HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex.

HCO Bulletin of MARCH 15, AD12.

ADD HCO BULLETIN March 8, 1962
THE BAD 'AUDITOR'

SUPPRESSORS

The discovery of the "other side of witholds" type 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 auditors 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 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 witholds, meaning an unwillingness to disclose past action. We should probably call the opposite of a withold 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 witholds, so it is more fundamental than a withold. 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 witholds.

Half the cases will run most rapidly on witholds, the other half most rapidly on suppressors. All cases will run somewhat on witholds and somewhat on suppressors, for all cases have both witholds and suppressors.

Witholds 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 sympton of a dangerous auditor would be (o) one who Q's and A's 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 of 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 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 1.

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 11 - Added Zero Question:

Have you ever suppressed anything?

Class 111 - 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 unconfrontable?   (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 111 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   L. RON HUBBARD