

Preface

*An ethic, really, is different than a code. People can be beaten into being moral but they can never be beaten into being ethical because an ethic requires a very good estimation of force. You have to be able to judge to be ethical. And one of the first things they tell a people that they only want to be moral — the first thing a ruler will tell a people that he only wants to be moral is to tell them that they mustn't judge anything. And then he lays in a code of morals with a club, you see, and then expects to them to live up to it and punishes them if they don't.*

*- L Ron Hubbard 7 November 1952*

**1. Revision of HCOPLs and HCOBs**

Observed Outpoints:

Whenever HCOBs or HCOPLs were revised, revisions were indicated in italics. This made it possible to easily discover the changes and compare them to the earlier or the original issue. This is not only no longer done, but is extended up to the point where different policies are being combined without any reference, e.g. in the book "Introduction to Scientology Ethics."

Several HCOPLs are missing in the most recent edition of the OEC Volumes. e.g. the very important HCOPL 15 Nov 68, Cancellation of Disconnection.

It has also become common practice at events that LRH is being quoted without any reference given. This amounts to giving verbal data as there is no possibility to check back to where the quote came from and in which context it was given.

LRH HCOPLs:

HCOPL 7 March 65 RA, III Revised 10 January 1961: Vol 0, 465 Under misdemeanors: Verbal Tech. This includes: giving out data which is contrary to HCO Bulletins or Policy Letter, or obstructing their use or application, corrupting their intent, altering their content in any way, interpreting them verbally or otherwise for another, or pretending to quote them without showing the actual issue. Where serious, repeated or of magnitude harmful to many, the same offenses can be reclassified as crimes by a convening authority.

HCOB 1 September 1971, I states: #12 Hidden data line trouble can wreck an HGC (and the org and field).

Questions:

Which HCOPL allows for revisions without indicating them?

Which HCOPL allows to omit any policy?

Which HCOPL allows to revise any policy after the death of LRH?

## **2. Re Disconnection**

Observed Outpoints:

Church practice is to issue a Suppressive Person declare when an suppressive act per HCOPL 23 December 1965 RB has been committed with an order to disconnect from such person.

I have been asked to disconnect from Debbie Cook by the Dir I&R AO Flag, Dir I&R ASHO D and an MAA AOLA.

In a TV interview given in 2009 to CNN the Church speaker, Tommy Davis, states that there is no disconnection policy in force. In a radio interview on Radio Paul in April 2010, the same Tommy Davis says that such policy exists.

Marriages and families of acquaintances of mine were destroyed by disconnect orders issued through HCO terminals.

LRH HCOPLs:

HCOPL 9 Jan 51, An Essay On Management, OEC Vol 7, page 574:

Any management which operates as a censorship or a propaganda medium will inevitably destroy itself and injure the group.

From The Creed of the Church of Scientology 1954

We of the Church believe

That all men have inalienable rights to think freely, to talk freely, to write freely their own opinions and to counter or utter or write upon the opinions of others.

And that no agency less than God has the power to suspend or set aside these rights, overtly or covertly.

From the Informal Scientology Wedding Ceremony

Here in all the dignity of God before me stand a woman and a man whose lives from this time hence until that day when Death alone can terminate the Union.

HCOPL 15 Nov 68 Cancellation of Disconnection: Since we can now handle all types of cases disconnection as a condition is cancelled.

This HCOPL is missing in the OEC Volumes reissued 1991, but isn't canceled either.

HCOPL 16 May 1980, II Suppressive Acts, Suppression of Scientology and Scientologists: Cancels and replaces: HCOPL 23 December 1965R, Revised 31 December 1979

The line "failure to handle or disavow and disconnect from a person demonstrably guilty of Suppressive Acts" and "any PTS who fails to either handle or disconnect from the SP who is making him or her a PTS is, by failing to do so, guilty of a Suppressive Act" are no longer listed as High Crimes or Suppressive Acts.

This line does, however, reappear in the 1991 reissued HCOPL 23 December 65RB, Revised 8 January 1991 without canceling HCOPL 16 May 1980, II. The reissue happened after LRH's death in 1986.

HCOB 16 April 1982: More on PTS Handling:

...The reasons he cannot handle are because he tries to do it in the heroic fashion that is required in a disconnect...It doesn't have to be a sudden explosive handling! It can be very gentle. All you want is the person at cause and that is attained on a gradient toward the SP...The whole crux of PTSes is Handle or Disconnect. And the misunderstood on it is how gently one can handle.

HCOB 10 August 73, PTS Handling: Now, as the sparks will really fly in his life if he dramatically disconnects and if he can't see how he can, you persuade him to begin to handle on a gradient scale...

All you are trying to do is MOVE THE PTS PERSON FROM EFFECT OVER TO SLIGHT GENTLE CAUSE.

A being is rather complex. He may have a lot of sources of suppression. And it may take a lot of very light auditing to get him up to where he can do work on suppressives since these were, after all, the source of his overwhelm. And what he did to THEM might be more important than what they did to HIM but unless you unburden HIM he may not get around to realizing that.

HCOB 10 September 1983, PTSness and Disconnection: The term “handle” more commonly means, when used in relation to PTS tech, to smooth out a situation with another person by applying the tech of communication.

The term “disconnection” is defined as a self-determined decision made by an individual that he is not going to be connected to another. It is a severing of a communication line.

There is of course another technical way to handle PTSes and that is to get them through all problems they have had with the terminal involved and the PTSness will disappear. (Ref: HCOB 29 Dec. 78, The Suppressed Person rundown, a magical new rundown). But it still requires that during the handling the person disconnects.

Questions:

Which HCOPL cancelled the HCOPLs on lifting disconnection?

### **3. Re Fundraising for Ideal Orgs and IAS**

Observed Outpoints:

For many years I have been approached by various persons, including IAS terminals, MAAs, Course Supervisors and even the Vice President of the Church to pay for other services than those offered through the registrar’s office. Often times a course or session break is filled by being regged for some project. Once when I resisted the attempt I was taken by the D/CO ASHO F for a metered rollback. Once I received a KR by an IAS person because I was unwilling to discuss my financial situation with her.

At one occasion my wife and I were even invited by the VP of Scientology, Bob Anderson, to make donations. At another instance I received regging interviews for donations from various top executives from Bridge, Author services, SMI and Bob Anderson, an action that stretched over several hours. Early 2008, at the Flag Office Jeff Mintz with three other people around, among them the Chief MAA FSO, called my bank and arranged for an increase of my credit limit so that I could donate about \$32,000 for Basic Packages. After that donation I caved in and began to cry. Myriam, the Flag MAA indicated that I for the first time was showing remorse. Thereafter, she tried to exert another similar donation in the name of my wife. When I refused she screamed at me and called me several names connected with the F-word. I was held in the Flag Office against my will for over 4 hours way past midnight.

In March 2010, my most recent handlings in the MAA office at the AO Flag consumed a major part for being “persuaded” to make Library donations and to buy and distribute Scientology TWTH DVDs. It was hinted that I needed that to complete my MAA cycle even though my previous amends project had already been approved.

My most recent selectee to Flag for L10 and L12, before he started with his Ls, was regged by the IAS for a full day until he physically collapsed. He told another pc of mine whom I trying to do the Ls not to go by himself to be protected from such occurrence.

Today ideal orgs are built by fundraising; either directly or via donations to the IAS.

Small orgs suddenly find themselves in posh buildings without enough public. Many posts are manned by staff from other orgs or SO; e.g. when I toured the Inglewood Ideal Org I met several terminals from ASHO. Ideal Orgs e.g. are today mainly established by fundraising.

A lot of fundraising is done for ads on TV, the Internet and billboards.

Arriving at Flag you are asked for your IAS status; from Patron on up a Gold Seal will be affixed to the routing form speeding up the flow of service.

Of all of our big events, the auditors' day is the least spectacular one, put on a local basis.

At events held at the Shrine Auditorium or the Ruth Eckerd Hall, the premier rows are not reserved for auditors, but for the top donors to the IAS.

The person publicly awarded the greatest honor is a movie actor.

Quite frequently COB ends his presentations with the invitation to upgrade your IAS status. I have never heard him say to train to become an auditor or to advance on the Bridge.

LRH HCOPLs:

HCOPL 9 Jan 51, An Essay On Management, OEC Vol 7, page 567

Men were prone to measure the excellence of management in how many dollars a company accumulated or how much territory a country acquired. These are, at best, crude rules of thumb. Until there was another and better measure, they had to serve. To understand that these are not good measures of the excellence of management one has only to review the history of farms, companies and nations to discover that few have had any long duration and almost all of them have had considerable trouble.

HCOPL 31 January 1983: The reason for Orgs: The only reason orgs exist is to sell and deliver materials and service to the public and get in public to sell and deliver to. The object is totally freed beings!

HCOPL 31 May 1968, Auditors: Auditors have since the first session of Scientology been the only individuals on this planet, in this universe capable of freeing man. At times some will forget or choose to ignore the fact that the auditor is not just another fellow or a guy who works in Scientology. An auditor is a highly trained specialist, no matter what level of auditor. He or she is the only one who can give man the truth, that man knows. An auditor is to be respected. An auditor is very important in clearing this planet, and this universe. It's a big job and the auditor will do it. All auditors are appreciated.

HCOPL 12 March 1975, II: The Ideal Org: It would be busy looking, with staff in motion, not standing about. It would be clean and attractive enough not to repel its public. Such an ideal org would be built by taking what one has and step by step building and smoothing; grooving in and handling each of its functions, with each of its divisions doing more and more of its full job better and better.

The business is always there-the skill with which it is handled and the results on pcs and students is the single important line which makes it possible to build the rest. The ideal org is the image one builds toward. It is the product of the causative actions of many. Anything which is short of an ideal org is an outpoint that can be put right. The end product is not just an ideal org but a new civilization already on its way.

HCOPL 24 February 1964, II Org Programing: ...don't engage in "fundraising," or "selling postcards" or borrowing money. Just make more income with Scientology. It's a sign of very poor management to seek extraordinary solutions for finance outside Scientology. It has always failed. For orgs as for pcs "Solve it with Scientology."

HCOPL 7 April 1983, Goodwill: The amount of public demand for service and your future income are both largely dependent upon GOODWILL. Excellent technical delivery is what generates a blaze of goodwill and PR that spreads by word of mouth like wildfire. Events, open houses, tours, film or slide presentations-all such activities serve to generate public interest and goodwill.

Training and processing are commodities that are far, far more desirable than anything else this world has to offer. And when they are delivered with superlative technical application with the out-of-this world gains that are possible, you would drum up so much public support that you would soon have an army of ardent supporters outside your door, no matter how much the psychs and press railed about us. Word of mouth is a superior form of advertising to newspaper, radio and TV ads. People tend to believe their friends. They are skeptical of advertising.

Questions:

Why does present Church management so flagrantly violate these basic management principles as laid down in the above issue?

#### **4. Re Management**

Observed Outpoints:

Our top management has become mysterious. E.g. we don't know the whereabouts of the president of the Church, Heber Jentzsch, the Snr C/S int, Ray Mitthoff, the head of the LRH preservation project, Norman Starkey, the head of the WDC, etc. etc.

Several top executives left the Church and were declared SP.

When I, in connection with my comm ev, wrote a letter to the IJG, I never received an answer. The comm ev continued even though it was conducted in an off-policy manner.

When my daughter Maya wrote to the RTC regarding the difference of tech at Flag and in the field, she never received an answer.

When Debbie Cook wrote an email to her friends, she did not make a public statement, she was instantly declared SP. This appears to be following the practice of "instant SP declares" which were first instituted by David Miscavige on October 17, 1982, at the San Francisco Mission Holder Conference without any LRH policy.

Instead of handling the Debbie Cook affair quietly through communication an immediate legal action with suing her for \$300,00 was originated against her. This lead to an unprecedented discrediting of our Church worldwide. Among leading newspapers and periodicals in the US, Germany, Australia, Great Britain and probably many more, ABC broadcasted to millions of viewers directly from the court room in San Antonio, Texas. ABC also presented the Church's video deposition in which Debbie Cook received a check in the amount of \$50,000 in exchange for the promise not to talk about her experiences within the Church, an act in which she waived her constitutionally guaranteed inalienable human right to free speech.

Debbie Cook stated under oath that she was tortured at the Scientology Int. Base at Hemet, CA. Among other things she described a 12-hour ordeal where she was made to stand in a trash can while fellow

## **Observed Outpoints and Questions by Wolfgang Keller, Class VIII, OT VII**

**28 April 2012**

executives poured water over her, screamed at her and said she was a lesbian. She said that she saw David Miscavige attack church executive Marc Yager, punching him in the face and wrestling him to the ground. She also recounted how church executive Mark Ginge Nelson was punished for objecting to violence he saw in "The Hole." (The Hole being a fenced-in and locked-up RPF place). Cook said she saw Nelson taken to another room, where he was beaten by a Miscavige assistant and two other men for two hours. She said Nelson also was made to lick a bathroom floor for at least 30 minutes. This is the most perturbing report for me that I ever became aware of and this is what I told my family about. It casts a very unpleasant view at our COB RTC and officially recognized leader of the Church. It is definitely entheta, but nevertheless factual, as factual as e.g. reports about the 26 December 2004 tsunami.

Several similar reports of cruel treatment of high ranking executives by David Miscavige emerged. The reports I am aware of are issued or publicly stated by the concerned individuals themselves and are specific as to time, location, duration and event. They cannot be classified as black PR.

Wiser now and to avoid more embarrassing exposure, on 24 April the Church settled the lawsuit out of court which could have been done in the first case.

LRH HCOPLs:

HCOPL 9 Jan 51, An Essay On Management, OEC Vol 7, page 576:

A true group must have a management which deals in affinity, reality and communication, and any group is totally within its rights, when a full and reasonable examination discloses management in fault of perverting or cutting ARC, of slaughtering, exiling or suspending that management. ARC is sacred.

HCOPL 9 Jan 51, An Essay On Management, OEC Vol 7, 576:

Management should be cognizant of the differences existing in power. Management undeniably must have power but a management which confuses authority with power is acting, no matter its "sincerity" or "earnestness" or even conscious belief that it is doing what is right and well, in the direction of decay of organizational efficiency. Power which is held and used by rationale alone is almost imperishable. That power deteriorates and becomes ineffective in exact ratio to the amount of pain or punishment drive it must use to accomplish its end. The theta of management becomes entheta in a dwindling spiral once this course is entered upon... Punishment drive against inefficiency creates more inefficiency and no management wisdom or power under the sun can reverse or interrupt this working law... Management has only succeeded when punishment drive was suspended or when theta moved in over the scene from a goal maker and by sheer theta power, disentrubulated the group.

HCOPL 9 Jan 51, An Essay On Management, OEC Vol 7, 577:

Man would run better entirely unmanaged than in the hands of an authoritarian management, for the end of such a management is group death.

HCOPL 9 Jan 51, An Essay On Management, OEC Vol 7, 581: Hook up an abundance of communication lines to fill their various needs, keep the communications terse, keep the communications wholly honest and drop no curtains between the organization and the public about anything.

Questions:

With the observance of the above outpoints and LRH policy violations, do we still have a legal management?

What on-policy tools do I have to help end the present very distractive to Scientology situation?

Which specific statistics as to Bridge Progress made and auditors trained contradict my observations of a declining trend in Scientology?

I am not asking for auditing hours since I am not the only one who underwent unnecessary and time consuming sec checks (in my case 14 intensives).  
Where are are top executives? Why are they hiding?

## **5. Re Super Power**

Observed Outpoints:

Super Power is not yet being delivered, 34 years after LRH promised it.

LRH HCOPLs:

LRH ED 17 December 1978

Super Power will be delivered at St. Hills within the next 6 weeks as we are right now super grooming the Super Power Auditors in a special international course. It will be delivered in almost all languages.

Questions:

What happened to this?

LRH says the delivery will be at St. Hills. Why will it be delivered only at Flag in a special building with special equipment, a building that after years of construction and consumption of millions of dollars has not been yet completed?

In other issues LRH talks about the urgency and importance of the Super Power Rundowns and that Staff should receive it first. What happened to all this?

## **6. Re Two different Lower Bridges**

Observed Outpoints:

For the past several years Flag has been advertising broadly as to their speed of the delivery of the lower Bridge in comparison to all other Orgs, missions and groups. This has never happened under LRH. If there was a pilot then he would conduct it secretly until proven and ready for general release.

LRH HCOPLs:

HCOPL 1 October 1967 Uses of Orgs:

There are two uses (violently opposed to each other) to which Scientology orgs can be put. They are:

1. To forward the advance of self and all dynamics toward total survival.
2. To use the great power and control of an org over others to defend oneself.

When a decent being goes to work in an org, he uses (1)

When a suppressive goes to work in an org, he uses (2)

HCOPL 23 December 1965 RB, R 8 January 1991: Suppressive Acts, Violations of the ten points listed below that are Technical Degrades: #8 Boasting as to speed of delivery in as session, such as "I put in Grade 0 in three minutes." Etc.

HCOB 1 September 1971, I states: #12 Hidden data line trouble can wreck an HGC (and the org and field).

Questions:

How is it possible to develop a new approach to deliver grades after LRH's death?  
How is it possible that this hidden data line remains sanctioned by RTC?

## **7. Re Sec Checks**

Observed Outpoints:

Regular sec checks every six months in the middle of OT VII, independent of how the person is doing on the level. SO members are exempted from these sec checks.

After I depleted my financial resources and am carrying an additional debt in excess of \$150,000 the Dir I&R AO Flag told me that there is no leave from OT VII.

I know of several SO members who have discontinued auditing on OT VII or have not even re-embarked onto OT VII as delivered after the introduction of the GAT.

Despite the drive for 10,000 persons on OT VII, qualified SO members don't participate, at least those terminals I were in direct contact with do not.

Persons who have completed OT VII are urged to immediately continue onto OT VIII, being delivered at the Freewinds. Before being admitted, everybody has to undergo again several intensives of sec checks even though they just arrived from Flag.

LRH HCOBs:

HCOB 8 March 1982 R, Revised 24 April 1983:

One would not embark on a series of Confessionals during another grade or OT section, but it is imperative that pre-OTs on these sections who have missed withholds get them off and a specific Confessional can and should be done to accomplish this.

Caution. A pre-OT who is running well and making case gain should not be interrupted. And, where a person in the Non-Interference Zone does need O/Ws pulled, the auditor must first obtain a C/S okay.

No policy describes the necessity of those regular sec checks and the requirement for a new round of sec checks prior to OT VIII.

Questions:

What is the purpose of these regular and extended sec checks when they result in attaining the levels of OT VII and OT VIII more difficult than easier?

## **8. Re Floating Needles**

Observations:

Since the beginning of the Golden Age of Tech every auditor is drilled to indicate an F/N only after a minimum of three swings. Everybody is word cleared as to understand the word rhythmic as something denoting at least three repetitions.



At the examiner sometimes long lines form because PCs who are F/Ning sometimes have to wait up to several minutes before an F/N is being indicated.

While a “three swing” F/N in regular auditing, when a PC has reached his full EP, generally does not pose a problem, it can, however, bypass an F/N at critical situations such as e.g. during a sec check when all charge has bled from a question and it is not reading any longer, but should F/N. This could be an explanation for time consuming sec checks. An auditor will also miss what is called a “fleeting F/N.”

HCOB of 21 July 1978 R, Revised 8 October 2000 signed with the name of LRH redefines what a Floating Needle is. LRH has been dead for 18 years. This HCOB combines data from HCOB 21 July 1978 with those from HCOPL 21 February 1979 which are E-Meter Essentials Errata.

LRH HCOBs:

HCOB 21 July 1978: A floating needle is a rhythmic sweep of the dial at a slow, even pace of the needle. That's what an F/N is. No other definition is correct.

HCOB 30 April 1960: ACC TRs: Description of Needle Movements:

6. Free Needle: A needle which shows none of the reactions described above. It floats back and forth easily, registering only the body, its breathing, heartbeats, etc. While needle free, no facsimiles are being impinged on the body.

Note: All movements may vary in amplitude (width of reaction on dial at given sensitivity) and velocity (speed of needle movement - units of dial/instant of time) from pc to pc, or from time to time on the same pc, particularly under processing.

HCOPL 21 February 1979, Corrected & Reissued 26 April 1979, Corrected & Reissued 6 May 1979: E-Meter Essentials Errata Sheet.

Re: Free Needles: Page 17, Section 41:

Delete: “It means an idle, uninfluenced motion, no matter what you say about the goal or terminal. It isn't just null, it's uninfluenced by anything (except body reactions).”

The entire section is replaced by: “It means the same as a Floating Needle which is a rhythmic sweep of the dial at a slow, even pace of the needle, back and forth, back and forth, without change in the width of the swing except perhaps to widen as the pc gets off the last small bits of charge. Note that it can get so wide that you have to shift the tone Arm back and forth, back and forth, to keep the needle on the dial in which case you have a floating tone arm.”

E-Meter Essentials: Section F. The Needle

Free needle (floating needle) In addition to the above:

Man, it's really free.

You'll know one when you see one. The're really pretty startling. The needle just idles around and yawns at your questions on the subject.

It can occur after a cognition blowdown of the Tone Arm, at a release point, or on the erasure of a Dianetic chain.

HCOB 25 April 1974: Rhythm, any kind of movement characterized by the regular recurrence of strong and weak elements. Rhythm denotes the regular patterned flow, the ebb and rise of sounds and movements in speech, music, writing, dance, and in other physical activities.

HCOB 23 August 1968, Arbitrariness: Knock off all the arbitrariness NOW.

Punch in hard standard tech. Standard tech is that tech which has absolutely no arbitrariness.

## **Observed Outpoints and Questions by Wolfgang Keller, Class VIII, OT VII**

**28 April 2012**

HCOB 21 March 1974 End Phenomena: In Ruds it's the same idea. When you've got your F/N and that charge has moved off, indicate it. don't push the pc on and on for some "EP." You've got it.

An OT is particularly subject to F/N abuse as he can blow things quite rapidly. If the auditor misses the F/N due to too high a sensitivity setting or doesn't call it as he's waiting for an "EP," overrun occurs. It invalidates an OT's ability to as-is and causes severe upsets.

This error can also stem from auditor speed. The auditor, used to auditing lower level pcs or never trained to audit OTs, can't keep up with the OT and misses his F/Ns or reads.

Thus overruns occur and charged areas are bypassed.

This could account for those cases who were flying then fell on their heads with the same problems that blew back again.

Questions:

How is it possible that the RTC tolerated the introduction of such deadly arbitrary, especially in training, that can be devastating to delivering standard tech and creating free beings?

### **9. Re Use of Buttons**

Observed Outpoints:

Auditors are trained to check unreading questions with buttons. When a button reads it is assumed that the question itself read. The original question will not be re-checked.

LRH HCOBs:

HCOB 1 August 1968: The Laws of Listing and Nulling:

9. On an item that is suppressed or invalidated, the read will transfer exactly from the item to the button and when the button is gotten in the item will again read.

HCOB 15 August 1969, Flying Ruds:

If a rud doesn't read, put in Suppress and recheck.

To fly all ruds you ask for an ARC Break, if no read, put in Suppress. If it reads take it, do ARCU CDEI...

HCOB 7 March 1996, Handling a read: But the thing reads the way it read. That's uniform. It's also a transference of read. So let us say the pc read half-a-dial drop at a certain speed, half-a-dial drop, and then says, 'No, I can't think of an answer.' If you say, 'Well, did you invalidate it?' and you get the same read back, the read is transferred over to invalidate. 'Well, what did you invalidate?' 'Well, er, rah, rah, bluh, bluh, blah, blah...' F/N

This is just skilled meter handling.

HCOB 23 August 1968, Arbitraries: Here's one-when the needle on an E-Meter read in the response to an auditor's question, all you know is that the needle on the E-Meter read. That's all you know. Now in the next few seconds you will prove out, as to whether the read was to the question or to something else like a protest. To assume anything else in regard to meter reads is an arbitrary and will close up that pc with a bang.

HCOB 16 August 1971, R Issue II Revised 5 July 1978: TR3 (revised 1961)

Name: Duplicative Question.

Purpose: ...To teach that one never asks a second question until he has received an answer to the one asked.

Questions:

How is it possible that the arbitrary not to recheck the original question entered without being detected by RTC? (As far as I can trace it back it was introduced by a BTB).

How is it possible that RTC did not notice that this arbitrary leads to taking up uncharged flows, non-reading listing questions and badgering pcs and Pre OTs with uncharged sec check questions leading to wasted session time and unnecessary repairs?

Is shortening the grades process lists, as apparently done at Flag, the solution to correct the overlong lower Bridge?

## **10. Re MW/H rudiment**

Observed Outpoints:

With the GAT “justifications” were added to the MW/H rudiment procedure.

LRH HCOBs:

HCOB 11 August 1978, II Rudiments, Definitions and Patter: The third rudiment question is:

1. Has a withhold been missed?
2. If you get a missed withhold, find out:
  - a. What was it?
  - b. When was it?
  - c. Is that all of the withhold?
  - d. Who missed it?
  - e. What did (He/She) do to make you wonder whether or not (He/She) knew?
  - f. Who else missed it? (Repeat the above).

(The GAT drill question for justifications does not exist)

Questions:

What LRH HCOPL authorizes whom to change original LRH materials?

What HCOPL allows exceptions to KSW #1?

## **11. Re Auditing PCs for Production**

Observed Outpoints:

Auditing is performed for production rather than for the pc.

When I audited on my Class VI GAT internship, whenever my pcs had a big win and persistent F/N, I was urged to take them back into session after a short break. When I refused, one of my pcs was re-assigned to the Power Auditor who's target was to get a Dianetic Case Completion so that Power Processing could be started. In this context I learnt that a certain number of Power PCs had to be produced by ASHO in order to keep their RTC license to deliver these processes.

When I audited my daughter on her OT preps I was constantly urged to take her more frequently into session even though that was creating PTPs for her and not in her best interest; it was because AOLA needed her as a start.

When my wife received her Ls recently at Flag her only complaint was that she wasn't given enough time to enjoy her wins.

LRH HCOBs:

HCOB 8 October 1970, C/S Series 20, KSW Series 19, Persistent F/N:

Any big win (F/N dial-wide, Cog, VGIs) gives you this kind of persistent F/N. You at least have to let it go until tomorrow and let the pc have his win.

That is what is meant by letting the pc have his win. When you get one of these dial-wide F/Ns Cog VGIs WOW, you may as well pack it up for the day.

Questions:

In an Org, how can auditing for production become senior to delivering for the pc? How is it possible that production push on account of a pc's welfare can be tolerated?

## **12. Re Illness**

Observed Outpoints:

I know of several OT VIIIs who died of cancer. A very dear friend of mine, an all 3Ls completion, contracted cancer and died. Another previous PC of mine, after he received his 3 Ls, lost his job as the CEO of a major international company and has had money problems ever since.

I know one person who is OT VIII and 3 Ls completion who is roller coasting.

The Senior C/S Flag, Alain Kartuzinski died of cancer, Richard Reiss, his successor as Snr C/S Flag died of cancer. (In order to become a permanent Ls auditor, you yourself must have received the L Rundowns).

I know of two Flag AO terminals who contracted cancer.

LRH HCOBs:

HCOB 12 March 1968: Mistakes, Anatomy of

In the presence of suppression, one makes mistakes.

People making mistakes or doing stupid things is evidence that an SP exists in that vicinity.

HCOB 10 August 1973: PTS Handling: There are two stable data which anyone has to have, understand and KNOW ARE TRUE in order to obtain results in handling the person connected to suppressives.

These data are:

1. That all illness in greater or lesser degree and all foul-ups stem directly and only from a PTS condition.
2. That getting rid of the condition requires three basic actions: (A) Discover; (B) Handle or disconnect.

Flag Promo:

What are the L Rundowns?

L11 - The New Life Rundown

It handles the major aberration on the case, on the whole track--and obliterates it. You're handling ridges that have been on the track for trillions of years. When you remove that, you restore life. And you literally have a new life.

L 10 - The King of The Mountain

L 10 is about doingness. You're basically handling why is the being restraining himself? Why is he not operating as an OT? At the end of L 10, you can literally have an F/Ning future.

**L 12 - Flag OT Executive Rundown**

In the first step, you address the body. It's a very OT address of the body and you remove any stuck attention units stuck on any part of the body.

The second part addresses valences, personalities, characteristics - anything that's not you. An you fully blow that.

The last step of L12, you actually audit the being, exterior to the body. LRH wrote in HCOB of 8 June 1971, "The Flag OT Executive Rundown makes a stable thetan exterior whose ability is greatly increased and who is not likely to become PTS to anything."

Questions:

Is there any other answer possible than flagrant out-tech?

**13. Summary**

With my queries I have been resorting to stable LRH data. In the following, I have listed additional key references to the ones quoted.

From The Fundamental Axioms of Dianetics (May 1950)

The reward of survival activity is pleasure.

Happiness is the overcoming of not unknown obstacles toward a known goal and, transiently, the contemplation of or indulgence in pleasure.

From the educational Axioms of Dianetics (August 1950)

A datum is valid only when it can be sensed, measured or experienced.

Natural law is enforced by nature. Logic adapts decision and conduct to nature or adapts nature.

Arbitrary law is anything formulated and promulgated by reason of Man's will, to be enforced by threat or punishment or merely disapprobation.

The amount of arbitrary law existing in a society is a direct index to the inability of that society to be rational and to the irrationality of the members of that society.

Only in the face of irrationality is force necessary.

Authoritarianism is the introduction of arbitrary law where no natural is known, yet maintaining that the arbitrary law is the natural law.

It is a prime purpose of education to increase the self-determinism of the individual.

It is a goal of education to sort the arbitrary from the natural.

From The Axioms of Scientology (July 1954/1972)

Axiom 21 Understanding is composed of Affinity, Reality and Communication.

Axiom 22 The practice of Not-isness reduces Understanding (Not-isness is the effort to handle Isness by reducing its condition through the use of force. It is an apparency and cannot entirely vanquish an Isness {from Axiom 11})

Axiom 38 1. Stupidity is the unknownness of consideration.

Mechanical definition: Stupidity is the unknownness of time, place, form and event.

2. Truth is the exact consideration.

3. Truth is the exact time, place, form an event.

## **Observed Outpoints and Questions by Wolfgang Keller, Class VIII, OT VII**

**28 April 2012**

From The Code of a Scientologist Feb. 1969

1. To keep Scientologists, the public and the press accurately informed concerning Scientology, the world of mental health and society.
2. To use the best I know of Scientology to the best of my ability to help my family, friends, groups and the world.
9. To embrace the policy of equal justice for all.
10. To work for freedom of speech in the world
11. To actively decry the suppression of knowledge, wisdom, philosophy or data which would help Mankind.
12. To support the freedom of religion.
14. To stress the freedom to use Scientology as a philosophy in all its applications and variations in the humanities.
19. To set an example of the effectiveness and wisdom of Scientology.
20. To make this world a saner, better place.

From The Code of Honor November 1954

1. Never desert a comrade in need, in danger or in trouble.
2. Never withdraw allegiance once granted.
3. Never desert a group to which you owe your support.
6. Never compromise with your own reality
7. Never permit your affinity to be alloyed.
9. Your self-determinism and your honor are more important than your immediate life.
10. Your integrity to yourself is more important than your body.
12. Never fear to hurt another in a just cause.
14. Be your own advisor, keep your own counsel and select your own decisions.
15. Be true to your own goals.

From The Creed of the Church of Scientology 1954

We of the Church believe

That all men have inalienable rights to think freely, to talk freely, to write freely their own opinions and to counter or utter or write upon the opinions of others.

And that no agency less than God has the power to suspend or set aside these rights, overtly or covertly.

And we of the church of believe that the laws of God forbid Man...  
to destroy the sanity of another, To destroy or enslave another's soul....

Personal Integrity (Ability 125, February 1961)

What is true for you is what you have observed yourself and when you lose that you have lost everything.

What is personal integrity? Personal integrity is knowing what you know-

What you know is what you know- And to have the courage to know and say what you have observed.

And that is integrity. An there is no other integrity.

Of course we can talk about honor, truth, all these things, these esoteric terms.

But I think they'd all be covered very well if what we really observed was what we were observing, that we always observed to observe.

And not necessarily maintaining a skeptical attitude, a critical attitude, or an open mind.  
But certainly maintaining sufficient personal integrity and sufficient personal belief and confidence in self and courage that we can observe what we observe and say what we have observed.

Nothing in Dianetics and Scientology is true for you unless you have observed it  
And it is true according to your observation.  
That is all.

#### **14. Epilog**

I have been a Scientologist for 43 years. I traded my profession of being an engineer with becoming a full-time Scientology auditor. I have weathered many attacks on Scientology and on me personally because I stood up for Scientology. While living in Germany I handled a number of attacks together with OSA.

When LRH wrote most of his policies on suppression, Scientology was faced with serious attacks from outside sources and people who had no knowledge what Scientology really represented. Scientology was a big threat to them.

Today's situation is entirely different; our major attacks originate from persons who have been long time devoted Scientologists, most of them SO members. Over the recent years many top Scientology executives have been declared SP; most of the Class XII Auditors, personally trained by LRH, have been declared. And so have some people I personally knew and respected. What is the truth behind this? Maybe, here lies the answer:

LRH taped conferences 1966:

Now the Scientologist...is perfectly willing and is at this time by Ethics being over disciplined, so we are over disciplining the Scientologists and under disciplining society and we should reverse that - reverse that very definitely. If anything under discipline the Scientologist and over discipline the society. Now in that direction you'd still win but in the direction we are going we won't. If you under discipline a society and over discipline Scientologists, why you've had it, as a Scientologist normally is very, very willing. We've got to upgrade the idea of what is a Suppressive, as Suppressives really are nuts. They are really damaging, Suppressives. You only need a few heads on a pike . (18 July 1966)

You should upgrade your idea of what an SP is. Man, meet one sometime! A real one! A real monster... Well, in all the time we've been around here we only had one SP that I know of. One real SP that was on staff... And I don't know of another single SP that we've ever had on staff. Isn't that interesting. You see all these SP orders an so on.... Don't throw it around carelessly, because this an-a very exaggerated condition, SP. (19 July 1966)

Or are most of us too PTS to apply the PTS data correctly to spot the source of suppression within our own group?

In most of the given references I quoted only the directly applying sentences. However, for a full understanding, please resort to the HCOBs respectively HCOPLs.

Without the in-depth research done by Jim Logan, formerly posted as permanent Cramming Officer at Gold and before that at FLB, I would not have been able to discover the existing out-points regarding the standard application of LRH tech.

With ARC,  
Wolfgang Keller