

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 28 FEBRUARY 1984

Remimeo
Execs
MAA/EO Hat
HCO
Tech
Qual
C/Ses
Sec Checkers
De-PTSers
PTS Packs
SSOs
Missionaires

(Also issued as an HCOB,
same date and title.)

C/S Series 118

PRETENDED PTS

(This data is being issued as an HCO PL, so that executives know what to look for when somebody that they have requested be handled in ethics hasn't been handled.)

(Ref: HCOB 19 Jun 70 II C/S Series 8, CHART OF HUMAN
EVALUATION
HCOB 3 May 80 PC INDICATORS
HCOB 13 Oct 82 C/S Series 116, ETHICS AND THE C/S
HCO PL 11 May 65 ETHICS OFFICER HAT
HCOB 9 May 77 II PSYCHOSIS, MORE ABOUT
HCOB 28 Nov 70 C/S Series 22, PSYCHOSIS
HCO INFORMATION LETTER 2 Apr 64, TWO TYPES OF PEOPLE
HUBBARD CHART OF HUMAN EVALUATION)

It is evident that asking directly for evil purposes as part of sec checking has been knocked out of use over the years by SPs.

It recently occurred that, in using sec checking to clean up several persons who had gotten into ethics trouble on their posts, a peculiar phenomenon and pattern came to light. The persons being handled had been asked for "overts" before and had "gotten them off" but would continue committing the overts. In each case they had blamed their difficulty on having been the effect of false data and black PR fed them by bad hats long since detected and removed from the area. However, these particular cases did not straighten out with de-PTSing actions.

These persons were then asked directly for evil purposes and this action finally got to the root of the matter.

APPARENT SEQUENCE

Apparently the sequence with such persons is:

- (a) They "get off overts" but then continue committing them.
- (b) When overt products and flaps in their areas get investigated, they palm it off as having "gone effect of others' black PR or false data". In other words, the person appears to be PTS.
- (c) They manage to convince those doing the investigating that that's the end of the investigation.
- (d) If something flaps, they get off some overts and start the cycle again at (a).

In other words, they were actively committing suppressive actions while pretending to be PTS. And were busy making people around them feel PTS. While apparently the effect of suppression or black PR, they were actually generating it themselves: Originating black PR to cover their own overt acts.

What had been omitted in the handlings these persons had gotten previously was the full follow-through, because routine PTS tech would of course not handle someone who was on the other side of the coin — and by pursuing it all the way through it would have exposed the pretense.

We have in the (a) through (d) sequence above, the exact mechanism by which such people skid through the lines undetected. This may explain a great deal to many executives who have ordered staff handled and then have had to conclude that the tech didn't work because the staff wasn't handled. What had actually occurred is that evil purposes had been omitted from sec checking tech with malice aforethought, and that PTS checks did not include checks for evil purposes.

This sequence shows the exact "failure" to handle people in RPFs, etc.

HANDLING

In handling a PTS, the C/S must monitor the person's progress closely. This means inspection of all interviews and session worksheets, observing the results of each PTS handling action, his change of position (or lack of) on the Chart of Human Evaluation as evident from the pc folder and so forth.

Also it is important that the Ethics Officer advise the D of P when a staff or public person is undergoing an ethics or justice action, so that this can be noted in the person's pc folder. In this way the C/S can also find out if the pc has landed in ethics trouble. (Ref: HCOB 13 Oct 82, C/S Series 116, ETHICS AND THE C/S)

If the person is not making change, or repeatedly slipping into further out ethics behavior, the C/S must recognize this. It is, possibly, the (a) to (d) sequence above in action. If the C/S suspects this to be the case, his action is to begin to handle the case with sec checking by a competent sec checker. And such sec checking must include questions about the person's purposes and intentions.

Instead of only sec checking on, for example, "Have you committed an overt on the org?", one would also ask "Have you had an evil purpose regarding the org?".

Handled standardly in this way, the person can be expected to experience tremendous relief and case change.

CAUTION

If a person is progressing well on a de-PTSing program (such as PTS interview, PTS RD, Suppressed Person RD), is making change, keeping his personal ethics in and moving up the Chart of Human Evaluation, then it would be a C/S error to suddenly interject a sec check into his program.

ETHICS

None of this sets aside standard ethics and justice procedures. Such a person as would be found with a pretended PTS situation is

quite likely already under some justice action, and in fact doesn't deserve immediate handling other than what HCO deals out.

SUMMARY

Some executives have gotten in the frame of mind that it is a waste of time trying to handle a bad hat. It is true the bad hat probably doesn't deserve to be handled but it is nevertheless true that we do have the tools to handle one.

We're not out to handle the insane, but whether we like it or not we live in a pretty insane civilization. Any data which handles that or amplifies it technically or solves it is of course extremely vital.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

Adopted as Official
Church Policy by the
CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY
INTERNATIONAL

LRH:CSI:rw:iw