

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

Remimeo  
Sthil Students  
Franchise

HCO BULLETIN OF AUGUST 24, 1964

SCIENTOLOGY I TO VI  
SESSION MUST-NOTS

Not that you would do such a thing - you undoubtedly already know better. But just as a matter of record, the following session must-nots should be taught in letters of fire to any new auditor.

I

NEVER tell a pc what his present time problem is.

The pc's PTP is exactly and only what the pc thinks or says it is.

To tell a pc what his PTP is and then audit what the auditor said it was will inevitably ARC Break the pc.

This of course is under the heading of Evaluation in the Auditor's Code and is one way of evaluating, a very serious way too.

II

NEVER set a goal for a pc.

Don't set a session goal, a life or livingness goal or any other kind of a goal.

Auditors get tangled up on this because everybody has the same R6 goals and when you call out the next goal from the list it appears you are giving the pc a goal. But an R6 educated pc knows that and it isn't evaluation.

Other goals are highly variable. The pc's life and livingness goals and session goals are especially variable pc to pc and even within one session on the same pc.

To tell a pc what goals to set for a session or for life is to upset the pc.

If you don't believe it, trace some pc's upsets with their parents and you will find these usually trace back to the parents' setting life and livingness goals for the child or youth.

The pc's session and life and livingness goals are the pc's and for an auditor to deny, refute, criticize or try to change them gives ARC Breaks; and for an auditor to dream up a brand new one for the pc is especially evaluative.

III

NEVER tell a pc what's wrong with him physically or assume that you know.

What's wrong with the pc is whatever the pc says or thinks is wrong physically.

This applies of course only to processing, for if you weren't auditing the person, and if the person had a sore foot and you found a splinter in it and told him so, it would be all right. But even in this case the person would have had to tell you he had a sore foot.

The main reason society has such a distaste for medical doctors is the MDs continuous "diagnosis" of things the person has not complained of. The violence of surgery, the destruction of lives by medical treatment rather educates people not to mention certain things. Instinctively the patient knows that the treatment may leave him or her in much worse condition and so sometimes hides things. For the medical doctor to cry "aha" and tell the person he or she has some undefinable ill is to drive many into deep apathy and accounts for the high frequency of operational shock wherein the person just doesn't recover.

So NEVER tell a pc what is physically wrong with him. If you suspect something is physically wrong that some known physical treatment might cure send the pc for a physical check up just to be safe.

In the field of healing by mental or spiritual means, the pc is sick because he or she has had a series of considerations about being sick. Deformity or illness, according to the tenets of mental healing, traces back to mentally created or re-created masses, engrams or ideas which can be either de-stimulated or erased completely. De-stimulation results in a temporary recovery for an indefinite period (which is nonetheless a recovery). Erasure results in permanent recovery. (De-stimulation is the most certain, feasible and most rewarding action below Level VI; erasure below Level VI is too prone to error in unskilled hands as experience has taught us).

The reality of the auditor is often violated by a pc's statement of what ails him. The pc is stone blind - but the pc says he has "foot trouble." Obviously, from the auditor's viewpoint, it is blindness that troubles this pc. BUT IF THE AUDITOR TRIED TO AUDIT THE AILMENT THE PC HAS NOT OFFERED, AN ARC BREAK WILL OCCUR.

The pc is ailing from what the pc is ailing from, not from what the auditor selects.

For it is the statement of the pc that is the first available lock on a chain of incidents and to refuse it is to cut the pc's communication and to refuse the lock. After that you won't be able to help this pc and that's that.

#### PERMITTED AUDITOR STATEMENTS

There are, however, two areas where the auditor must make a statement to the pc and assume the initiative.

These are in the OVERT-MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE and in the ARC BREAK.

#### A

When the pc is critical of the auditor, the organization or any of many things in life, this is always a symptom of overts priorly committed by the pc.

The pc is looking for motivators. These criticisms are simply justifications and nothing more.

This is a sweeping fully embracive statement - and a true one. There are no criticisms in the absence of overts committed earlier by the pc.

It is quite permissible for the auditor to start looking for the overt, providing the auditor finds it and gets it stated by the pc and therefore relieved.

But even here the auditor only states there is an overt. The auditor NEVER says what the overt is for that's evaluation.

You will be amazed at what the pc considered was the overt. It is almost never what we would think it should be.

But also, an auditor whose pc is critical of him or her in session who does not say "It sounds like you have an overt there. Let's find it." is being neglectful of his job.

The real test of a professional auditor, the test that separates the unskilled from the skilled is: CAN YOU GET AN OVERT OFF THE PC'S CASE WITHOUT ARC BREAKING THE PC AND YET GET IT OFF.

The nice balance between demanding the pc get off an overt and getting it off and demanding the pc get off an overt and failing to get it off but ARC Breaking the pc is the border line between the unskilled and the professional.

If you demand it and don't do it you'll ARC Break the pc thoroughly. If you fail to demand it for fear of an ARC Break you'll have a lowered graph on the pc. The pro demands the overt be gotten off only when necessary and plows on until its gotten off and the pc brightens up like a lighthouse. The amateur soul searches himself and struggles and fails in numerous ways - by demanding the wrong overt, by accepting a critical comment as an overt, by not asking at all for fear of an ARC Break, by believing the pc's criticism is deserved - all sorts of ways. And the amateur lowers the pc's graph.

Demanding an overt is not confined to just running O/W or some similar process. It's a backbone auditing tool that is used when it has to be used. And not used when it doesn't have to be.

The auditor must have understood the whole of the overt-motivator theory to use this intelligently.

#### B

Indicating by-passed charge is a necessary auditor action which at first glance may seem evaluative.

However the by-passed charge is never what the pc says it was if the pc is still ARC Broken.

By-Passed Charge is, however, found by the meter and the pc has actually got it or it wouldn't register. So the pc has really volunteered it in a round-about way -

first by acting like he or she has by-passed charge and then by bank reaction on the meter.

Always indicate to the pc the by-passed charge you find on the meter.

Never tell a pc what the by-passed charge is if you don't know.

A Class VI auditor knows all goals but the goals are wrong and often sloppily just tells people at random they have "a wrong goal" knowing this to be probable. But it's very risky.

If you find it on the meter, telling the pc what the by-passed charge is is not evaluation. Telling the pc "what it is" without having found it is evaluation of the worst sort.

LRH:jw  
Copyright © 1964  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD