

(First Draft.....12 July 2003 21:51 revised 13 July 3:40)

TECH EVAL

SIT: Sec checking and FPRD taking up a big chunk of pcs/preOTs audited hours and often slowing progress on the Bridge. (time/money consuming OT Eligibility Checks)
Lots of stalled Clears and OTs.

DATA: "Any arbitrary entered into any line is a way to stop that line." (HCOB 23 August 1968) "Know your basics. They are in our very oldest books" (HCOPL 16 April 1970 Issue III Arbitraries OEC Vol 0, pg 65)

1.HCOB 6 Jun 84 III, "Handling of Missed Withholds":

If on handling of a missed withholds in Ruds or Sec-Checking PC gets an F/N before the point when the auditor asks "who nearly found it out" and "what did he do", the auditor nevertheless should ask these questions to "widen the F/N considerably" and "really make the MWH disappear"

The above bulletin was issued in 1984 when LRH was not really on the lines, it is in the line of expectation that such a piece of 'tech' would have been found and issued by LRH at a time he was researching sec checking or rudiments and that was in the sixties. =ALTERED TIME, OMITTED EXPLANATION

The purpose of Ruds is a key-out of the lock and an F/N VGIs. Nothing more. (Ref.: HCOB 11 Aug 78 I, "Ruds, Definitions and Patter") The "new" MWH-handling is an overrun. The best you can achieve with it is that the pc goes release again. The MWH will not "disappear" as this is not a basic incident and you are not erasing, but keying out on Ruds and in a Sec-Check or Confessional. =FALSE PURPOSE

This handling of MWHs has a tendency of making the pc wrong. = INCORRECTLY INCLUDED MAKE WRONG OF PC

2. HCOB 8 Jun 84 "Clearing Justifications"

The HCOB tells the Auditor who pulls an overt or withhold in Sec-checking or False Purpose RD to ask the pc as part of the procedure "did you justify it?" and "how else did you justify it?"

HCOB 10 Jul 64 Overts - Order of effectiveness in processing states that you don't use Justifications before Grade IV. "There is no reason to expect any great pc responsibility for his or her own overts below Level IV and the auditor seeking to make the pc feel or take responsibility for overts is just pushing the pc down. The pc will resent being made feel guilty. Indeed the auditor may only achieve that, not case gain. And the pc will ARC break." = CONTRARY DATA, WRONG TARGET

3. HCOB 11 Apr 82, "Sec-checking implants".

An enforced no-communication or enforced withhold (the threatened child) commonly called a lock or secondary is included as an implant. =INCORRECTLY INCLUDED DATUM

A new concept is introduced: the "still needle". Because of the "withhold character" of implants it may happen that in session you come into an area of time-track where "nothing reads on the meter...the needle is just very still and doesn't react anymore...

There is a basic datum in standard tech in HCOB 27 May 1970 Unreading questions and items as follows: "THINGS THAT DON'T READ WON'T RUN"

This brandnew idea "the still needle" ignores completely the datum that the needle will react only on things that are real to the pc, and if there is no read, it may be that there is something in the bank, but not accessible to the pc. It is "below the awareness level of the pc". (Ref.: HCOB 29 Apr 69 Assesment and interest and = CONTRARY DATA,

"An auditor sometimes has to work like mad to get the needle responding." Instructions are given how the auditor should work with various questions now that concern the possibility of an implant. "Is this something you are not supposed to tell? "Ever see a psychiatrist or psychologist?". = WRONG TARGET, ADDED INAPPLICABLE EVALUATION

This is a great tool for "handling" a pc. If you have a read on an overt or withhold-type question, he has an overt (or withhold). If you don't have a read, it may be a "still needle" and the pc still has an overt! You just have to guess and fish until you get it! Guaranteed to make any pc wrong with this "new breakthru tech". = FALSEHOOD,

What will happen if you "handle" the no-read situation like described in "Sec-Checking implants"? Your pc will invent answers, key-in on the whole track without being able to confront and as-is, and - worst - key-in on stuff of the OT levels, even OT 3. This will give him a nice chunk of wrong items. =ADDED INAPPLICABLE OVERWHELM OF PC

The HCOB ends with the comment "Pretty good, huh? You're welcome!" unlike LRHs style of writing. Same applies to HCOB 13 April 1982. = INCORRECTLY INCLUDED STYLE CHANGE

4. HCOB 21 July 1978 "What is a floating needle" states

"A floating needle is a rhythmic sweep of the dial at a slow even pace of the needle. That's what an FN is. No other definition is correct."

(Webster's New World Def: Rhythm is a flow, movement, procedure, etc. characterized by basically regular recurrence of elements or features, as beat, or accent, in alternation with opposite or different elements or features; such recurrence, pattern of flow or movement.)

Per HCOB 21 October 68 Floating Needle "One does not sit and study and be sure of an "F/N". It swings or pops, he lets the pc cognite and then indicates the F/N to the pc, preventing overrun." ... "The F/N does not last very long in releasing. The thing to do is end the process off NOW. Don't give another command."

A puritanical interpretation and implementation of the above definition of floating needle at the advent of the Golden Age of Tech in '96, forced auditors/examiners to 'wait' till the third sweep before they could have been sure of an FN, or face grave penalties when caught on video or life, indicating an FN before the third sweep had started. =FALSEHOOD, ALTERED IMPORTANCE

Several issues and even books published after 1980 have been found to contain alter-is from the originals as covered in other recent reports. And the above is alter-is in application.

PROBABLE WHY: While LRH was off church lines since 1981, someone other than LRH starts writing technical bulletins and wittingly or unwittingly entering arbitraries. (Note: Further investigation will no doubt reveal an actual who and attendant false purposes)

IDEAL SCENE: Standard Tech is that tech which has absolutely no arbitraries (HCOB 23 August 68) CL VIII Course) Clears and OTs moving up the Bridge with no stops in great numbers.

HANDLING: Report the outpoints observed to RTC and request a correction/cramming and/or explanation of these points.=DONE

Compiled and written for RTC
by Caspar de Rijk,
HGA, (Class IX Auditor prior to '97 in SO)
DSEC Grad