

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 8 MARCH 1962

**THE BAD “AUDITOR”**

It is time we spent time on improving auditing skill.

We have the technology. We can make clears and OTs with it as you will find out. Our only remaining problem is getting it applied skillfully.

This is why I started the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. The extremely high calibre of auditor we are turning out is causing gasps of amazement whenever these fine graduates return into an area. We are not trying for cases at Saint Hill. I can always make clears. We are trying for skilled auditors. But we are getting there on cases, too, faster than anywhere else on the average.

This training has been almost a year in progress. I have learned much about training that is of great benefit to all of us, without at the same time skimping the training of the Saint Hill student.

Looking over incoming students I find we have, roughly, two general categories of auditor, with many shades of grey between:

1. The natural auditor.
2. The dangerous auditor.

The natural auditor ties right into it and does a workmanlike job. He or she gets lots of bulletin and tape passes in ratio to flunks, absorbs data well and gets it into practice, does a passable job on a PC even at the start of training, and improves casewise rapidly under the skilled training and auditing at Saint Hill. This is true of the clears and releases that come on course as well as those who have had much less case gains prior to this training. These, the natural auditors, make up more than half the incoming students.

The other category we will call the “dangerous auditor”. The severe examples of this category make up about 20% of the incoming students and are very detectable. In shades of grey the other 30% are also, at the start, to be placed in the category of “dangerous auditor unless tightly supervised”.

At Saint Hill, with few exceptions, we only get the cream of auditors and so I would say that the overall percentage across the world is probably higher in the second category than at Saint Hill.

Thus it would seem we must cure this matter at the Academies and cure it broadly throughout Scientology, and if we do, our dissemination, just on this effort alone, should leap several thousand percent. If all PCs audited everywhere were expertly audited, well, think of what that would do. To accomplish this we need only move the dangerous auditor out of the danger class.

I have found out what makes a PC suffer a deterioration of profile (missed withholds) and have found out why a dangerous auditor is dangerous. Therefore, there are no barriers to our handling the matter as even the dangerous auditor, oddly enough, wants to be a good auditor but doesn't quite know how. Now we can fix it up.

The difference between a natural auditor and a dangerous auditor is not case level as we have supposed, but a type of case.

The earliest observation on this came in ACCs. About 1% of the students (say two students every ACC) could be counted on to be miserable if his or her PC made gains and happy if the PC was collapsing. This was an observation. What were these students trying to do? What did they think they should accomplish in a session? They are an extreme case of "dangerous auditor".

This is how to detect a "dangerous auditor" in any shade of grey:

Any auditor who (a) cannot achieve results on a PC, (b) who finds items slowly or not at all, (c) who gets low marks on tape tests, (d) who has a high flunk-to-pass ratio on taking tests for classification, (e) whose own case moves slowly, (f) who does not respond well to a "think" process, (g) who chops a PC's comm, (h) who prevents a PC from executing an auditing command, (i) who obsessively changes processes before one is flat, (j) who apologizes or explains why he or she got no results session after session, (k) who tries to make PCs guilty, (l) who blames Scientology for not working, (m) whose PCs are always ARC breaking, or (n) who will no longer audit at all, is suffering not from withholds but from the reverse of the withhold flow, "Afraid to find out."

The person with withholds is afraid he or she will be found out. The other type of case may have withholds but the dominant block is exactly the reverse. Instead of being afraid he or she will be found out, the opposite type of case is afraid to find out or afraid of what he or she may find out. Thus it is a type of case that makes a dangerous auditor. He or she is afraid of finding out something from the PC. Probably this case is the more usual in society, particularly those who never wish to audit.

A person with withholds is afraid to be found out. Such a person has auditing difficulties as an auditor, of course, because of restraint on their own comm line. These difficulties sum up to an inability to speak during a session, going silent on the PC, failures to ask how or what the PC is doing. But this is not the dangerous auditor. The only dangerous thing an auditor can do is miss withholds and refuse to permit the PC to execute auditing commands. This alone will spin a PC.

The dangerous auditor is not afraid to be found out (for who is questioning him or her while he or she is auditing?). The dangerous auditor is the auditor who is afraid to find out, afraid to be startled, afraid to discover something, afraid of what they will discover. This phobia prevents the "auditor" from flattening anything. This makes missed withholds a certainty. And only missed withholds create ARC breaks.

All cases, of course, are somewhat leery of finding things out and so any old-time auditor could have his quota of ARC breaks on his or her PCs. But the dangerous auditor is neurotic on the subject and all his or her auditing is oriented around the necessity to avoid data for fear of discovering something unpleasant. As auditing is based on finding data, such an auditor retrogresses a case rather than improves it. Such an auditor's own case moves slowly also as they fear to discover something unpleasant or frightening in the bank.

Today, the increased power of auditing makes this factor far more important than it ever was before. Old processes could be done with minimal gain but without harm by such an auditor. Today, the factor of fear-of-discovery in an auditor makes that auditor extremely dangerous to a PC.

In prep-checking, this becomes obvious when an auditor will not actually clean up a chain and skids over withholds, thus "completing" the case by leaving dozens of missed withholds and an accordingly miserable PC.

In Routine 3D Criss Cross this becomes obvious when the auditor takes days and weeks to find an item, then finds one that won't check out. An item every three sessions of two hours each is a low average for 3D Criss Cross. An item a week is suspect. An item a month is obviously the average of an auditor who will not find out and is dangerous. The auditor who uses out-rudiments always to avoid doing 3D Criss Cross is a flagrant example of a no-discovery-please auditor.

In the CCHs, the dangerous auditor is narrowed down to prevention of executing the auditing command. This, indeed, is the only way an auditor can make the CCHs fail. In any of the CCHs, the commands and drills are so obvious that only the prevention of execution can accomplish not-finding-out. The dangerous auditor is never satisfied the PC has executed the command. Such an auditor can be seen to move the PC's hand on the wall after the PC has in fact touched the wall. Or the PC is made to do a motion over and over which is already well done. Or the PC is run only on processes that are flat and is halted on processes that are still changing.

The PC is never permitted to reveal anything by the dangerous auditor. And so "auditing" fails.

The remedies for the dangerous auditor, by class of process, are:

### **Class I—Repetitive Process, run in sequence**

#### **REVELATION PROCESS X1**

What could you confront?

What would you permit another to reveal? What might another confront?

What might another permit you to reveal?

What would you rather not confront?

What would you rather not have another reveal? What might another hate to confront?

What might another object to your revealing? What should be confronted?

What shouldn't anyone ever have to confront?

(Note: This process is subject to refinement and other processes on the same subject will be released.)

### **Class II — Prep-checking Zero Question**

Have you ever prevented another from perceiving something? (Other such Zero Questions are possible on the theme of fear-of-discovery.)

CCHs should be used if tone arm action during any Prep-checking is less than 3/4 of a division shift per hour.

### **Class III — Routine 3D Criss Cross**

Find Line Items as follows:

Who or What would be afraid to find out? (then get oppterm of resulting item) Who or What would prevent a discovery? (then oppterm it)

Who or What would startle someone? (then oppterm it)

Who or What would be unsafe for you to reveal? (then oppterm it)

Who or What would be dangerous for another to reveal? (then oppterm it)

*Note: Well run CCHs, run according to the very earliest data on them, given again on two Saint Hill Briefing Course Tapes (R-10/6106C22SH/Spec 18, "Running CCHs" and R-12/6106C27SH/Spec 21, "CCHs—Circuits"), benefit any case and are not relegated to the psychotic by a long ways. The CCHs do a remarkable job in making a good auditor for various reasons. The first CCH (Op Pro by Dup) was invented exclusively to make good auditors. The CCHs 1 to 4 are run each one in turn, only so long as they produce change and no longer, before going on to the next. When is a CCH flat so that one can go on to the next CCH? When three complete cycles of the CCH have a uniform comm lag it can be left. My advice in straightening out or improving any auditor is to first flatten the CCHs 1 to 4, and then flattening all in one run Op Pro by Dup. This would be regardless of the length of time the auditor had been auditing in Dianetics and Scientology. Then I would do the Class II and Class III processes above, preferably doing the Class III items first, then the Class II so it could go whole track, or doing the Class II, then the Class III and then the Class II again.*

---

## SUMMARY

Following out any part of this program in any organization, in the field and on any training course will vastly improve the results of auditing and enormously diminish auditing failures.

LRH:jw.rd

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

*[This HCOB is added to by HCOB 15 March 1962, Suppressors, which is on the following page.]*

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 8 MARCH 1962

**ADD HCO BULLETIN 8 March 1962 THE BAD “AUDITOR “**

**SUPPRESSORS**

The discovery of the “other side of withholds” type of case, the person who is afraid to find out, brings to view the reason behind all slow gain cases.

My first release was directed at auditing because good auditing is, of course, my primary concern at the moment.

But let us not overlook the importance of this latest discovery. For here is our roughest case to audit, as well as our roughest auditor.

Every case has a little of “afraid to find out”. So you may have taken HCO Bulletin of March 8, 1962, more personally than you should have. BUT everyone’s auditing can be improved, even mine, and adding a full willingness to find out to one’s other auditing qualities will certainly improve one’s auditing ability. Here probably is the only real case difference I have had. My own “afraid to find out” is minimal and so I had no reality on it as a broadly held difficulty. Where I ran into it was in trying to account for differences amongst students and in auditors who sought to audit me. Some could, some couldn’t. And this was odd because my ability to as-is bank is great, therefore I should be easy to audit. But some could audit me and some couldn’t. Two different auditors found me reacting as two different PCs. Therefore there must have been another factor. It was my study of this and my effort to understand “bad auditing” on myself as a PC that gave us the primary lead in. I made a very careful analysis of what the auditor was doing who couldn’t or wouldn’t audit me, an easy PC. The answer, after many tries and much study of students, finally came down, crash, to the “afraid to find out” phenomena. Thus my first paper on this (HCO Bulletin of March 8, 1962) enters the problem as a problem of auditing skill.

**THE ROUGH PC**

The characteristic of the rough PC is not a PC’s tendency to ARC Break and scream, as we have tended to believe, but something much more subtle.

The first observation of this must be credited to John Sanborn, Phoenix, 1954, who remarked to me in an auditor’s conference, “Well, I don’t know. I don’t think this PC is getting on (the one he was staff auditing). I keep waiting for him to say, ‘Well, what do you know!’ or ‘Gosh!’ or something like that and he just grinds on and on. I guess you’d

call it 'No cognition' or something.' John, with his slow, funny drawl, had put his finger on something hard.

The PC who makes no gain is the PC who will not as-is. Who will not confront. Who can be audited forever without cogniting on anything.

The fulminating or dramatizing PC may or may not be a tough PC. The animal psychologist has made this error. The agitated person is always to blame, never the quiet one. But the quiet one is quite often the much rougher case.

The person whose "thought has no effect on his or her bank" has been remarked on by me for years. And now we have that person. This person is so afraid to find out that he or she will not permit anything to appear and therefore nothing will as-is? therefore, no cognition!

The grind case, the audit forever case, is an afraid to find out case.

We need a new word. We have withholds, meaning an unwillingness to disclose past action. We should probably call the opposite of a withhold, a "suppressor". A "suppressor" would be the impulse to forbid revelation in another. This of course, being an overt, reacts on one's own case as an impulse to keep oneself from finding out anything from the bank, and of course suppresses as well the release of one's own withholds, so it is more fundamental than a withhold. A "suppressor" is often considered "social conduct" in so far as one prevents things from being revealed which might embarrass or frighten others.

In all cases a suppressor leads to suppression of memory and environment. It is suppression that is mainly overcome when you run havingness on a PC. The PC is willing to let things appear in the room (or to some degree becomes less unwilling to perceive them). The one-command insanity eradicator, "Look around here and find something that is really real to you" (that sometimes made an insane person sane on one command), brought the person to discharge all danger from one item and let it reveal itself. Now, for any case, the finding of the suppressor mechanism again opens wider doors for havingness processes. "Look around here and find something you would permit to appear" would be a basic havingness process using the suppressor mechanism.

Thus we have a new, broad tool, even more important in half the cases than withholds. Half the cases will run most rapidly on withholds, the other half most rapidly on suppressors. All cases will run somewhat on withholds and somewhat on suppressors, for all cases have both withholds and suppressors.

Withholds have been known about since the year one, suppressors have been wholly missing as a pat mechanism. Thus we are on very new and virgin search ground.

---

Additionally adding to the data in HCO Bulletin of March 8, 1962, another symptom of a dangerous auditor would be (o) one who Qs and As with a PC and never faces up to the basic question asked but slides off of it as the PC avoids it and also avoids it as an auditor. All dangerous Q and A is that action of the auditor which corresponds to the PC's avoidance of a hot subject or item. If the PC seeks to avoid by sliding off, the auditor, in his questions, also slides off. Also, the auditor invites the PC to avoid by asking irrelevant questions that lead the PC off a hot subject.



Also add (p) who fails to direct the PC's attention. The PC wants to cut and run, the auditor lets the PC run.

Also add (q) who lets the PC end processes or sessions on the PC's own volition. Also add (r) who will only run processes chosen by the PC.

Also add (s) who gets no somatics during processing.

Also add (t) who is a Black Five.

The common denominator of the dangerous auditor is "action which will forestall the revelation of any data."

Because the auditor is terrified of finding out anything, the whole concentration of the auditor is occupied with the suppression of anything a process may reveal.

Some auditors suppress only one type of person or case and audit others passably. Husbands as auditors tend more to fear what their wives may reveal to them and wives as auditors tend to suppress more what their husbands may reveal to them. Thus husband-wife teams would be more unlucky than other types of auditing teams as a general rule, but this is not invariable and is now curable if they exclusively run on each other only suppression type processes.

### **Add Class I REVELATION PROCESS X2**

What wouldn't you want another to present?

What wouldn't another want you to present?

What have you presented?

What has another presented?

### **Class II—Added Zero Question:**

Have you ever suppressed anything?

### **Class III—Add Lines:**

Who or What would suppress an identity? (oppterm it)

Who or What would make knowledge scarce? (oppterm it)

Who or What would not want a past? (oppterm it)

Who or What would be unfrontable? (oppterm it)



Who or What would prevent others (another) from winning? (oppterm it)

Who or What should be disregarded when you're getting something done?  
(oppterm it)

Who or What would make another realize he or she hadn't won?  
(oppterm it)

(In choosing which one of the above to oppterm first, read each one of all such Class III Lines [including those of HCO Bulletin of March 8] once each to the PC watching the meter for the largest reaction. Then take that one first. Do this each time with remaining Lines. One does the same thing [an assessment of sorts] on Line Plot Items when found to discover the next one to oppterm.)

LRH:jw.cden  
Copyright © 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder