

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

Remimeo

ALL TECH DIV
ALL QUAL DIV
ETHICS SECTION
CLASS VII INTERNES

STAFF AUDITOR ADVICES

No Staff Auditor or Interne or organization auditor or any auditor on a Staff Co-audit may seek advices on what to do from any person except the officially appointed person doing the auditing folders.

Seeking advice on cases verbally or in writing from the person not doing the folders is OFF LINE except in Ethics matters when Ethics may be consulted or Saint Hill advised.

When an auditor seeks advice off-line and accepts it, unbeknownst to the official supervising the auditing via the folders, a random factor is introduced into the running of cases that can be quite fatal.

At Saint Hill, on Power Processes, such an action is a crime as the consequences can be so catastrophic to cases run on Power Processes.

The proper sources of instruction are tapes and HCOBs. *Adding* bits to these that aren't there is the commonest auditor error.

Asking for unusual solutions from a case supervisor who is doing the folders is a sure sign that the last directives have not been followed; giving instructions that are unusual is useless because they won't be complied with either.

The Dev-T situation of asking for advice off-line burdens lines and fouls up cases.

COMM CYCLE AND ETHICS

When an auditor has a fractured comm cycle very often processing still works on the average pc.

When an auditor has a fractured comm cycle and the pc is an Ethics type case (SP, PTS, W/Hs) a mess ensues. One can always tell if an auditor's comm cycle is poor or if the Code is being broken because when put on an Ethics type pc, things collapse.

When a pc won't run, one can be sure that

1. The Auditor's Comm Cycle is out and
2. The pc is an Ethics type case.

When both these are present, no results can possibly occur.

When only one is present, usually the auditing works somewhat.

CASE SUPERVISOR PUZZLE

When a Case Supervisor doing folders sees a process going wrong, he should not blame the process or his own advice if these are even faintly educated.

Instead the pc is an Ethics type or the Auditor's Comm Cycle is out.

If neither of these seem to be the case and things still go wrong then the auditor just isn't running what he says he is or running what he is supposed to run.

If all the above seems not to be the case, then the auditor is seeking off-line advices and some screwball interpretation has been added to the process.

A clever Case Supervisor marking folders, goes by the text – case running well, continue the standard approach. Case not running well, send to Review for analysis REGARDLESS OF ANY AUDITING TIME LOST.

When a pc goes to Review, it is clever to send the auditor to the Review Cramming Section to check over his Auditor's Code and Comm Cycle with TRs.

If when auditor and pc *still* don't run well, send the pc to Ethics. (Review may already have done so.)

ETHICS

If the Case Supervisor ever finds an auditor not following instructions or seeking or taking off-line directions he must at once send the auditor to Ethics. It is usually an Ethics Hearing and a minor suspension.

If a Case Supervisor doing the folders finds a false report has been made, he *must* send the offender to Ethics.

WITHHOLDS

A pc is not sent to Ethics because of withholds gotten off in a session. However, on the Invalidation button one commonly finds suppressive persons around the pc and the auditor must send the pc to Ethics at session end to get the matter disconnected or handled.

Sometimes one finds another person's offences than the pc's in getting off withholds. These are reported to Ethics for investigation.

TEXT BOOK

D of P work is completely text book. PC doing okay – get on with it as per the process, the next process to be run, or the next grade.

PC not doing okay – to Review to find out why.

If Review finds pc is an Ethics type, sends pc to Ethics.

It's all text book. It is so easy.

L. RON HUBBARD