Free Scientologists
Dipl.-Ing. Andreas Groß, Schweiz
FS Bulletin of December 30, 2014

Remimeo

SECURED BY THE ENEMY:
OUR PROBLEMS WITH E-METER-SENSITIVITY

All footnotes about the following quoted HCOB were written by Andreas Gross in 2003[1].

This presentation of the HCOB March 18, 1974 shows the original text as well as the revision of 1979. The matching text is printed in red, the added passages are blue and the text removed during revision is red but crossed out. Open Office Write or MS Word both use this way of presenting in its powerful function of text comparisons, which is very useful for studies like this.

Since the complaints in the HCOB January 24, 1977 about Ron not having control over his series of publications anymore and that others have changed the tech in his name, a flood of HCOB revisions has started, which is lasting until today. Obviously, the opposing side has managed to keep LRH away from regaining control over his publishing line.

Instead, they have increasingly changed the tech since the beginning of the 70s: And not into a direction of more workability, they have rather perverted and twisted it in such a way that auditors have no option but to fail. The main target of attacks of these squirrel references are the basics of auditing because this is the only way they can secure maximum losses with a minimum amount of revising. LRH generally never created revisions of his references during the 50s and 60s. This must be because LRH read his own references as little as no other author. Instead, he just published new references when he wanted to correct a previous version, often without referring to the latter. This is why I am suspicious of these revisions that have come into existence, especially since 1973 and those lasting into the current millennium. They have obviously not been approved by Ron. For this you have to know that all hand-written instructions for the writing or changing of references, which LRH supposedly created, were lost in a fire in Flag. Therefore, you have to believe any changes done by today's management because they cannot prove anything anymore. This is why it is also called "Scientology Religion" today because the certainty[2] had to make room for the uncritical faith in RTC due to review.

Andreas Gross
for the
Independent Scientologists

P.S. See also my FSB 20060831 E-METER SENSITIVITY AND EM-5RB on this subject.

---

[1] Originally written in February 2003 and published here: http://www.freiescientologen.de/empfindlich.htm Published as FSB in December 2014

[2] See the original designation by LRH for our subject: „THIS IS SCIENTOLOGY - THE SCIENCE OF CERTAINTY" LRH-lecture from June 1953

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 18 MARCH 1974R

Revised 22 February 1979

Remimeo
Tech/Qual
All Auditors

E-METERS
SENSITIVITY ERRORS

(*Refs:* [3]

HCOB 4 Dec. 77	CHECKLIST FOR SETTING UP SESSIONS AND AN E-METER
HCOB 24 Jan. 77	TECH CORRECTION ROUNDUP
HCOB 7 Feb. 79R	E-METER DRILL 5RA-CAN SQUEEZE

An auditor must set the sensitivity of an E-Meter exactly right for *each* pc and each session[4]**.**

The setting is different for almost every pc and can change, session to session, even for one pc[5].

---

[3] It is remarkable that all these reference materials fall into the end-70s when a lot of other basics were messed up.

[4] I have always been dissatisfied with having to make huge efforts to check and recheck the sensitivity of one and the same PC in a session: Time better spent with auditing. Most of the time – up to a bigger case gain – the sensitivity of a PC remains the same, as every auditor can easily identify looking up his admins.

[5] The turned around mistake is introduced here: As if the sensitivity stayed the exact same during a session. No: It can be useful to change the sensitivity several times during a session. That is why there is still a column S for sensitivity in the auditors reports form, since it can be adjusted during the session. And that is the main point of the original of this reference: The auditor is supposed to understand what a real sensitivity is so that he can readjust it at any time. There just isn't a method that sets the perfect sensitivity to begin with. Ron's instruction in the HCOB of November 16, 1965 E-METER SENSITIVITY SETTING is a first attempt to the right sensitivity during the session preparation, but it does not replace the understanding and readjustment during the session. There it says: „Rudiments are run at Sensitivity 16. Lower Level processes are run at Sensitivity 16. Above Grade V Sensitivity is run at 5.“

TOO LOW

Too low a Sensitivity on some pcs (like Sens ~~5-32~~ 1[6]) will obscure reads and make them look like ticks. It will obscure an F/N. Whereas a Sens 16-128[7] will show reads and F/Ns.

A pc can be hindered by the auditor not setting the Sensitivity high enough to show reads and F/Ns. Items are missed as well as F/Ns.

On almost any pc, a convulsive or incorrect can squeeze can shoot the needle across the dial and cause the auditor to reduce his sensitivity down and down and down until he finally sets it at a point where long falls become ticks and FINS don't exist. E-Meter Drill 5RA tells one how to do a proper can squeeze.[8]

TOO HIGH

When auditing a flying pc or a Clear or OT the auditor who sets the Sensitivity too high gets weird impressions of the case.

„Latent reads" on such a case are common. They aren't latent at all. What happens is that the F/N is more than a dial wide at high sensitivity and a started F/N looks like a read as its sweep is stopped by the pin on the right of the dial.

Also, the pc can delicately press the cans improperly with his thumbs and forefingers when doing a can squeeze and cause the auditor to push the sensitivity up and up and up, and then, with the sensitivity set too high, be unable to keep the needle on the dial and so miss or imagine reads. E-Meter Drill 5RA now teaches how to do this properly.[9]

In this way uncharged items are taken up, the case is slowed, overrun and general upsets requiring repairs occur.

On one hand electrode an OT VII sometimes has a ¾ dial wide F/N at Sens ~~5-32~~ 2!

This would mean a 3/4 dial wide F/N at Sens 2-32 with two cans.

A Clear sometimes has a floating TA at sensitivity ~~32-32~~ 5 or 10 instead of an F/N. He would have to be run at Sens ~~3-32~~ 1 on two cans to keep him on a dial or detect F/Ns.

This is a *very* important matter, as the auditor will miss F/Ns, think beginning F/Ns are reads and, as the Pre-OT is off the dial, miss reads.

---

[6] Since the Mark VI (1979), the sensitivity scale has been changed, thus explaining the modifications of the numbers here. "5-32" refers to setting 5 on the left sensitivity control knob and 32 on the toggle switch to the right. Compare with the photo of the Mark V on the previous page.

[7] Here the adjustment to Mark VI is missing in the revision which lets the study of the HCOBs end in confusion. This mistake has not even been corrected until 1991 – it can still be found on page 618 in the Red Volume 10.

[8] And exactly that is the bummer: "E-Meter-Exercise 5RA instructs how to execute a squeezing correctly"! It influences the PC more than it makes the auditor learn how to use an e-meter!

[9] Here we have it again: The PC is trained to give a consistent, soft squeezing. Two possible instances follow which are both a catastrophe for the sessions: Either the auditor spends a lot of time with the PC in trying to train him on "how he should squeeze" before the beginning of the session. PC and auditor can very well become desperate by that. The PC notices that he can't fulfill the auditor's expectations and gains more attention on the e-meter, which is also fatal. The auditor can become desperate with a PC untrained on e-meter-exercise 5RA: How is he supposed to set the sensitivity correctly if the PC doesn't manage to give the same squeezing again and again.

Or the PC has been "fully trained" to give a steady squeezing and is therefore being stopped to give a squeezing according to his havingness. A squeezing, similar to a handshake, shows the havingness of a PC and it is therefore used for the purpose of finding the right havingness process of the PC. But if the PC has learned to give a consistent squeeze, then exactly that won't work anymore. Thus, an important tech – the finding and using of the suited havingness process – is made useless. "It's not so bad", one or the other may think, "that little bit of havingness"! Hah: Let's see what Ron says about the meaning of havingness: **"When havingness is neglected, cases do not improve, that's all there is to it."** LRH on page 2 of the PAB 80 of April 17, 56 "SCIENTOLOGY'S MOST WORKABLE PROCESS".

Thus, uncharged areas are run and charged ones are missed.

The result is very chaotic to repair.

Some lower level pcs also have a need for lower Sensitivity settings.

SUMMARY

Sometimes an easy pc looks very difficult just because of wrong sensitivity settings brought about by wrong can squeeze procedure[10].

Set the Sensitivity for the pc ~~for a half dial F/N maximum or minimum~~[11] for one-third-of-a-dial drop on a correct can squeeze per E-Meter Drill 5RA (Ref: HCOB 7 Feb. 79R, E-METER DRILL 5RA-CAN SQUEEZE). And do the drills. You will be amazed.[12]

Don't get repairs.

Get wins.

L.RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:ntm

---

[10] With a short afterthought the reference gets turned around completely. As if this reference was originally about hammering e-meter-exercise 5 – which had existed in its unrevised form before, into people's heads. No: It was precisely about giving the auditor an understanding of how he can recognize the wrong sensitivity during a session so that he can correct it. The sensitivity setting by squeezing at the beginning of the session is only a first attempt to get to the right sensitivity. But according to this reference it will be readjusted on the basis of the F/N size, if necessary.

[11] And this is why this significant sentence has been removed after setting the sensitivity in such a way that the F/N spreads over half the range of a scale. With a hovering tonearm it is difficult to differentiate the F/N from the BD.

[12] Yes, you will be amazed at how long you can hassle students with this meaningless exercise and make them desperate. You only need – as is actually common in the Church nowadays (seriously: no joke!) - to have one third of the scale calculated: There are exactly 40 secondary lines divided by 3 = 13 1/3 secondary lines. These are counted from set (as if you could always exactly adjust on set) and then you will have precisely the point at which the right squeeze will create "a fall of one third of the scale". Of course, no one actually manages to do this in practice. Simply because of the impossibility to give the same squeeze over and over. And what happens to auditors of the Church who think they're not working precisely? They just prefer to not audit anymore instead of continuing to pile up mistakes. - And that is where we reach the product that the enemy wants to achieve, IMO.