

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 28 AUGUST 1980

All Tech  
All Qual  
KOTs  
Execs

(Also issued as an HCO PL  
of same date, same title.)

*Keeping Scientology Working Series 22*

**HOW TO HANDLE THE QUICKIE IMPULSE**

Ref.	HCO PL 7 Feb 65	KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING
	HCO PL 26 May 61	QUALITY COUNTS
	HCO PL 29 May 61	QUALITY AND ADMIN IN CENTRAL ORGS
	HCO PL 2 Nov 61 II	TRAINING QUALITY
	HCO PL 14 Feb 65	SAFEGUARDING TECHNOLOGY
	HCO PL 30 May 70	IMPORTANT—CUTATIVES
	HCO PL 17 Jun 70R	URGENT AND IMPORTANT; TECHNICAL DEGRADES
	HCO PL 26 Oct 71	TECH DOWNGRADES
	HCO PL 31 Jul 65	PURPOSES OF THE QUALIFICATIONS DIVISION
	HCO PL 25 Jan 80	EXECUTIVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR TECHNICAL EXCELLENCE
	HCOB 19 Apr 72	„QUICKIE“ DEFINED

This issue is an examination of some of the factors involved in recent instances of Quickying and False Declares. Knowing what factors have led to quickying and false declares enables both Tech/Qual personnel and Executives to be on guard against them.

It gives examples of handlings that have been done successfully on Tech/Qual personnel and the results, and provides a list of references that can be used by anyone encountering Quickying and False Declares, and enables you to help KEEP SCIENTOLOGY WORKING.

**„2WC-ING TO EP’**

„2WC-ing to EP is really an expression of an impossibility, as one cannot „2WC a process to its EP“. It means that instead of *running the process* to its EP, somebody rabbitied, stopped running the process, and tried to get the EP of the process by 2WC-ing. Yet the only thing that will get the EP of the process is continuing to run the process until its EP is reached.

Trying to „2WC Objectives to EP“ is covered in HCOB 19 Mar 78 QUICKIE OBJECTIVES, but there are still instances of this showing up in folders. Sometimes it is called „verifying“ or „rehabbing“ Objectives. The only valid EP on an Objective process is when that process has been run and continued until its EP has been reached while running that process.

In earlier years auditors would never have thought of starting to run an Objective process and then putting the pc on the meter to 2WC or discuss the process, get an F/N, and call that the EP of the process.

The same holds true for other processes as well. On repetitive processes, it is *the process* that is run to its FP. Not a 2WC or discussion of the process to an F/N. That’s an entirely different F/N. *It’s an F/N on a discussion, not an F/N on the process!*

There have even been examples of a person Solo auditing on an OT Level, and without any EP having been attained in the actual Solo auditing on that Level, the person given a consultation and „2WCed“ to an F/N and this considered the EP. But it is not the EP of the Level,

nor was such an F/N attained *while running the Level*. (Lest anyone get the wrong idea, an F/N isn't the EP for any Solo Level anyway.) But, there have been instances of this sort of thing occurring and the Pre-OT sent to declare. That is of course a quickied Level and a false declare. It is the reason there are persons who are „OT III“ yet can't communicate, have problems, get easily overwhelmed, etc., etc.

HCOB 20 Nov 73 Issue II, C/S Series 89, F/N WHAT YOU ASK OR PROGRAM is a key reference. The main technical violation described above is „changing the process“, or „failure to flatten a process“, and is actionable per HCO PL 19 Apr 65 ETHICS—TRAINING AND PROCESSING REGULATIONS. (It is also a breach of the Auditor's Code.)

The same rule of course is true when rehabbing. You *can't rehab* a process *that hasn't been run to EP*, as there is no EP on the process to rehab. Often one sees in folders an auditor „2WC“ a process, get an F/N on the 2WC, and consider that the process has been rehabbed. If the process has been run, and the EP occurred while running the process, *then* that EP on that process could be rehabbed.

### LACK OF R-FACTOR

Lack of sufficient R-Factor can put a pc into mystery about a process or why it is being run. Thus the pc is not fully in-session on the process, may protest it, or even start asserting that it is unnecessary. And sometimes pcs have already been given false or confusing „R-Factors“ by friends or acquaintances spouting Verbal Tech about processes they know nothing about.

The most basic R-Factor is the Gradation Chart, and copies of these should be on display and made known to preclears. HCOB 5 Apr 69 (reissued 26 May 70), NEW PRE-CLEARs—THE WORKABILITY OF SCIENTOLOGY, is to be applied to educate the public.

And *very importantly*, a thorough Dn CS-1, and a thorough Scn CS-1, must be done on preclears, as neglect of these actions results in a preclear being audited over misunderstandings, which is a CODE BREAK.

### EVALUATIVE, SUGGESTIVE OR „LEADING“ QUESTIONS

Evaluative, suggestive or „leading“ questions are all breaches of the Auditor's Code, Clause #1, as they are both: (a) Evaluation, and (b) telling the preclear what to think about his case.

While most auditors do not evaluate outright, there have been recent instances of auditors evaluating covertly by asking the pc suggestive or „leading“ questions, feeding cognitions or EPs under the guise of „clearing definitions“ or „showing the pc references“. When this is done with the intention *or* result of telling the pc what to think about his case, or with the intention *or* result of feeding a cognition or EP, it is Evaluation, is a breach of the Auditor's Code and is actionable in Ethics.

One notorious SP even fed confidential data to a lower level pc, under the guise of „references“ and „clearing words“! That is an extreme case of this and is suppressive.

But sometimes auditors are tempted to „help“ the pc by evaluation or suggestion. Not only does it not help the pc, it is not Scientology, and is akin to what was done in earlier destructive mental practices.

The way to get cognitions and EPs on cases is by *running the process, Grade or Level*. And if you are trying to rehab a process or state, if the pc had the EP or cognition *while running*

*the process*, he will know about it. Otherwise the pc didn't have the cognition or EP and there is nothing to rehab.

### **NOT CLEANING UP BPC OR ASSERTIONS**

If you by-pass charge on a case and fail to clean it up the PC will become less and less in-session, may try to find ways to get out of the session or process, or in extreme—blow the session. Pcs audited over by-passed charge often start protesting or asserting and it is a grave mistake to rabbit from handling this by seeking to pass it off as „process over-run“, „by-passed a win“ or „by-passed a state“, when those are not true. The only solution is to handle the truth, and if it is by-passed charge or protest or assertion, then that is what will handle it. The most extreme version of this is asserting that the process „isn't necessary“ or that the person „had already made it“ without the process having been run at all

It is sometimes necessary to clean up all the protests, assertions and considerations that the pc has had (or has gotten from others), in order to get the pc into session. But if that is needed to get the pc to run the process (and get the gains from it!), then it must be done. Otherwise it would violate the three basic laws from DIANETICS: THE ORIGINAL THESIS, as a pc asserting or protesting is contrary to „pc plus auditor is greater than the bank“.

It sure is a fast way to false declares though, to rabbit from BPC by failing to repair it and flatten the process. And when there is no EP on running the process, pretending that there was or that the pc must be a „natural Clear“, is no answer at all. Only finding and handling the correct BPC will handle. (See HCOB 19 Aug AD13 HOW TO DO AN ARC BREAK ASSESSMENT, and Technical Dictionary definition of By-Passed Charge.)

The best solution is to have perfect TRs, metering and to follow the Grade Chart, so as not to by-pass charge in the first place.

### **LOWERED TECHNICAL INTEGRITY**

This whole matter of quickying and false declares comes down to an ethics situation on the part of those who did it, those who condoned it and those especially who did nothing about it.

Enquiries into why the various C/Ses and auditors, Examiners and Dir Vals and other Tech/Qual personnel either quickied processes or whole Grades, sent people to falsely declare or went along with these, revealed the following:

a) Some claimed that they didn't know what else to do if the pc asserted he didn't need a process or Grade or asserted that he had already made it or that he wanted to declare to a particular state. (Yet the answer to this is contained in C/S Series 1—10, 46, HCO PL 31 Jul 65 PURPOSES OF THE QUALIFICATIONS DIVISION and the HCO PLs in part 2 of OEC Vol 5, the Keeping Scientology Working section.)

As these issues are broadly known amongst Tech/Qual personnel it is really more an inability to confront a preclear and his reactions (= out TR 0).

b) Another reason given was „not wanting to ARC break or upset the preclear“ and/or feeling that they „had to ‘validate’ the pc“. This reason was quite common. While it is understandable, it is very short-sighted as it ARC breaks a person much more to be left in an unflat process, in an incomplete Grade or hung up in a false declare. (See HCO PL 26 Oct 71 TECH DOWNGRADES.)

As this is already adequately covered in policy and HCOBs, this reason too is really an inability to confront a preclear and his reactions (= out TR 0).

c) The most common reason given is because „everyone else is doing it“ and variations of that such as „if we don't let them quickie and skip Grades and Levels or don't let them attest to these weird states, they'll go to another org who will! and so on. One can find many variations of justifying compromised Technical Integrity, and selling the results of Scientology down the drain, just because some other person has done so or is doing it!

This too is an inability to confront *and* an inability to hold a position (= out OT TR 0).

Also per HCOB 3 Feb 79 Issue II CONFRONT TECH HAS TO BE PART OF THE TR CHECKSHEET, „The inability to confront is basically caused by withholds and where a person cannot be drilled into confronting, he has to have his withholds pulled.“

The dwindling spiral exposed here is that Tech/Qual personnel with withholds (especially Tech O/Ws) (1) lose their ability to hold a position and confront (2) lower their Technical Integrity further by doing or condoning Out Tech (3) develop more withholds, and thus due to a lowered ability to confront (4) lower their Technical Integrity further and so on. Just because others have gone down this route is no reason to follow them!

The solution is very easy and obvious. Get off their Tech O/Ws and get all Tech/Qual personnel through the Professional TRs Course, Upper Indocs, Objective processes and a Drug RD.

## **EXECUTIVE RESPONSIBILITY**

Any executive who thinks that the quality of Tech in his org doesn't have anything to do with him, ought to take a look at what products his org produces and exchanges with its public. And he should study HCO PL 26 May 61 (reissued 21 Jun 67), QUALITY COUNTS and HCO PL 25 Jan 80 EXECUTIVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR TECHNICAL EXCELLENCE. Of what value are Paid Comps if they are false declares?

## **COMPULSION TO „VALIDATE“**

One of the most common reasons found for a person permitting and agreeing to quickying and false declares could be described as a compulsion to „validate“ others. So when a pc mistakenly asserts that he feels that a process is „overrun“ or is „unnecessary“ or that he „had already made it before the process or Grade was even run“, (or even suggests that he had „run all the Grades or OT Levels last lifetime“), auditors and C/Ses who are inclined toward propitiation could make the big mistake of „validating“ a lie, rather than maintaining their Technical Integrity.

The answer to this is contained in C/S Series 46, DECLARES, in HCO PL 31 Jul 65, PURPOSES OF THE QUALIFICATIONS DIVISION and in HCO PL 20 Nov 65, THE PROMOTIONAL ACTIONS OF AN ORGANIZATION (under the section on Qual Div 5).

The word „valid“ means: „sound; fulfilling all the necessary conditions“, so it is not possible to *validate* something that isn't true. It simply adds another lie or alter-is to the case.

## **TECH/QUAL PERSONNEL WITH THE SAME OUT TECH ON OWN CASE**

It is an observed fact that a person can tend to dramatize the Out Tech on his own case, on others. A person does not always do so though, as such a dramatization is pretty low toned and also certainly never has been an extenuating circumstance.

But all too often when an auditor or case supervisor or examiner has been involved in a false declare or quickying, an inspection of that person's folders has revealed that he/ she was quickied and had often falsely attested to Grades, Levels and states.

Thus, not having made real case gains themselves and operating over a pretense of Grades or Levels not attained, they haven't even got a subjective reality themselves of the fabulous wins and gains available from processing. This tends to lessen the overt of denying others gains through quickying and false declares.

The handling is to get such a person's own integrity in, cancel the false declares, get the case repaired and honestly making case gain and moving up the Grade Chart.

Tech and Qual personnel are also required to make good case gain themselves, and failed cases and no-case-gain cases should be handled before being allowed on Tech/Qual lines, if allowed on Tech/Qual lines at all.

### **SOMEONE ELSE PROGRAMMING THE CASE**

„To people who have no personal reality on the results of processing it is especially easy to be „reasonable“ about no results.

„The public is not result conscious.“ (HCO PL 26 Oct 71 TECH DOWNGRADES)

There have been many examples of the above in recent folders where the pc's insistence was simply on being allowed to declare and get onto the next Grade or Level without any real result, and, even worse, where the pc's insistence was that he be allowed to skip standard Grades or processes on the basis that these were „unnecessary“! This is the pc C/Sing or programming his own case.

Sometimes registrars have gotten into C/Sing or programming the case. Examples of this are registrars suggesting that the pc might be a Clear and thus „not need“ New Era Dianetics, or that the Grades might not be „necessary“, or that the person „doesn't need“ any case set-up before a major Grade or Level. There have also been instances of games conditions between orgs on special deals and promising quickie by „arranging“ for the pc to get quickie Grades instead of Expanded Grades, so that the pc could „get through in less hours of auditing“. Of course these examples are both Out Tech and cut the Registrar's and org's stats in the long run, as well as doing a disservice to Tech/Qual personnel and the pc. Registrars are forbidden to C/S or program cases by HCO PL 28 Sep 71, SELLING AND DELIVERING AUDITING.

I have also seen and heard of some pcs resorting to using a control mechanism of „If you ... I will red-tag“, „...get my auditing at another org“, etc. Such a person is not being self-determined but is acting at the dictates of his bank and trying to get others to do so too. (Under those circumstances both the person's motivation and earlier Out Tech on the case should be looked into and handled right away.)

If Tech/Qual personnel do not hold their ground and stick to their HCOBs, they can go effect and even PTS to such demands and give in to quickie, false declares and betraying the trust placed in them.

Cases are C/Sed and programmed by case supervisors in accordance with Standard Tech, never by the demands of pcs, registrars or executives.

An org can become sloppy as there is no *visible* demand for results. There is only an invisible hope. And a definite reaction when they don't occur.

We CAN and DO achieve results beyond anyone's hopes.

So long as we continue to do this our area control will expand. When we don't it will contract.

### SAMPLE CRAMMING ORDERS ISSUED

The Cramming Orders issued on the various Tech/Qual personnel are published here as samples of Cramming Orders that may be used to handle Quickying and False Declares.

*Cramming Order #1:*

This was issued on the auditors, C/Ses and Examiner responsible for declares of various states such as: Natural Clear, Clear-OT, „Past Life Grades Release“ (a multiple declare) and at the time when the folder was inspected a declare of „overall Objective EP“ was being considered. This was a case that had not done any OT Levels, or Grades, and had had very little auditing.

There had been a non-standard „rehab“, in that *no process* was rehabbed nor was any *specific release point* found to be rehabbed. Instead a genera „grades release“ was „rehabbed“ from last life—even though the pc didn't recall any process run last life, nor anything particularly about such auditing.

The persons involved were crammed on:

HCO PL 7 Feb 65      KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING

HCO PL 17 Jun 70R Rev. 9.4.77 URGENT AND IMPORTANT TECHNICAL DEGRADES

HCO PL 26 Oct 71      TECH DOWNGRADES

HCO PL 26 May 61      QUALITY COUNTS

THE CLASSIFICATION AND GRADATION CHART

THE CHART OF HUMAN EVALUATION

THE EFFECT SCALE

HCO PL 10 Feb 66R II Rev. 22.2.79 TECH RECOVERY

HCO PL 21 Jul 66      TECH vs QUAL

HCOB 30 Jun 70R      C/S Series 13R, page 3, re Multiple Declare Forbidden

\* All materials from 1965 onward on the subject of Rehabs/ Rehabbing (see just below)

HCOB 19 Jun 71      C/S Series 46, DECLARES (including getting off any False Data about „states' or reasons to falsely declare states not attained.)

HCO PL 15 Sep 67      URGENT—RELEASE AND CLEAR CHECKOUTS

\* The following is a list of the materials on Rehabs:

PAB #115              THE REHABILITATION OF ABILITIES

HCOB 30 Jun 65      RELEASE, REHABILITATION OF

HCOB 12 Jul 65      STATES OF BEING ATTAINED BY PROCESSING

HCOB 2 Aug 65      RELEASE GOOFS

HCOB 30 Aug 65      RELEASE STAGES

HCOB 22 Sep 65      RELEASE GRADATION, NEW LEVELS OF RELEASE

HCOB 27 Sep 65	RELEASE GRADATION, ADDITIONAL DATA
HCOB 7 Nov 65	RELEASE REHABILITATION ERROR
HCOB 26 Nov 65	INFORMATION ON REHABILITATION
HCO PL 10 Feb 66	TECH RECOVERY
HCOB 11 Feb 66	FREE NEEDLES, HOW TO GET THEM ON A PC
HCOB 18 Nov 66	REHAB ON SELF ANALYSIS
HCOB 23 Sep 68	DRUGS & TRIPPERS
HCOB 3 Mar 69	CASE GAIN, COMPLETING LEVELS
HCOB 13 Feb 70	HIGH TA, FULL HANDLING OF
HCOB 19 Jun 70	C/S Q AND A
HCOB 19 Dec 80	REHAB TECH

### *Cramming Order #2:*

This Cramming Order was issued on persons who had quickied Objective processes by ceasing to run the process and had „2WCed the Objective process to F/N“. It was also issued on some who had „verified“ or „rehabbed“ Objective processes by „2WC-ing about these processes to F/N“.

Cram on:

HCOB 12 May 80	DRUGS AND OBJECTIVE PROCESSES
HCOB 19 Mar 78	QUICKIE OBJECTIVES

Also check for False or Verbal Data on Objective processes, and if so False Data Strip.

Additionally on some persons who had left Objective processes unflat on a case and tried to repair the case with various subjective/thinkingness processes, Cramming was done on all references listed in Vol X Index under: „Objective processes“, „Subjective processes“ and „Thinkingness“.

### *Cramming Order #3:*

The following issues are all relevant to the subject of Keeping Scientology Working, and Quickie and False Declares, and if there is a spate of this going on in an area, both the Tech/Qual personnel and the Executives should be crammed on the following:

HCO PL 7 Feb 65	(reissued 27.8.80) KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING
HCO PL 26 May 61	(reissued 21.6.67) QUALITY COUNTS
HCO PL 14 Feb 65	(reissued 7.6.67) SAFEGUARDING TECHNOLOGY
HCO PL 30 May 70	CUTATIVES
HCO PL 17 Jun 70R	(revised 9.4.77) TECHNICAL DEGRADES
HCO PL 26 Oct 71	TECH DOWNGRADES
HCO PL 31 Jul 65	PURPOSES OF THE QUALIFICATIONS DIVISION
HCO PL 8 Mar 66	HIGH CRIME
HCO PL 10 May 70	SINGLE DECLARE
LRH ED 103 INT	FAST FLOW GRADES CANCELLED
HCO PL 2 Nov 61 II	TRAINING QUALITY
HCO PL 25 Jan 80	EXECUTIVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR TECHNICAL EXCELLENCE
HCOB 19 Apr 72	„QUICKIE“ DEFINED, C/S Series 77

HCOB 19 Jun 71 II	DECLARES, C/S Series 46
HCOB 8 Oct 70	PERSISTENT F/N, C/S Series 20
HCOB 21 Jun 70	SUPERFICIAL ACTIONS, C/S Series 9
HCOB 25 Jun 70RA II	(revised 6.10.78) GLOSSARY OF C/S TERMS, C/S Series 12RA
HCOB 26 Aug 70	INCOMPLETE CASES, C/S Series 17
HCOB 12 Jun 70	PROGRAMMING OF CASES, C/S Series 2
HCOB 14 Jun 70	THE RETURN PROGRAM, C/S Series 4
HCOB 15 Jun 70	REPAIR EXAMPLE, C/S Series 5
HCOB 16 Jun 70	WHAT THE C/S IS DOING, C/S Series 6
HCOB 19 Jun 70	C/S Q & A, C/S Series 7
HCOB 15 Jan 70 II	HANDLING WITH AUDITING
HCOB 23 Jun 80	CHECKING QUESTIONS ON GRADE PROCESSES
HCOB 19 Mar 78	QUICKIE OBJECTIVES
HCO PL 20 Sep 76	THE STAT PUSH
HCO PL 20 Sep 76-1	(reissued 5.12.77) STAT PUSH CLARIFIED
LRH ED 306 INT	MAKING AUDITORS
HCO PL 29 May 61	QUALITY AND ADMIN IN CENTRAL ORGS
HCOB 5 Apr 69 (reis. 26.5.70)	NEW PRECLEARS THE WORKABILITY OF SCIENTOLOGY

#### THE CLASSIFICATION AND GRADATION CHART

#### *Successes As a Result of These Crams:*

The following are excerpts from the Success Stories showing the results of the cramming on the above issues.

„The biggest gain I’ve had was from the Cram Order on... (Cramming Order #1 above). I got Comm Eved and removed from post back in April and I got pretty stuck into it. I realized the main thing that stuck me was that I never got a *correct* technical indication of what I did wrong.

„But the indication of a whole broad scene of quickying pcs and false declares *was* the why at the time. And I did deserve the Comm Ev. I was not able to end cycle on it until now. But as a result of the Cram and resultant corrections all the pieces fell into place and my certainty and responsibility are back.“

---

„This Cram changed my whole viewpoint as a Tech person and indicated to me the major out tech in this entire area.

„Also I spotted when I first ran up against this whole body of data regarding false declares.“

---

„The first thing about ‘states’ and falsely declaring states I realized, is that it is a symptom of a quicky, druggy ‘age’ in which anyone who can’t confront something experiences a huge ‘keyout’ similar to a false drug high and goes off to attest to some super state such as ‘Totally at cause over the universe’. The fact is that the original false data got laid into this society



by the drug culture which promoted the benefits of being ‘spaced-out’ (i.e., out of PT), due to the poisons in the body. ‘Elation’ as an Awareness Level is way down below ‘Hallucination’. So there is a societal tendency toward ‘feeling high’ rather than face reality. I first ran into this in college, when I was first exposed to the drug society.

„Recently I seem to have picked up a lot of False Data on ‘by-passed states’ as the key case remedy. A pc who was in trouble was thought to have ‘undeclared states’ , which is an alter-is of a proper rehab of a real release. I saw one ‘state attained’ declared as ‘Perfection as a Being’. This crept into my thinking that unless you declare a lot of states on a pc, the pc would bog.

„I see now that this in effect has prevented pcs from *running* processes. A pc at the lower level of the Effect Scale, would be most likely to want to declare huge states as an effort to blow from the bank!“

---

„I feel more honest as a Tech person and have learned that if you align the data (Chart of Human Evaluation, Effect Scale), you will see the real scene.

„I blew some False Data and cleared up misunderstands that made me afraid to ‘invalidate someone’. BUT if you’re honest and call it like it is, that is the only way.

„I had a lot of realizations and a lot of BASIC Tech aligned for me. I feel more certain about handling cases in general.“

---

„I realized that you attain states and releases by doing the processes in auditing and not by rabbiting, being polite, or using PR. A good win!“

---

„My own technical perceptions have increased by doing this Cram and my ethics level on the point has markedly changed as well. The point is to simply *really* duplicate the case and not attest states not attained as you hang the being at that point.“

---

„This Cram handled a basic reasonableness for me, and it feels very good. It is clear to me why it is that you cannot keep Tech in passively, that continued diligence is the way to do this, and that any other way invites your own failure and the failure of others around you.“

---

„I have been having tremendous Tech wins and results since that Cram. It came up on a GF that a process had been overrun, and when asked the PC said ‘Objectives’. From this I checked which process. I got it down to the session it was overrun in and rehabbed. It was very simple, but had I not been crammed, I may have rehabbed ‘Objectives’ and caused the case endless trouble.

„Next I got a Grades pc who was C/Sed for Grade II to be continued. I studied the folder and saw that on Grade I the PC didn’t run anything ‘because it was all handled’ , yet on Grade II the PC had problems each session. I also noted that the PC had originated she went release on ‘Objectives’ and all Objectives on her were skipped! I sent the folder back to the C/S.

„Then we went in and started from scratch. We had to flatten an unflat CCH, another Objective was unflat, and we ran the ones not run, and then got onto S-C-S (which had been run be-fore). It produced change like crazy. In the first session of S-C-S the PC went anaten, turned on circuits, couldn't execute the command, you name it. Finally she had a big valence shift and said she felt herself now and in control! I ended there to let her have her win.

„I am finally getting a real reality on what Standard Tech is all about, and how you really go about handling cases!“

---

### **CRAMMING CAUTIONS**

Remember that in order to get Tech in after it has been out it may be necessary to get Ethics in first and that the purpose of Ethics is to get Tech in. HCO PL 1 Sep AD15 Issue VII, ETHICS PROTECTION.

It may be necessary to get O/Ws of Quickying and of False Declares off Tech/Qual personnel and Executives involved in order to be able to effectively Cram and call a halt to these forms of Out Ethics. This can be done in an O/W write-up provided it is meter checked for completeness or it can be done in a confessional.

The various Qual Corrective actions such as CRMU, Cramming Repair List and especially False Data Stripping must be used where needed.

### **ETHICS CAUTION**

Once Tech has gone in, the scene has reverted and Tech and Scientology are being fully applied, do not continue to take Ethics actions (as happened in one area), as Tech is now in and Scientology is being applied.

### **TO WHOM DO THESE POLICIES APPLY?**

The Policies mentioned in this issue apply to every Scientologist whether pc, student, staff member or executive and they apply from here on out. It is not just up to someone else to keep Tech in and Keep Scientology Working. It is up to every Scientologist to do so.

If you didn't do so, someone else might not do so either, and the end result of that would be squirming and the loss of results of the Technologies of Dianetics and Scientology, not only for everyone else, but for you too!

But if you do help Keep Scientology Working, then you by doing so have helped contribute to the most priceless gift to Mankind—Dianetics and Scientology—and all the gains and abilities that amount to full recovery of self and true freedom.

Help keep our Tech pure and being applied.

L. RON HUBBARD  
FOUNDER

As assisted by Senior C/S Int

