

Technical Alter-is Report Golden Age of Tech

- I. **HCOB 3 May 62R ARC Breaks, Missed Withholds** , LRH defines a missed withhold as **AN UNDISCLOSED CONTRASURVIVAL ACT WHICH HAS BEEN RESTIMULATED BY ANOTHER BUT NOT DISCLOSED**. Please read it. In the same HCOB in the 4th to the last paragraph, **"Give a new auditor the order to clean up "missed withholds" and he or she invariably will start asking the pc for withholds. That's a mistake. You ask the pc for missed withholds. Why stir up new ones to be missed when you haven't cleaned up those already missed? Instead of putting out the fire we pour on gunpowder....."**

Last paragraph, **"If pcs, organizations and even Scientology vanish from man's view it will be because you did not learn and use these things."**

Yet, the Church is taking the number one most likely way a withhold will be missed and trains the auditor to change the question and start asking for withholds. That's a mistake. Correction lists are put together, by order of importance; first 'out-int', second out-list' and third, 'out-ruds', Ref: C/S Series 44. After that, the questions on the correction list will appear by order of likelihood.

Take a look at **HCOB CONFSSIONAL REPAIR LIST - LCRE**. The first appearing question after 'out- int', 'out-list' and 'out-ruds' is question #7. **"Did you tell part of a withhold but not the rest?"** By definition it's a missed w/h question. Ref: **HCOB 3 May 62R ARC Breaks, Missed Withholds, HCOB Withholds, Missed and Partial. Sec Checks in Processing, BC Lecture #95**, pg. 152 LRH defines a half truth as a missed w/h. If you just partially miss a withhold, you've missed a withhold. **HCOB 8 FEB 62 MISSED WITHHOLDS, "A missed withhold is not just a withhold. Please burn that into the stone walls.** " Done.

The LCRE handling is, **"Get all of the w/h, flatten it E/S to F/N."** The tech on handling a question E/S is **HCOB Auditing By Lists**. It states: **"ask for an earlier-similar_____, whatever the question concerned. Do NOT change the question. This is the E/S part of it."** Big capital letters on NOT. Easy to understand, easy to apply. If the pc doesn't go F/N on getting the rest off, then there's an earlier time he only told part of it.

The GAT drill trains the auditor to change the question and go earlier on the withhold and not the question, *"Is there an E/S w/h?"* (Again pc telling only part of it stirring up more W/Hs to be missed). A direct violation of Auditing By Lists and every missed w/h reference in the book. Even before GAT, auditors would change these questions. **#9. (LCRE) "Did you avoid telling one overt by giving a different one?"** Another missed w/h question or more accurately, missed overt question and the auditor will change the question and go earlier on the overt and not the question.

Well, pcs have vanished, missions have vanished. Overts, out-int, M-Us and PTS can all cause blows (and per HCOB BLOW-OFFS, conditions can be so bad that one has no choice but to blow) but ONLY the MWH can make one vanish.

I've heard it all from others, even top cramming officers on the planet. *"He's telling you to change the question."* No he's not, not my MU. *"It all depends, you might have to go E/S on the W/H or you might have to go E/S on the question. It all depends."* Where's that written? *"Well okay. But after I pulled the MWH, I'd then pick up the W/H and handle that."* Okay, do you do that whenever you handle any MWH? *"No."* How standard is that? I'm not going to invent any tech. *"When you change the question and go E/S on something else you're now running a process. So it is Standard Tech."* Oh yea, some handlings do require a process, not E/S. There are questions like **#21. WAS A CHAIN OF OVERTS NOT TAKEN BACK TO BASIC?** Handling line: **(Take it back to basic.)** You will have to change the

question and go E/S on it but E/S doesn't appear in the handling line. It's never confusing. And from a Flag Auditor, *"You mean to say, David Miscavige and all of Snr C/S Int Office are all wrong?"* All I'm saying is, 'What do the materials state?' There's that group Ser Fac showing its ugly head. He would handle an unreading withhold and ignore a reading MWH question. Go figure. Per LRH, cleaning up old sessions of missed W/Hs gives the pc all the latent gains from that session. It's worth having!

II. Concerning **HCOB 1 AUG 68, THE LAWS OF LISTING AND NULLING**, at the end of the reference, it states: **"NOTE: There are no variations or exceptions to the above."** **"Law 1, The definition of a complete list is a list which has only one reading item on list."** So, tell me the many variations to law #1? None. That's my answer. How about one item reading on suppress? Or one item reading on invalidate? How many variations do they have? Law # **"6. The question must be checked and must read as a question before it is listed."** How many variations are there to law #6? None. That's my answer. What about a question reading on suppress? I know of 4 BC Demo tapes where Ron is getting in buttons on items. I can find them so that you can listen to how Ron gets in buttons and compare that to how a GAT auditor gets in buttons. Today, if an auditor gets a button to read, he takes up the question without getting the button answered or 'in'. Jim Logan has written an excellent article on this titled "Has anything been suppressed." at www.scientology-cult.com. Only a couple of things I could add to this are the references below and there's a big difference between 'Pushing a button (saying it) and getting a button 'IN'. Both get defined in **HCOB 29 JAN 70 NULL LIST IN DIANETICS**. Every time an auditor doesn't get a reading button answered, you have an **'Inadvertent MWH.'** Ref. **Making a Goal Fire, BC Lecture #224, pg. 69-70.**

New TRs, 15 May 1962 BC Lecture #154, Pg. 219. "Well, the drill is to get the invalidation off and find out if it reads.

My recommendation for anyone who has received GAT auditing is to get the **'Buttons'** prepchecked to get off the BPC. How anyone coming off the Briefing Course can consider that pushing a button which is saying it is the same thing as 'getting a button in' is beyond me.

I consider EM Drill 19-1, the only non LRH EM Drill to be squirrel!

Ref: **HCOB 29 JAN 70 NULL LIST IN DIANETICS**

HCOB 1 MAR 64 METER READS, SIZE OF

HCOB 15 MAR 64 METER, EVERYTHING READING

HCOB 15 AUG 69 FLYING RUDS

HCOB 28 FEB 71 C/S SERIES 24 METERING READING ITEMS

HCOB 27 MAY 70R UNREADING QUESTIONS AND ITEMS (read to the very end)

III. For the FPRD Auditor who trained pre-GAT:
Case Analysis-Healing 5 Mar 1964 BC Lecture #369

"Now the person, in doing this to somebody else, probably did it so long ago, and it is so far off course of any current activity at all, that to get the basic overt on the track is equally – well, actually it's something you would probably never do now – I mean, you probably never will pick up the basic overts on the track, you see. There's no point, once you've got the first postulates out, why pick up the overts that keyed them in? But you can pick up the key-in of the overt". LRH.

IV. For all the auditors who trained GAT, when the pc answered 'Yes' and "yes" read, they were trained to take the question up. Better study **HCOB 28 FEB 71 C/S SERIES 24 METERING READING ITEMS** again, there's the laws on it. LRH states

"a tick is always noted". Didn't somebody else pass a law on this?

E-METER ACTIONS, ERRORS IN AUDITING 12 June 1961 BC Lecture #12

Pg. 178. *Male voice: I have a problem, Ron. Uh, when the pc answers, say, "Is it all right to audit in this room?" you don't get any motion on the meter, whether the pc says no or yes. And then – say he says yes – and then you get a drop after he says yes. This is the latent read that you're referring to?*

LRH: That's a latent read.

Male voice: Latent read.

LRH: That is a latent read. A meter reading on the pc's reply or response is a latent read.

Male voice: Do you exploit it?

LRH: Hm?

Male voice: Do you exploit this one? Try to find out what it is?

LRH: Brother, I'd drop that one so hard it goes plop. You know, I'd just pay no attention to it.

V. Concerning all the Clears & OTs being put back onto their Objectives.

STAGES OF RELEASE 27 Jul 65 #428

Pg 154. "But you can just crudely group all lower-level processes as just one type of process. So there's the objective, there's the subjective, there's this, there's that, there's the other thing. We know all about that. But all of those processes, of course, are just skimming the top of the case. Cases go to many levels.

And the first level off of it is, "Is there a room?" you know? Where am I? You know, that kind of thing. Just a recognition of the environment. So if you just ask somebody to look around and spot where he was, you have more or less gotten rid of the Objective Processes.

Now, if the individual was asked to look around to find out where he was and that needle at that moment floated, you've had it! As the auditor you've had it right then! You can't run any CCHs. That's it. All Objective Processes are now ffftt! Gone! You follow? That whole class of processes is now null and void. Now, it isn't that it isn't nice to run them. It's that you'll practically kill the guy if you run them! Do you understand? Because you are cleaning a clean."

I've turned in several other Technical Alter-is Reports to no avail, no need to continue.

Best,

Forrest Crane

CL VIII