Remimeo
Product Officers
Org Officers
Execs
All Staff
Programs Chiefs
Project Operators
Mission Operators
Missionaires
Assistant Guardians
Flag Representatives
LRH Communicators
Cramming Officers
Review

Product Debug Series 1

Esto Series 37

DEBUG TECH

Ref: LRH ED 302 INT DEBUG TECH BREAKTHROUGH
HCO PL 23 Aug 79 II DEBUG TECH CHECKLIST
HCOB 23 Aug 79 II PRODUCT DEBUG REPAIR LIST
HCOB 17 fun 79 URGENT, IMPORTANT—CRASHING
MlS-Us: THE KEY TO COMPLETED
CYCLES OF ACTION AND PRODUCTS
HCOB 7 Aug 79 FALSE DATA STRIPPING
HCO PL 26 Mar 79RA MISUNDERSTOOD WORDS AND
CYCLES OF ACTION—MU
WORDS AND NO PRODUCTS
HCOB 23 Aug 79 I CRASHING Mu's BLOCKS TO
FINDING THEM

When I wrote LRH ED 302 DEBUG TECH BREAKTHROUGH in February of this year I promised that there would be a policy letter issued covering the tech more fully. Well, there have been further breakthroughs in the area of debugging production. The tech given in that LRH ED has been acclaimed by hundreds to be miraculous. This policy reissues that tech and brings it up to date with the new discoveries.

HISTORY

Recently I noticed quite a few programs were not progressing rapidly. I found many targets bugged. Project Operators did not seem to know what to do and were getting losses and becoming frustrated. Their targets were "bugged."

"Bugged" is slang for snarled up or halted.

"Debug" means to get the snarls or stops out of something.

I had always been given to believe somebody had developed and written up debug tech. People would often tell me they had debugged this or that, so of course I assumed that the tech existed and that issues and checksheets existed and were in use. Yet here were people operating projects who couldn't get the targets done by themselves or others.

I didn't recall ever having written any policy letter containing the tech of debugging programs or targets.

So I called for the various "Debug Checksheets" and "Debug Issues" they were

using and found something very astonishing. None had any real tech on them to debug something. They just had various quotes that did not necessarily apply.

I did a study of the subject based on what people trying to debug should be doing and what they were not doing and developed a fast, relatively simple system. Some Project Operators were located in very bugged areas which had brought them to apathy and even tears of frustration. The new debug tech was put into their hands and they came streaming back in wild excitement. It worked! Their areas were rolling!

I am releasing this tech to you as it is vital that programs are quickly executed and that production occurs.

This debug tech is tested, fully valid and for immediate use.

Debug tech is a vital executive tool. Anyone who is responsible for getting targets and programs executed, getting production out, turning insolvency into solvency and generally making a better world frankly can't live without it.

Debug tech is used to debug program targets, programs, a lack of completion of the cycles of action which lead to production and in short, whenever there is *any* insufficiency

of viable products coming from an area, org or individual.

THE TECH

1. INSPECTION

The first action in debugging an area is an inspection to see what is going on in terms of production. In inspecting the area you do the following:

1. You look for what products have been gotten out in the past.

2. You look for products that are there completed.

3. You look for what products can be attained in the immediate future.

4. You look for the value of the products produced as compared to the overall cost of the production organization.

5. You look for overt products or cycles where products continuously have to be redone, resulting in no or few products.

The full volume of data on how to do an investigation is given in the Investigations Checksheet on page 175 of *The Volunteer Minister's Handbook.*

When you first inspect an area for products you just look. Policies on "Look Don't Listen" apply (HCO PL 16 Mar 72, Esto Series 8, LOOK DON'T LISTEN). Don't listen to how they are going to get 150 products, just look and walk around with a clipboard.

If you don't see 150 products waiting to be shipped or invoices showing they have been, they don't exist. If you don't see receipts for 150 shipped products, they don't exist and never have. The product is either there or there is ample shipping or departure or finance evidence that they have just left or been shipped. Products that are only in people's heads don't exist.

Dreams are nice—in fact they are essential in life but they have to be materialized into the physical universe before they exist as *products.*

401

The most wide trap the debugger can fall into is, "But next week . . . ," since experience will tell you that next week's production may never arrive. The definition of

product is something that can be exchanged for a valuable product or currency. They have subproducts. These are necessary. A subproduct can also be an overt product and block final products.

When you have done your product inspection, you then look over the period of time from a viewpoint of time and motion. This is to answer the question, "Are things arranged so that there is no time wasted in useless motions which are unnecessary?" This includes poor placement of materiel on a flow line or tool sheds five miles from the site of work so that one has to go there every time one wants a hammer, out-ofsequence

flows or waits.

One counts up the amount of wasted time simply because of the disorganization of a place. It isn't enough to say a place is disorganized. How is this disorganization consuming time and motion which is not resulting in a higher quantity of production? Examples of this are quite gross.

When you have done this study, during which of course you have made notes, you will have the raw materials necessary to make an estimation of the area.

If there is not an adequate and even spectacular record of products getting out and if products have to be redone or if no products are coming out, you proceed as follows:

II. PERSONAL HANDLING

Find a product that *can* be gotten out, any product, and insist that it and products like it or similar cycles be gotten out flat out by the existing personnel.

Do not let this debug act as an excuse for them not to produce. The first step of this handling is to demand production.

When you have gotten them on that, you enter in upon a second stage of debug. This consists essentially of finding if the place is knowledgeable enough and able enough to produce what is actually required and what is actually valuable or being needed from it.

This is accomplished as follows:

(Note: You should not attempt to find Crashing MUs, etc. until the above inspection and the Steps A to H below have been done.)

A. Where are the orders relating to this target (or project or production area)?

(Can include policies, directives, orders, bulletins, issues, despatches, tapes, valid texts and previous debugs and any and all files.)

Handling: Collect up all of the orders relating to this target (or project or production area). This includes the orders and policies the person is operating off of as well as all those he should be operating off of. At this point you may need to employ the "How to Defeat Verbal Tech Checklist":

1. If it isn't written it isn't true.
2. If it's written, read it.
3. Did the person who wrote it have the authority or know how to order it?
4. If you can't understand it, clarify it.
5. If you can't clarify it, clear the MUs.
6. If the MUs won't clear, query it.

402

7. Has it been altered from the original?

8. Get it validated as a correct, on-channel, on-policy, in-tech order.

9. Only if it holds up this far, force others to read it and follow it.

IF IT CAN'T BE RUN THROUGH AS ABOVE *IT'S FALSE!* CANCEL IT!

And use HCOB 7 Aug 79 FALSE DATA STRIPPING as needed.

B. Have you read the orders?

Handling: If he has not read them then have him read, word clear and starrate them.

Ca. Do you have MUs on these orders?

Handling: Get the orders word cleared using M4, M9 or M2 Word Clearing—whatever Word Clearing is needed to fully clear any MUs he has.

Cb. Do you have false data on these orders?

Handling: Strip off the false data per HCOB/PL 7 Aug 79 FALSE DATA STRIPPING .

Handle this step (Ca and Cb) until the person has duplicated the orders and issues relating to this production area.

D. Are there financial or logistics problems on them?

Handling: Debug using HCO PL 14 Mar 72, Issue II, Esto Series 7, FOLLOW POLICY AND LINES and Flag Divisional Directive of 25 Aug 76 FINANCIAL PLANNING MEMBER HAT CHECKSHEET. Debugging this may require getting the whole FP Committee through the FP pack.

E. Are there personnel problems?

Handling: Debug this using HCO PL 16 Mar 71 Org Series 25, Personnel Series 19, LINES AND HATS and the Personnel Series, as given in *The Management Series.*

It may be necessary to do this debug on the HAS or any person responsible for getting the products of staff members who produce.

F. Are there hatting problems?

Handling: Handle this using full Word Clearing and False Data Stripping and get the scene debugged using HCO PL 29 Jul 71 Personnel Series 21, Org Series 28, WHY HATTING? and HCO PL 22 Sep 70 Personnel Series 9, Org Series 4, HATS and HCO PL 27 Dec 70, Personnel Series 16, HATS PROGRAM PITFALLS .

Hatting problems may include the total and utter lack of a hatting course for the staff or a hatting course where WHAT IS A COURSE? PL is flagrantly not in and if you find this you have gotten to the root of why you are working hard debugging all over the place and it had better be handled quick.

It may also be that the area senior doesn't make sure his staff puts in study time off production hours and in this you may find the senior is a failed student himself and this you would also have to handle.

Note: A person who cannot be hatted at all has false data. The handling would be to strip off the false data.

403

G. Is there exterior influence stopping the production which cannot be handled in the production area?

Handling: Handle using HCO PL 31 Jan 72, Data Series 22, THE WHY IS GOD and HCO PL 25 May 73 Data Series 27, SUPPLEMENTARY EVALUATIONS

and HCO PL 30 Dec 70, Org Series 20, ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL. When told that these exterior influences exist the wise debugger immediately verifies. The simplest way to verify is to ask the person who is supposed to be putting stops on the line if he has issued such orders. You commonly find out he hasn't. But if he has, then you have started to locate your area to handle.

You commonly run into verbal tech at which moment you use the "How to Defeat Verbal Tech Checklist."

H. What other excuses exist?

Handling: As per HCO PL THE WHY IS GOD, HCO PL 19 May 70, Data Series 8, SANITY, HCO PL 30 Sep 73, Data Series 30, SITUATION HANDLING and HCOB 19 Aug 67, THE SUPREME TEST.

And once any obvious ones in the above have been handled, and production *still* isn't rolling, you have:

I. Routine finding of MUs per Word Clearing Series.

J. Crashing MU tech per HCOB 17 Jun 79 CRASHING MIS-Us: THE KEY TO COMPLETED CYCLES OF ACTION AND PRODUCTS. Crashing MU finding is done exactly per this HCOB. Crashing MUs can be buried or suppressed as covered in HCOB 23 Aug 79, CRASHING MUs, BLOCKS TO FINDING THEM. The factors as listed in that HCOB which can cause a Crashing MU to remain hidden and unknown may have to be handled before the Crashing MU appears.

K. Do they have any idea at all that they should be getting out any products? Or do they pretend to but don't?

Handling: Simply two-way comm of why the guy was there. It might come as a startling realization that he is supposed to get out products. This can be backed up with Exchange by Dynamics, HCO PL 4 Apr 72, Esto Series 14, ETHICS and Short Form Product Clearing, HCO PL 13 Mar 72, Esto Series 5, PRODUCTION AND ESTABLISHMENT ORDERS AND PRODUCTS or HCO PL 23 Mar 72, Esto Series 11, FULL PRODUCT CLEARING LONG FORM.

There is also such a thing as a person who will not complete a cycle of action. This is normally true of what we call a "suppressive person" or even an insane person.

Handling: Get the person's case looked into by a competent C/S and also by the Ethics Officer for background.

But as PTS people are in suppressive persons' valences he may only be PTS.

Handling: See Section P below for de-PTSing.

L. Wrong stat. The person has been given a stat that has nothing to do with what he is supposed to produce.

Handling: get the right stat figured out so that it agrees with what he is supposed to produce and actually measures his actual production.

404

M. Wrong VFP or wrong product? Do they have the idea of VFP right? (or does the org think it's the award rather than the product, i.e. GI rather than an audited paying pc or a trained paying student?).

It of course can occur, amazingly, that the person or department, etc. is trying to turn out a product that has no exchange value. This can occur because what they

do produce is so flubby as to be called "an overt product" which nobody can use further on up the line or even at the end of the line. You handle this by coming down on their sense of fitness of things. Overt products waste resources and time and personnel and are actually more destructive than on first glance. They cannot be exchanged but they also waste resources as well as lose any expected return. You can remedy this sort of thing by improving their tech so they do turn out something decent and useful.

They can also be turning out a type of product nobody wants—such as 1819 buggy whips in a Space Age. They may be great buggy whips but they won't exchange because nobody wants them.

They may also be getting out products of excellent quality but never tell anybody they have or do them. This can apply as narrowly as one worker who doesn't tell anybody he is having or doing them or a whole organization which, with complete asininity, never markets or advertises their products.

It is also possible that a combination of all three things above may be found.

It also may be they have all sorts of products they could get out but they never dreamed of getting them out yet their life blood may depend upon it.

Handling: HCO PL 24 Jul 78, SUBPRODUCTS, which tells how to compile a subproducts list and attain VFPs. Exchange by Dynamics per HCO PL 4 Apr 72, Esto Series 14 ETHICS and Full Product Clearing Long Form on the correct and actual VFP (as well as any other products the person or area may have), as well as marketing and PR tech.

N. Never figured out what they would have to do to get a product?

Handling: Handle this using HCO PL 7 Aug 76, Issue I, II and III, Admin Know-How Series 33, NAME YOUR PRODUCT, Admin Know-How Series 34, WANT YOUR PRODUCT, Admin Know-How Series 35, TO GET YOU HAVE TO KNOW HOW TO ORGANIZE, HCO PL 24 Jul 78, SUBPRODUCTS and HCO PL 14 Jan 69, OT ORGS.

O. Out-ethics?

Handling: Determine the situation and handle with O/W write-ups or auditing and ethics conditions or correction of past conditions and the ethics policies that apply.

P. Is the area or individual creating problems and demanding solutions to them?

Handling: Give the person PTS handling as per ethics policies. If and when available, get the personnel de-PTSed using Clay Table De-PTSing as per HCOB CLAY TABLE DE-PTSing—THEORY AND ADMINISTRATION. (Note: Clay Table De-PTSing can only be done on someone by a person who has had the step himself .)

Q. Total organize? (Is the area organizing only?)

Handling: This is an indicator of many misunderstoods in the area, especially on the part of its senior. The senior and the personnel in the area need full Word Clearing on the materials to do with the production area, including Crashing MU

405

finding as in J (ref: HCO PL 26 Mar 79RA MISUNDERSTOOD WORDS AND CYCLES OF ACTION—MU WORDS AND NO PRODUCTS) off production

hours and meanwhile make them produce what they can.

R. Organization adequate to get the product?

Inadequate organization:

Handling: Debug the organization per HCO PL 13 Sep 70, Org Series 1, BASIC ORGANIZATION, HCO PL 14 Sep 70, Org Series 2, COPE AND ORGANIZE, HCO PL 14 Sep 70, Org Series 3, HOW TO ORGANIZE AN ORG, HCO PL 8 Oct 70, Org Series 8, ORGANIZING AND PRODUCT, HCO PL 29 Oct 70, Org Series 10, THE ANALYSIS OF ORGANIZATION BY PRODUCT.

No organization:

Handling: This is the situation where someone does not organize any corner of his area or work or organizations or lines. This manifests itself by irrational demands to only produce and to prevent any organization so that production can occur. The handling is to clear the misunderstoods (including Crashing MUs) in the area, particularly on the purpose of the production and why one is producing.

Lacking a sense of organization?

Handling: Lack of a sense of organization lies below the level of MUs, overts and withholds and PTSness—and you have to go north through PTSness and overts and withholds to even get to the MUs.

The handling would be de-PTSing as in Step P. Then handle any overts and withholds and then clear the MUs in the area being addressed (including Crashing MUs.)

Debug tech is laid out as a checklist in HCO PL 23 Aug 79, Issue II, DEBUG TECH CHECKLIST. It is a very useful checklist as the points of debug can be assessed on a meter by an auditor (or any person trained to use an E-Meter) or be administratively used by anyone wishing to debug an area.

HCOB 23 Aug 79, Issue IIs PRODUCT DEBUG REPAIR LIST is for use by an auditor to repair someone who has been messed up by somebody trying to debug his area. As faulty debugging can mess a person up, this repair list has been written to remedy that, should it occur.

Normally, in an area that is very bogged and not producing, the first question or two will deliver the reasons right into your hands. They are trying to produce blue ruddy rods but the order they finally dig up after a fifteen minute search says specifically and directly that green finglebums are what are wanted here and that blue ruddy rods are forbidden. It is usually outrageous and large. As you go down the list you will find out that you are running into things which open the door to justification. So you take very good care to notice the justifications which are being used. The handling of justifications is indicated in HCOB 23 Aug 79, Issue I, CRASHING MUs, BLOCKS TO FINDING THEM and the HCOB of JUSTIFICATIONS 21 Jan AD10.

WHAT TO HANDLE

Handling of course is indicated by what you find and the above references. But handling must always be in the direction of at least 50% production. Even while debugging do not go for an all-organize handling. Also do not go for an all-production handling.

A person, once trained on the data as contained in this PL, Crashing MU tech, False Data Stripping and Product Clearing, will be able to get almost any area debugged

and producing. It is important to remember that debug tech applies from the very small expected action to the huge expected project.

THE EP OF DEBUG

The above debug actions are never carried on past the point where the target or area or individual or org has been debugged.

Once production has been debugged and desirable products are now being gotten for real in adequate quantity, the debug has been accomplished.

This could occur at any one of the above steps. And when it does you let the area get on with producing the products they are now able to produce.

EVALUATION AND PROGRAMMING

There is a whole different technology called Evaluation. The full tech on how to execute and program is contained in the Data Series and the Data Series Evaluator's Course and BPL 4 Jul 78 ELEMENTARY EVALUATOR'S COURSE and the Target Series HCO PLs: 14 Jan 69 OT ORGS, 16 Jan 69 TARGETS, TYPES OF, 18 Jan 69, Issue II, PLANNING AND TARGETS, 24 Jan 69, TARGET TYPES, 24 Jan 69, Issue II, PURPOSE AND TARGETS and HCO PL 4 Dec 73, Data Series 32, TARGET TROUBLE. One is expected to know how to evaluate. But even after you have evaluated, evaluations contain targets. And targets get bugged. So you will need debug tech even when you are an accomplished evaluator.

With the debug tech and the added steps of Crashing MU finding, overts and withholds, False' Data Stripping, Product Clearing, etc. you will be able to crack the back of the most resistive nonproducing areas and get them into roaring, high-morale production.

Between February 79 and 23 August 79 I have spent a great deal of development time on the technology needed to completely debug people, projects, targets and production. A very large number of missions researches and pilots were undertaken to discover and polish up this tech. It can now be considered a completed development cycle.

The above IS the tech.

USE IT!

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder
LRH:kjm

Remimeo
Sups
Tech   (Also issued as HCOB 7 Aug 79
Qual   FALSE DATA STRIPPING)
Execs
ALL STAFF

Product Debug Series 8
Esto Series 36

FALSE DATA STRIPPING

(Ref. The Study Tapes
Dianetic Auditor's Bulletin Vol I Numbers *1–2*
STANDARD PROCEDURE
Tech Vol 1, pgs. *15–20*
Dianetic Auditor's Bulletin Vol I Number *3*
HOW TO RELEASE A CHRONIC
SOMATIC
Tech Vol 1, pgs. *24–26*
NOTES ON THE
LECTURES Pgs. *52–66,112–113*)

When a person is not functioning well on his post, on his job or in life, at the bottom of his difficulties will often be found unknown basic definitions and laws or false definitions, false data and false laws, resulting in an inability to think with the words and rules of that activity and an inability to perform the simplest required functions.

The person will remain unfamiliar with the fundamentals of his activity, at times appearing idiotic, because of these not-defined and falsely defined words.

Verbal hating is the main source of false definitions and false data.

Someone who "knows" tells someone else a definition or a datum. The person now thinks he knows the definition (even though nothing in the field makes any sense to him).

The word may not even read on the meter during misunderstood checks because the person "thinks he knows."

A politician is told by an advisor, "It doesn't matter how much money the government spends. It is good for the society." The politician uses this "rule" and, the next thing you know, inflation is driving everybody to starvation and the government to bankruptcy. The politician, knowing he was told this on the very best authority, does not spot it as false data, but continues to use it right up to the point where the angry mobs stand him up in front of a firing squad and shoot him down.

And the pity of it is that the politician never **once suspected** that there was anything false about the data, even though he couldn't work with it. There is no field in all the society where false data is not rampant. "Experts," "advisors," "friends," "families," seldom go and look at the basic texts on subjects, even when these are known to exist, but indulge in all manner of interpretations and even outright lies to seem wise or expert. The cost, in terms of lost production and damaged equipment is enormous. You will see it in all sectors of society.

People cannot think with the fundamentals of their work. They goof. They ruin things. They have to redo what they have already done. You'll find people whose estimate of the environment is totally perverted to the point they're walking around literally in a fog.

The guy looks at a tree and the reality of the tree is blurred by the "fact" that "trees are made by God" so he won't take care of the tree because he is convinced.

What we're trying to cure in people is the inability to think with data. This was traced by me to false data as a phenomenon additional to misunderstood words, although the misunderstood word plays a role in it and will have to be allowed for.

When a person is having difficulty in an area or on a post, when he can't seem to apply what he has "learned" or what he is studying or when he can't get through a specific drill or exercise in his training materials, you will suspect he has false data in that area or on those materials. If he is to use it at all effectively he must first sort out the true facts regarding it from the conflicting bits and pieces of information or opinion he has acquired. This eliminates the false data and lets him get on with it.

INABILITY TO HAT

We are looking here at a brand new discovery I have made which is that it can be nearly impossible to hat anyone who is sitting on false data on the subject you are trying to hat him on. This is the *primary* reason people cannot be hatted and False Data Stripping therefore enables a person to be hatted even though other approaches have failed. This is a very valuable discovery- it solves the problem of inability to hat or train.

SOURCES

False data on a subject can come from any number of sources.

In the process of day-to-day living people encounter and often accept without inspection all sorts of ideas which may seem to make sense but don't. Advertising, newspapers, TV and other media are packed with such material. The most profound false data can come out of texts such as Stanislavsky (a Russian actor and director); and even mothers have a hand in it, such as "children should be seen and not heard."

Where a subject, such as art, contains innumerable authorities and voluminous opinions you may find that any and all textbooks under that heading reek with false data. Those who have studied study tech will recall that the validity of texts is an important factor in study. Therefore it is important that any supervisor or teacher seeking to use False Data Stripping must utilize basic *workable* texts.

These are most often found to have been written by the original discoverer of the subject and when in doubt avoid texts which are interpretations of somebody else's work. In short, choose only textual material which is closest to the basic facts of the subject and avoid those which embroider upon them.

It can happen, if you do False Data Stripping well and expertly without enforcing your own data on the person, that he can find a *whole* textbook false-much to his amazement. In such a case, locate a more fundamental text on the subject. (Examples of false texts: Eastman Kodak; Lord Keynes treatises on economics; John Dewey's texts on education; Sigmund Freud's texts on the mind; the texts derived from the "work" of Wundt (Leipzig 1879-Father of Modern Psychology); and (joke) a textbook on "Proper Conduct for Sheep" written by A. Wolf.)

USE OF FALSE DATA STRIPPING

False Data Stripping should be used extensively in all hatting and training activities.

Current society is riddled with false data and these must be cleared away so that we can hat and train people.

Then they will be able to learn useful data which will enable them to understand things **and produce** valuable products in life.

False Data Stripping can be done on or off the meter. It can be done by an auditor in session, by a Supervisor, Cramming Officer or Word Clearer or by an exec, Esto or any administrator. Students and staff can be trained to do it on each other.

Not a lot of training is required to deliver this procedure but anyone administering it must have checked out on this HCOB/PL and have demoed and drilled the procedure. If it is going to be done on the meter (which is preferable) the person doing it must have an OK to operate an E-Meter.

GRADIENTS

It will be found that false data actually comes off in gradients.

For example, a student handled initially on false data on a particular drill will appear to be complete on it. He goes on with his studies and makes progress for a while and then sometimes he will hit a bog or slow in his progress. This is usually an indication that more false data has been flushed up (restimulated or remembered as a result of actually doing studies or drills). At that point more basic false data will come off when asked for.

The reason for this is: when you first give a student false data handling he doesn't know enough about the subject to know false data from the true. When he has learned a bit more about the subject he then collides with more false data hitherto buried. This can happen several times, as he is getting more and more expert on the subject.

Thus the action of stripping off false data can and must be checked for and used in any training and hatting.

The rundown has to be given again and again at later and later periods, as a student or staff member may come up against additional faulty data that has been not-ised. It can be repeated as often as necessary in any specific area of training until the person is finally duplicating and is able to use the correct tech and only the correct tech exactly.

THEORY

There is a philosophic background as to why getting off false data on a subject works and why trying to teach a correct datum *over* a false datum on the subject does not work. It is based on the Socratic thesis-antithesis-synthesis philosophical equation.

Socrates: 470 B.C.-399 B.C. A great Greek philosopher.

A *thesis* is a statement or assertion.

Antithesis: opposing statement or assertion.

The Socratic equation is mainly used in debate where one debater asserts one thing and the other debater asserts the opposite. It was the contention of Socrates and others that when two forces came into collision a new idea was born. This was the use of the equation in logic and debate.

However, had they looked further they would have seen that other effects were brought into play. It has very disastrous effects when it appears in the field of training.

Where the person has acquired a *false* thesis (or datum), the *true* datum you are trying to teach him becomes an antithesis. The true datum comes smack up against the false datum he is hanging on to, as it is counter to it.

In other words, these two things collide, and *neither one will* then make sense to him. At this point he can try to make sense out of the collision and form what is called a synthesis, or his wits simply don't function. *(Synthesis:* a unified whole in which opposites, thesis and antithesis, are reconciled.)

So you wind up with the person either

> (a) attempting to use a false, unworkable synthesis he has formed, or

> (b) his thinkingness locks up on the subject.

In either case you get an impossible-to-train, impossible-to-hat scene.

GLIBNESS

Probably we have here the basic anatomy of the "glib student" who can parrot off whole chapters on an examination paper and yet in practice uses his tools as a door stop. This student has been a mystery to the world of education for eons. What he has probably done in order to get by, is set up a circuit which is purely memory.

The truth of it is his understanding or participation is barred off by considerations such as "nothing works anyway but one has to please the professor somehow."

The less a person can confront, the more false data he has accumulated and will accumulate.

These syntheses are simply additives and complexities and make the person complicate the subject beyond belief Or the collision of false data and true data, without the person knowing which is which, makes him look like a meathead.

Therefore, in order to cure him of his additives, complexities, apathy and apparent stupidity on a subject, in addition to cleaning up misunderstood words, it is necessary to strip the false data off the subject. Most of the time this is prior to the true data and so is basic on the chain. Where this is the case, when that basic false data is located and stripped, the whole subject clears up more easily.

FALSE DATA PRONE

Some people are prone to accepting false data. This stems from overts committed prior to the false data being accepted. The false data then acts as a justifier for the overt.

An example of this would be a student studying past Mis-Us on a subject, cheating in the exam and eventually dropping the subject entirely. Then someone comes along and tells him that the subject is useless and destructive. Well, he will immediately grab hold of this datum and believe it as he needs something to justify his earlier overts.

This actually gets into service facsimiles as the person will use the false data to make the subject or other people wrong.

So if you see someone who is very prone to accepting false data on a particular subject or in general, the answer is to get the prior overts pulled. Then the person will not need to justify his overts by accepting any false data that comes his way.

PROCEDURE

You may not easily be able to detect a false datum because the person believes it to be true.

When False Data Stripping is done on a meter the false datum won't necessarily read for the same reason.

You therefore ask the person if there is anything he has run across on the subject under discussion which he couldn't think with, which didn't seem to add up or seems to be in conflict with the material one is trying to teach him.

The false datum buries itself and the procedure itself handles this phenomenon.

When the false datum is located it is handled with elementary recall based on 1950 Straightwire. Straight memory technique or Straightwire (so called because one is stringing a line between present time and some incident in the past, and stringing that line directly and without any detours) was developed originally in 1950 as a lighter process than engram running.

Cleverly used, Straightwire removed locks and released illnesses without the pc ever having run an engram.

Once one had determined whatever it was that was going to be run with Straightwire, one would have the pc recall where and when it happened, who was involved, what were they doing, what was the pc doing, etc., until the lock blew or the illness keyed out.

Straightwire works at a lock level. When overdone it can key in underlying engrams. When properly done it can be quite miraculous.

STEPS

A. Determine whether or not the person needs this procedure by checking the following:

1. The person cannot be hatted on a subject.

2. No Crashing Mis-Us can be found on a subject yet it is obvious they exist.

3. The person is not duplicating the material he has studied as he is incorrectly applying it or only applying part of it, despite Word Clearing.

4. He is rejecting the material he is reading or the definition of the word he is clearing.

5. You suspect or the person originates earlier data he has encountered on the materials that could contain false data.

6. The person talks about or quotes other sources or obviously incorrect sources.

7. He is glib.

8. The person is backing off from actually applying the data he is studying despite standard Word Clearing.

9. He is bogged.

10. He cannot think with the data and it does not seem to apply.

B. Establish the difficulty the person is having-i.e. what are the materials he can't duplicate or apply? These materials must be to hand and the person must be familiar with the basic true data on the subject being addressed.

C. If the action is being done metered, put the person on the meter and properly adjust the sensitivity with a proper can squeeze.

D. Thoroughly clear the concept of false data with the person. Have him give you examples to show he gets it. (This would be done if the person was receiving False Data Stripping for the first time.)

E. The following questions are used to detect and uncover the false data. These questions are cleared before they are used for the first time on anyone. They do not have to read on a meter and may not do so as the person will not necessarily read on something that he believes to be true.

1. "Is there anything you have run across in (subject under discussion) which you couldn't think with?"

2. "Is there anything you have encountered in (subject under discussion) which didn't seem to add up?"

3. "Is there something you have come across in (subject under discussion) that seems to be in conflict with the material you are trying to learn?"

4. "Is there something in (subject under discussion) which never made any sense to you?"

5. "Did you come across any data in (subject under discussion) that you had no use for?"

6. "Was there any data you came across in (subject under discussion) that never seemed to fit in?"

7. "Do you know of any datum that makes it unnecessary for you to do a good job on this subjectT'

8. "Do you know of any reason why an overt product is all right?"

9. "Would you be made wrong if you really learned this subject?"

10. "Did anyone ever explain this subject to you verbally?"

11. "Do you know of any datum that conflicts with standard texts on this subject?"

12. "Do you consider you really know best about this subject?"

13. "Would it make somebody else wrong not to learn this subject?"

14. "Is this subject not worth learning?"

The questions are asked in the above sequence. When an area of false data is uncovered by one of these questions one goes straight on to Step F-handling.

F When the person comes up with an answer to one of the above questions locate the false datum as follows:

1. Ask "Have you been given any false data regarding this?" and help him locate the false datum. If this is being done on the meter, one can use any meter reads one does get to steer the person. This may require a bit of work as the person may believe the false data he has to be true.

   Keep at it until you get the false datum.

   If the person has given you the false datum in Step E then this step will not be needed: just go straight on to Step G.

G. When the false datum has been located, handle as follows:

1. Ask "Where did this datum come from?" (This could be a person, a book, TV, etc.)

2. "When was this?"

3. "Where exactly were you at the time?"

4. "Where was (the person, book, etc.) at the time?"

5. "What were you doing at the time?"

6. If the false datum came from a person ask: "What was (the person) doing at the time?"

7. "How did (the person, book, etc.) look at the time?"

8. If the datum has not blown with the above questions ask: "Is there an earlier similar false datum or incident on (the subject under discussion)?" and handle per Steps 1-7.

Continue as above until the false datum has blown. On the meter you will have a floating needle and very good indicators.

DO NOT CONTINUE PAST A POINT WHERE THE FALSE DATUM HAS BLOWN.

If you suspect the datum may have blown but the person has not originated then ask:

"How does that datum seem to you now?" and either continue if it hasn't blown or end off on that datum if it has blown.

H. When you have handled a particular false datum to a blow, going earlier similar as necessary, you would then go back and repeat the question from E (the detection step) that uncovered the false datum. If there are any more answers to the question, they are handled exactly as in Step F (location) and Step G (handling).

That particular question is left when the person has no more answers. Then, if the person is not totally handled on the subject under discussion, one would use the other questions from Step E and handle them in the same way. All the questions can be asked and handled as above but one would not continue past a point where the whole subject has been cleared up and the person can now duplicate and apply the data he has been having trouble with.

I. *CONDITIONAL:* If False Data Stripping is being done in conjunction with Crashing Mis-U Finding one would now proceed with the Crashing Mis-U Finding.

J. Send the person to the Examiner.

K. Have the person study or restudy the true data on the subject you have been handling.

END PHENOMENA

When the above procedure is done correctly and fully on an area the person is actually having difficulty with, he will end up able to duplicate, understand and apply and think with the data that he could not previously grasp. The false data that was standing in the road of duplication will have been cleared away and the person's thinking will have been freed up. When this occurs, no matter where in the procedure, one ends off the False Data Stripping on that subject and sends the person to the Examiner. He will have cognitions and VGIs and on the meter you will have an F/N. This is not the end of all False Data Stripping for that person. It is the end of that False Data Stripping on the person at that particular time. As the person continues to work with and study the subject in question, he will learn more about it and may again collide with false data at which time one repeats the above process.

NOTE

False data buries itself as the person may firmly believe that it is true. Sometimes the person will have such faith in a particular person, book, etc., that he cannot conceive that any data from that particular source might be false. One artist being false data stripped had received some false data from a very famous painter. Even though the data didn't really add up and actually caused the artist tremendous problems, he tended to believe it because of where it came from. It took persistence on the part of the person administering the False Data Stripping to eventually blow this false datum with a resulting freeing up of the artist's ability to think and produce in the area.

MISUNDERSTOODS

Misunderstoods often come up during False Data Stripping and should be cleared when they do. One would then continue with the False Data Stripping. One person being false data stripped knew he had some false data from a particular source but the false data was a complete blank-

he couldn't remember it at all. It was discovered that he had a Mis-U just before he received the false data and as soon as this was cleared up he recalled the false data and it blew. This is just one example of how Word Clearing can tie in with False Data Stripping.

REPEATED USE

False Data Stripping can be done over and over as it will come off in layers as mentioned before. If False Data Stripping has been done on a specific thing and at some later point the person is having difficulty with a drill or the materials, the stripping of false data should be done on him again.

In such a case it will be seen that the person recognizes or remembers more false or contrary data he has accumulated on the subject that was not in view earlier. As he duplicates a drill or his materials more and more exactly, former "interpretations" he had not-ised, incorrect past flunks that acted as invalidation or evaluation, etc., may crop up to be stripped off.

CAUTIONS

CODE. False Data Stripping is done under the discipline of the Auditor's Code. Evaluation and invalidation can be particularly harmful and must be avoided. All points of the code apply.

RUDIMENTS. One would not begin False Data Stripping on someone who already has out-ruds. If the person is upset or worried about something or is critical or nattery, then you should fly his ruds or get them flown before you start False Data Stripping.

OVERRUN. One must be particularly careful not to overrun the person past a blow of the false datum. The stress in recall is that it is a light action which does not get the person into engrams or heavy charge. Keep it light. If you overrun someone past the point of a blow, he may drop into engrams or heavy charge. Just take the recall step to a blow and don't push him beyond it.

DATE/LOCATE. Date/Locate is another way of getting something to blow. If a false datum does not blow on the recall steps despite going earlier similar, then it could be handled with Date/Locate *in session* as ordered by the C/S. This would normally be done as part of a False Data Stripping Repair List. Date/Locating false data would never be done except in session as ordered by the C/S or as directed by the False Data Stripping Repair List. The auditor must be totally starrated on Date and Locating and practised in it before he attempts it.

FALSE DATA STRIPPING REPAIR LIST. The False Data Stripping Repair List is used in session by an auditor when False Data Stripping bogs inextricably or the person is not F/N GIs at Exams or gets in trouble after False Data Stripping has been done. A bogged False Data Stripping session must be handled within 24 hours.

NEW STUDENTS. Students who are new to Scientology should not use this procedure on each other as they may be insufficiently experienced to deliver it competently. In this case the Supervisor or someone qualified would administer False Data Stripping to those students who need it.

SUMMARY

The problem of the person who is unable to learn or who is unable to apply what he learns has never been fully resolved before. Misunderstoods were and are a major factor and Word Clearing must be used liberally. Now, however, I have made a major breakthrough which finally explains and handles the problem of inability to learn and apply.

Man's texts and education systems are strewn with false data. These false data effectively block someone's understanding of the true data. The handling given in this HCOB/PL makes it possible to remove that block and enable people to learn data so they can apply it.

With the ability to learn comes stability and the production of valuable products. With stability and the production of valuable products comes the achievement of one's purposes and goals, high morale and happiness.

So let's get to work on stripping away the false data which plagues Man, clogs up his ability to think and learn and reduces his competence and effectiveness. Let's increase the ability of individuals and the human race.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 23 AUGUST 1979
Issue II
Remimeo
Tech
Qual *Product Debug Series 10*
C/Ses

PRODUCT DEBUG REPAIR LIST

Ref: HCO PL 23 Aug 791 Product Debug Series 1,
Esto Series 37
DEBUG TECH
HCO PL 23 Aug 79 II Product Debug Series 2,
Esto Series 38
DEBUG TECH CHECKLIST
Product Debug Series

The purpose of this list is to repair a messed up Product Debug (as covered in
HCO PL 23 Aug 79 I Product Debug Series 1, Esto Series 37 DEBUG TECH and
HCO PL 23 Aug 79 II Product Debug Series 2, Esto Series 38 DEBUG TECH
CHECKLIST).

In the event of somebody getting messed up because of faulty debugging, use this
list to clean up the BPC and then get the person back to complete the debug actions.

This list is done in session by an auditor and is assessed Method 3.

Preface each line with: "On your Product Debug handling_____."

Each reading line is taken to F/N per the instructions.

Any R/S turned on on this list must be immediately reported to the Ethics Officer.

Any such assessment sheet as this must be placed in the person's pc folder.

PC's NAME: DATE:_____

AUDITOR:

SECTION 1

1A. DID YOU HAVE AN OUT-LIST? _____
(Handle per HCOB 11 Apr 77 LIST ERRORS CORRECTION
OF, section on "Use of L4BRA.")

1B. WERE YOU GIVEN A WRONG ITEM? _____
(Indicate and handle per HCOB 11 Apr 77 LIST ERRORS
CORRECTION OF and C/S Series 78.)

1C. WERE YOU GIVEN A WRONG WHY? _____
(Indicate and handle per HCOB 11 Apr 77 LIST ERRORS
CORRECTION OF and C/S Series 78.)

1D. WERE YOU BEING DEBUGGED ON THE WRONG
PRODUCT? _____
(Indicate and handle per C/S Series 78.)

1E. WAS THE WRONG AREA ADDRESSED? _____
(Indicate and handle per C/S Series 78.)

391

1F. WERE YOU ASSIGNED A WRONG CONDITION? _____
(Indicate and handle as a wrong item.)

SECTION 2

2A. DID YOU HAVE AN ARC BREAK? _____
(Fly the ARC break.)
2B. DID YOU HAVE A PROBLEM? _____
(Fly the problem.)
2C. DID YOU HAVE A WITHHOLD? _____
(Pull the withhold.)
2D. DID YOU HAVE AN OVERT? _____
(Pull the overt.)
2E. DID THE PERSON DOING THE DEBUG MISS A
WITHHOLD? _____
(Pull the withhold.)
2F. WERE OVERTS OR WITHHOLDS RESTIMULATED BUT
NOT BLOWN? _____
(Pull the overts or withholds.)
2G. WAS THERE AN OVERT OR WITHHOLD THAT WAS
GOTTEN OFF MORE THAN ONCE? _____
(Indicate it and 2WC E/S to F/N.)
2H. DID SOMEBODY SAY YOU HAD AN OVERT OR WITHHOLD
WHEN YOU DIDN'T? _____
(Indicate it and 2WC E/S to F/N.)
2I. WAS THERE SOME OTHER KIND OF OUT-RUD? _____
(Find out what and handle.)
2J. WERE YOU USING THE DEBUG AS AN EXCUSE NOT TO
PRODUCE? _____
(Handle as a withhold.)
2K. WAS THERE SOME KIND OF OUT-ETHICS? _____
(Handle as a withhold.)
2L. DID YOU HAVE COUNTER-INTENTION? _____
(Handle as a withhold.)
2M. DID YOU HAVE OTHER-INTENTION? _____
(Handle as a withhold.)
2N. WAS THERE ANY INVALIDATION? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N.)
2O. WAS THERE ANY EVALUATION? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N.)
2P. WERE THERE IGNORED ORIGINATIONS? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N.)
2Q. WERE YOU PROTESTING? _____
(Indicate and 2WC E/S to F/N.)
2R. DID YOU HAVE NO INTEREST IN THE ACTION? _____
392
(Find out if it's out-ruds, MUs or past failures and handle.)
2S. WAS THERE A FAILED PURPOSE? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N.)
SECTION 3
3A. DID YOU RESENT THE DEBUG ACTIONS? _____

(Find out why and 2WC E/S to F/N putting in any out-ruds. If the debug was unnecessary indicate it and take it E/S to F/N.)

3B. WAS THERE NO INSPECTION DONE TO DETERMINE WHAT TO DEBUG? _____

(Indicate and 2WC E/S to F/N. Program him to have the inspection done and then a proper debug.)

3C. WAS THE INSPECTION MISDONE IN SOME WAY? _____

(Indicate and 2WC E/S to F/N. Program him to have the inspection done properly and then a proper debug.

3D. DID YOU FEEL THE PERSON DOING THE DEBUG WAS ACTING OUT OF REVENGE? _____

(Quad ruds and overts on the terminal.)

3E. DID YOU FEEL THE PERSON DOING THE DEBUG WAS JUST TRYING TO GET EVEN WITH YOU? _____

(Quad ruds and overts on the terminal.)

SECTION 4

4A. DIDN'T YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT WAS BEING DONE? _____

(Handle his MUs and questions.)

4B. WERE THERE WORD CLEARING ERRORS? _____

(Assess and handle a WCCL.)

4C. WAS AN MU FOUND THAT WAS NOT CLEARED? _____

(Fully clear the MU to F/N.)

4D. WAS THE WORD CLEARED NOT REALLY A MISUNDERSTOOD? _____

(Indicate and 2WC E/S to F/N.)

4E. WERE YOU TOLD YOU HAD MUs WHEN YOU DIDN'T? _____

(Indicate and 2WC E/S to F/N.)

4F. WAS YOUR CRASHING MIS-U FINDING MESSED UP? _____

(Assess and handle a Crashing Mis-U Repair List.)

4G. WAS THE CRASHING MIS-U FOUND NOT FULLY CLEARED? _____

(Clear it fully to F/N.)

4H. COULDN'T YOU FIND THE CRASHING MIS-U? _____

(Assess and handle the Crashing Mis-U Repair List.)

4I. WERE YOU TOLD YOU HAD A CRASHING MIS-U WHEN YOU DIDN'T? _____

(Indicate and take E/S to F/N. Do a Crashing Mis-U Repair List if necessary.)

4J. WAS YOUR CRASHING MIS-U FINDING MISDONE? _____

393

(Assess and handle a Crashing Mis-U Repair List.)

4K. COULDN'T COMPLETE SOME CYCLE OF ACTION? _____

(2WC E/S to F/N. Send to the Word Clearer for handling with Crashing Mis-U tech.)

SECTION 5

5A. WAS THERE FALSE DATA? _____

(2WC E/S to F/N. Send to the debugger for False Data Stripping on the area.)

5B. WAS YOUR FALSE DATA HANDLING MESSED UP? _____
(Assess and handle the False Data Stripping Repair List.)

5C. WAS THE "FALSE DATA" FOUND NOT REALLY FALSE DATA? _____
(Indicate it and have him spot this. Take it E/S to F/N.)

5D. WAS SOME FALSE DATA UNCOVERED BUT NOT BLOWN? _____
(Handle the false data to a blow with the False Data Stripping procedure.)

5E. DID THE PERSON DOING THE DEBUG GIVE YOU FALSE DATA? _____
(Indicate and strip off the false data per HCOB 7 Aug 79 Product Debug Series 8, Esto Series 36 FALSE DATA STRIPPING.)

5F. WAS THE TRUE OR CORRECT DATA NEVER FOUND? _____
(Indicate and 2WC E/S to F/N. Program him to have this handled with False Data Stripping.)

5G. DID SOMEBODY SAY YOU HAD FALSE DATA WHEN YOU DIDN'T? _____
(Indicate and 2WC E/S to F/N.)

5H. HAD THE FALSE DATA ALREADY BEEN HANDLED? _____
(Indicate and 2WC E/S to F/N.)

5I. WERE YOU GIVEN ANY VERBAL DATA? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N. Program this to be handled with the "How to Defeat Verbal Tech Checklist.")

5J. ARE YOU OPERATING OFF FALSE OR VERBAL DATA? _____
(Indicate and 2WC E/S to F/N. Program this to be handled with False Data Stripping and the "How to Defeat Verbal Tech Checklist.")

5K. HAVE YOU GIVEN OTHERS FALSE DATA? _____
(Pull as a withhold. Then strip off any false data he has in the area.)

5L. HAVE YOU TOLERATED FALSE DATA BEING GIVEN YOU? _____
(Pull as a withhold. Then strip off the false data.)

5M. HAVE YOU CONCLUDED SOMETHING WITHOUT CHECKING IT OUT TO OBTAIN THE FULL FACTS? _____
(Handle as a withhold. Then strip off any false data he has on the area.)

394

5N. HAVE YOU FAILED TO DO YOUR HOMEWORK IN YOUR SUBJECT? _____
(Handle as a withhold. Then strip off any false data he has in the area.)

5O. HAVE YOU JUST HOPED SOMETHING WAS OKAY AND

PASSED IT ON AS OKAY WHEN YOU DIDN'T KNOW? _____
(Handle as a withhold. Then strip off any false data he has in the
area.)
5P. HAVE YOU PRETENDED KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERIENCE
YOU DID NOT HAVE? _____
(Handle as a withhold.)
5Q. HAVE YOU GIVEN FALSE DATA TO GET OUT OF SOMETHING?
_____
(Handle as a withhold.)
5R. HAVE YOU EVER LIED ABOUT ANYTHING IN THIS
AREA? _____
(Handle as a withhold.)
SECTION 6
6A. WAS YOUR ETHICS HANDLING MESSED UP? _____
(Indicate it and 2WC E/S to F/N. If necessary, assess the
appropriate correction list to handle the BPC.)
6B. WERE YOU NOT HANDLED ON YOUR ETHICS WHEN YOU
SHOULD HAVE BEEN? _____
(Indicate and 2WC E/S to F/N. Program this ethics situation to be
handled by the debugger.)
6C. WERE YOU TOLD YOU WERE OUT-ETHICS WHEN YOU
WEREN'T? _____
(Indicate and 2WC E/S to F/N.)
6D. WAS THERE SOME OUT-ETHICS SITUATION THAT WAS
NOT DETECTED? _____
(Pull this as a withhold. Then program for handling according to
what comes up.)
SECTION 7
7A. WERE YOU TRYING TO JUSTIFY YOUR ACTIONS? _____
(2WC the justifications E/S to F/N. Then check for and pull any
O/Ws in the area of the justifications.)
7B. WERE YOU TRYING TO JUSTIFY AN OVERT? _____
(2WC the justifications E/S to F/N. Then pull the overt.)
7C. WERE YOU TRYING TO LESSEN AN OVERT? _____
(2WC this E/S to F/N. Pull the overt.)
7D. IS THERE SOMETHING THAT MAKES IT OK FOR YOU
NOT TO GET YOUR PRODUCT OUT? _____
(Have him tell you about it E/S to F/N. Then strip off the justification
per HCOB 7 Aug 79 Product Debug Series 8, Esto Series 36
FALSE DATA STRIPPING.)
7E. IS THERE SOME REASON WHY PRODUCING AN OVERT
PRODUCT IS ALL RIGHT? _____
395
(2WC it E/S to F/N. Then strip off the justification per HCOB 7
Aug 79 Product Debug Series 8, Esto Series 36 FALSE DATA
STRIPPING.)

7F. IS THERE SOMETHING THAT MAKES IT OK FOR YOU NOT TO BE COMPETENT ON YOUR POST? _____
(2WC it E/S to F/N. Then strip off the justification per HCOB 7 Aug 79 Product Debug Series 8, Esto Series 36 FALSE DATA STRIPPING.)

SECTION 8

8A. IS THERE SOME IDEA YOU WERE USING TO MAKE YOURSELF RIGHT AND OTHERS WRONG? _____
(2WC him on this and get him to spot and tell you the service facsimile without getting into listing for it. What you are trying to do is get him to find and blow the service facsimile by recall. If he does not come up with the service facsimile complete the 2WC to F/N and program him for full service facsimile handling.)

8B. WERE YOU TRYING TO MAKE YOURSELF RIGHT AND OTHERS WRONG? _____
(Handle this as in 8A above.)

8C. IS THERE SOMETHING YOU ARE DOING TO MAKE YOURSELF RIGHT? _____
(Handle as in 8A above.)

8D. IS THERE A METHOD OF MAKING OTHERS WRONG? _____
(Handle as in 8A above.)

8E. ARE YOU CONCERNED ABOUT BEING RIGHT OR WRONG? _____
(2WC this E/S to F/N. Program him for full service facsimile handling.)

8F. WAS YOUR SERVICE FACSIMILE HANDLING MESSED UP? _____
(Determine if it is an L&N error or an incomplete list and if so, handle per HCOB 11 Apr 77 LIST ERRORS CORRECTION OF and C/S Series 78. Otherwise clean up the BPC with an L1C and program him to have any incomplete handling on service facsimiles completed.)

SECTION 9

9A. WAS THERE BAD CRAMMING? _____
(Assess and handle a Cramming Repair List.)

9B. WERE YOU NOT CRAMMED WHEN YOU SHOULD HAVE BEEN? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N. Program him to get the needed cramming done.)

9C. WAS THERE SOMETHING ELSE WRONG WITH YOUR CRAMMING? _____
(Assess and handle a Cramming Repair List.)

9D. FAILED TO LOOK OVER THE MATERIALS OF WHICH YOU HAD FALSE DATA OR MUs ON AFTER YOU WERE CLEANED UP AND WERE STILL BLANK ON THE

396

MATERIALS BECAUSE YOU HADN'T GONE THROUGH THEM AGAIN? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N. Program him to re-cover and restudy the materials and send the Cramming Officer to Ethics.)
9E. DID THE CRAMMING OFFICER JUST SYMPATHIZE WITH YOU? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N. Send the Cramming Officer to Ethics.)
SECTION 10
10A WAS THERE SOME PERSONNEL BUG THAT WAS NOT HANDLED? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N. Program this to be handled with debug tech.)
10B WAS THERE SOME SORT OF TROUBLE WITH PERSONNEL THAT WAS NOT FOUND? _____
(Indicate and 2WC E/S to F/N. Program for handling according to what comes up.)
SECTION 11
11A IS THERE SOME PROBLEM WITH YOUR COMM LINES? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N. Note for further handling with debug tech.)
11B NO ORDERS? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N. Note for handling with debug tech.)
11C CROSS-ORDERS? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N. Note for handling with debug tech.)
11D ILLEGAL ORDERS? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N. Note for handling with debug tech.)
11E SOME OTHER TROUBLE WITH ORDERS? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N. Note for handling with debug tech.)
SECTION 12
12A ARE YOU UNABLE TO STUDY? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N. Program him for the M8 and M9 program and PCRD if necessary.)
12B WAS THERE SOME DIFFICULTY WITH HATTING THAT WAS NOT FOUND? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N. Program for handling with debug tech.)
12C WERE YOU PREVENTED FROM GETTING HATTED? _____
(Indicate and 2WC E/S to F/N. Program for handling with debug tech.)
12D WAS THERE SOME OTHER PROBLEM WITH HATTING OR STUDY? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N. Program for handling with debug tech.)
12E IS THERE NO HATTING COURSE? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N. See that a hatting course is established and that he studies meanwhile.)
12F ARE THERE NO HATS? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N. Program him to compile his A-I Hat.)
397
SECTION 13

13A WAS YOUR PRODUCT CLEARING MESSED UP? _____

(Assess and handle a Product Clearing Correction List.)

13B WAS YOUR PRODUCT INVALIDATED? _____

(2WC E/S to F/N.)

13C DIDN'T YOU KNOW WHAT YOUR PRODUCT WAS? _____

(2WC E/S to F/N. Program for Product Clearing.)

13D WAS PRODUCT CLEARING NOT DONE? _____

(2WC E/S to F/N. Program for Product Clearing.)

SECTION 14

14A WAS YOUR CLAY TABLE PTS HANDLING MESSED UP? _____

(Assess and handle the PTS Clay Table Repair List.)

14B ARE YOU CONNECTED TO SOMEONE WHO IS ANTAGONISTIC TO YOU? _____

(2WC E/S to F/N. Send him to get routine PTS handling and program him for PTS Clay Table Handling.)

14C ARE YOU CONNECTED TO SOMEONE OR SOMETHING THAT IS SUPPRESSIVE TO YOU? _____

(2WC E/S to F/N. Send him to get routine PTS handling and program him for PTS Clay Table Handling.)

14D DID SOMEONE SAY YOU WERE PTS WHEN YOU WEREN'T? _____

(Indicate and 2WC E/S to F/N.)

14E ACCIDENTS? _____

(2WC E/S to F/N. Send him to get routine PTS handling and program him for PTS Clay Table Handling.)

14F ARE THERE LOTS OF PROBLEMS IN YOUR AREA? _____

(2WC E/S to F/N. Program him and any other PTS personnel in his area for PTS handling including Clay Table De-PTSing.)

SECTION 15

15A WAS THERE SOME EXTERIOR INFLUENCE THAT WAS NOT HANDLED? _____

(2WC E/S to F/N. Program for handling with debug tech.)

15B IS THERE SOMETHING STOPPING YOUR PRODUCTION WHICH IS OUT OF YOUR CONTROL? _____

(2WC E/S to F/N. Program for handling with debug tech.)

SECTION 16

16A WAS THERE SOME SORT OF ORGANIZATIONAL PROBLEM? _____

(2WC E/S to F/N. Program for handling with debug tech.)

16B WAS THERE SOME ORGANIZATIONAL TROUBLE THAT WAS NOT LOCATED? _____

(2WC E/S to F/N. Program for handling with debug tech.)

SECTION 17

398

17A WERE THERE FALSE READS? _____

(Indicate and take E/S to F/N.)

17B WERE THERE MISSED READS? _____
(Indicate and take E/S to F/N. Program him to get what was missed handled with debug tech.)
17C WERE YOU HANDLED ON SOMETHING THAT DIDN'T NEED HANDLING? _____
(Get what and indicate the unnecessary action. Take it E/S to F/N.)
17D WAS THERE SOMETHING WHICH SHOULD HAVE BEEN TAKEN UP THAT WASN'T? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N. Program for handling with debug tech.)
17E WAS SOMETHING QUICKIED? _____
(Indicate and 2WC E/S to F/N. Note for handling with debug tech.)
17F WAS SOMETHING LEFT INCOMPLETE? _____
(2WC E/S to F/N. Program this to be completed per debug tech.)
17G WAS SOME PART OF THE DEBUG OVERRUN? _____
(Indicate and rehab to F/N.)
17H WAS SOMETHING MISSED? _____
(Find out what and 2WC E/S to F/N. Pull any M/W/Hs.)
SECTION 18
18A WAS SOME PART OF THE DEBUG UNNECESSARY? _____
(Indicate and 2WC E/S to F/N.)
18B WERE YOU NOT HAVING ANY TROUBLE GETTING OUT YOUR PRODUCTS IN THE FIRST PLACE? _____
(If this is actually the case indicate to him that trying to debug his products when he was already getting them out was an unnecessary action. If necessary take it E/S to F/N.)
18C WERE YOUR PRODUCTS ACTUALLY BEING GOTTEN OUT? _____
(If this is actually the case indicate to him that trying to debug his products when he was already getting them out was an unnecessary action. If necessary take it E/S to F/N.)
SECTION 19
19A WAS THERE SOMETHING ELSE WRONG? _____
(Find out what and handle with the appropriate correction list.)
19B WERE YOU IN SOME SORT OF CASE TROUBLE? _____
(Assess and handle a C/S 53.)
L. RON HUBBARD
Founder
LRH:gal