	Dianetic List Errors (14 Sept. 71, C/S 59)	184
Beginning a Pc on Dianetics (28 July 71, C/S 54)	168	Dianetics (21 Apr. 71RB, C/S 36RB)	118
Case Actions, Off Line (8 Mar. 71, C/S 29)	94	Dianetics, Beginning a Pc on (28 July 71, C/S 54)	168
Catastrophes From and Repair of "No Interest" Items (13 Sept. 72, C/S 85)	236	D of P Operates by OCAs (19 Dec. 71, C/S 71)	205
Chart of Human Evaluation (19 June 70, C/S 8)	35	"Dog Pcs" (15 June 72, C/S 80)	223
Chronic Somatic, Dianetic Handling of (11 Sept. 70, C/S 18)	64	Drug Handling (15 July 71, C/S 48R)	156
Code of a C/S, The (BTB 30 Nov. 71 R, C/S 67)	197	"Failed" Cases (26 Oct. 75, C/S 95)	254
Correction Lists (BTB 11 Aug. 72RA, C/S 83RA)	230	Fantastic New HGC Line, The (5 Mar. 71, C/S 25)	81
C/S and Cramming Cycles, The (BTB 8 Dec. 71, C/S 68)	199	Flubless C/Sing (16 Aug. 72, C/S 84)	233
C/S as a Training Officer, A—A Program for Flubless Auditing (1 Sept. 71, C/S 57)	176	Flubless C/Sing in Missions (BTB 16 Aug. 72-1, C/S 84-1)	235
C/S Case Gain (15 July 71, C/S 50)	161	F/Ning Auditors (5 Oct. 71, C/S 64)	193
C/Ses and Overload—Reduction of Refunds (25 Sept. 74, C/S 94)	254	F/N What You Ask or Program (20 Nov. 73, C/S 89)	243
C/Sing a PTS Rundown (17 Apr. 72, C/S 76)	216	Folder Error Summaries (6 Oct. 70, C/S 19)	65
C/Sing Auditor-C/Ses (19 Mar. 71, C/S 30)	96	Getting the F/N to Examiner (High, Low TAs and Chronic Somatics)	
C/Sing Checklist (3 Jan. 72, C/S 69 Add.)	203	(16 Aug. 70, C/S 15)	56
C/Sing for New Auditors or Veterans (2 Oct. 71, C/S 63)	191	Glossary of C/S Terrrs (25 June 70, C/S 12)	48
C/Sing 2-Way Comm (3 July 70, C/S 14)	54	Handling Auditors—The Three Golden Rules of the C/S (22 Sept. 71, C/S 61)	186
C/S Q and A (19 June 70, C/S 7)	32	High and Low TA Breakthrough (3 June 71, C/S 37R)	127
C/S Responsibility for Training (10 Nov. 70, C/S 21)	69	Hi-Lo TA Assessment Rules (15 June 71, C/S 37R Add.)	131
C/S Rules (9 June 71, C/S 42)	145	How To Get Results in an HGC (25 Aug. 71, C/S 56)	172
C/S Rules (9 June 71, C/S 43)	147	How To Write Up a Cramming Order (BTB 12 Dec. 71R, C/S 70R)	204
C/S Rules (19 June 71, C/S 45)	152	Incomplete Cases (26 Aug. 70, C/S 17)	62
C/S Rules—Programming From Prepared Lists (10 June 71, C/S 44R)	149	Interiorization Errors (16 Dec. 71RA, C/S 35RA)	115
44R—C/S Rules—The Sequence of Programs (BTB 3 1 Oct. 7 1, C/S 44R Add.)	151	Interiorization Summary (17 Dec. 71 R, C/S 23RA)	76
C/S Series 11 (25 June 70, C/S 11)	44	Interest—Dianetic HCO B (10 Aug. 72, C/S 82)	229
C/S Series 37R Addition 3 (26 June 71, C/S 37R Add. 3)	133	Internes (19 July 71, C/S 52)	163
C/S Tips (9 June 71, C/S 41)	142		

Ivory Tower, The (8 Aug. 71, C/S 55)	170	Repair Example (15 June 70, C/S 5)	24
Know Before You Go		Repairing a Repair (24 June 70, C/S 10)	42
(28 Sept. 71, C/S 62)	188	Repair Pgms and Their Priority—Session	
Long C/Ses (6 Mar. 71, C/S 27)	87	Priorities (13 June 70, C/S 3)	16
Low TA Assessing	132	Return Program, The (14 June 70, C/S 4)	21
(16 June 71R, C/S 37R Add. 2R)	141	Sequence of Programs, The—44R—C/S	
LowTAs(7June71,C/S40)	141	Rules(BTB31 Oct.71,C/S44RAdd.)	151
Mandatory C/Sing Checklist	200	Session Grading—Well Done, Definition	
(BTB 12 Dec. 71R, C/S 69R)	79	of (21 Aug. 70, C/S 16)	59
Metering Reading Items	79	Session Priorities—Repair Pgms and	
(28 Feb. 71, C/S 24)	136	Their Priority (13 June 70, C/S 3)	16
Mixing Major Actions—TRs Course and	246	Short Hi-Lo TA Assessment C/S	
Auditing (26 May 71, C/S 38)	246	(24 Nov. 73RB, C/S 53RJ)	165
Mutual Out Ruds (17 Feb. 74, C/S 91)	248	Standard 121h Hour Intensive Programs	
New Grade Chart (31 Aug. 74, C/S 93)	86	(31 May 71R, C/S 39R)	139
New Uses for the Green Form	211	Superficial Actions (21 June 70, C/S 9)	37
(6 Mar. 71, C/S 26)	112	Supreme Test of a C/S, The	
No-Interference Area, The	211	(20 June 71, C/S 47)	154
(23 Dec. 71, C/S 73)	211	Talking the TA Down Modified	
Non-F/N Cases (6 Apr. 71, C/S 34)	112	(16 Feb. 72, C/S 74)	213
Nulling and F/Ning Prepared Lists	240	Tech Degrades	
(15 Oct. 73, C/S 87)	162	(BTB 22 Oct. 73R, C/S 88R)	241
Out of Valence (17 July 71, C/S 51)	67	Three Golden Rules of the C/S, The	
Persistent F/N (8 Oct. 70, C/S 20)	214	—Handling Auditors	
PreOTs Don't C/S (10 Apr. 72, C/S 75)	244	(22 Sept. 71, C/S 61)	186
Primary Failure, The (6 Dec. 73, C/S 90)	220	Triple and Quad Reruns	
Product Purpose and Why and WC Error	176	(5 Apr. 71, C/S 33RA-1)	108
Correction (20 Apr. 72, C/S 78)	99	Triple Reruns (5 Apr. 71RA, C/S 33RA)	105
Program for Flubless Auditing, A—A C/S	99	TRs Course and Auditing—Mixing Major	
as a Training Officer	182	Actions (26 May 71, C/S 38)	136
(1 Sept. 71 , C/S 57)	149	Use of Correction Lists	
Programming and Misprogramming	10	(20 Dec. 71, C/S 72)	209
(31 Mar. 71, C/S 31)	10	Use of Dianetics (7 Mar. 71RA, C/S 28RA)	89
Programming Cases Backwards	72	Use of Dianetics (4 Apr. 71RA, C/S 32RA)	100
(7 Sept. 71, C/S 58)	182	Use of Quad Dianetics	
Programming From Prepared Lists	149	(4 Apr. 71-1R, C/S 32RA-1R)	102
—C/S Rules (10 June 71, C/S 44R)	149	Use of Quadruple Dianetics	
Programming of Cases	222	(7 Mar. 71, C/S 28RA-1)	91
(12 June 70, C/S 2)	10	VIII Actions (30 June 70R, C/S 13R)	50
Psychosis (28 Nov. 70, C/S 22)	72	Well Done, Definition of—Session Grading	
PTS Interviews (24 Apr. 72, C/S 79)	222	(21 Aug. 70, C/S 16)	59
Quadruple Dianetics—Dangers of	122	What the C/S Is Doing	
(21 Apr. 71-1R, C/S 36RB-1R)	218	(16 June 70, C/S 6)	28
“Quickie” Defined (19 Apr. 72, C/S 77)	237	Word Clearing Errors	
Red Tag Line, The	252	(8 July 74R, C/S 92R)	247
(BTB 20 Jan. 73RD, C/S 86RD)	252	Word Clearing OCAs	
Reduction of Refunds—C/Ses and		(24 Feb. 72, C/S 71A)	207
Overload (25 Sept. 74, C/S 94)		Worst Tangle, The (15 Sept. 71, C/S 60)	185