

Free Scientologists
Dipl.-Ing. Andreas Grosz, Switzerland
FS Policy Letter of 27. Aug. 2007

Overt-Withholds Write-Ups are illegal

This issue explains, why HCOPL/HCO B 2 Mar. 1984; O/W Write-Ups is a fake and that O/W WU should never be done: They are illegal and destructive self auditing. An evil piece of black Scientology! This attempted alter-is started in early 1970ies on the book INTRODUCTION INTO SCIENTOLOGY ETHICS. This article is based on a message by a fellow named Push4Change¹ published on 22nd Febr. 2002 on the newsgroup ARS. His text is printed in *italics*. All the footnotes to show my viewpoints are from me. I quote him as I agree, that these extensive O/W W/Us are out-tech. Therefore I republish this article to promote this idea to my students:

In Missions, most Orgs and in field practices there was no reason to do excessive overt and withhold write-ups, brutal and incessant security checking or inquisition-like interrogations. Field auditors and Mission holders usually liked to create a friendly, family-like atmosphere and non-judgmental, non-invalidative, attentive listening was usually found to be most conducive to getting new people involved in Scientology and keeping the faithful coming in and paying for services.

The Sea Org, on the other hand, somehow got into the habit of using Sec Checking and O/W write-ups all the time.² Some of this was due to the fact that the Sea Org was always notoriously bad at training auditors, probably because they never got enough sleep to really study well and were pressured to zip through courses. Most of the Sea Org auditors who were good were highly trained before they ever joined.

There are exceptions, of course. But, by and large, the few Sea Org auditors who were competent were needed to service paying public and staff usually only got student auditing or auditing by people who had only done a little bit of training. Of course, there were those trained on the RPF. Many of them didn't understand the theory behind what they were doing, and, anyway, Security Checking was the thing that was stressed on the RPF.³

The problem was that the Sea Org always had lots of 'missions' that they would send staff on and they always required Sec Checks. Also, if you wanted a promotion you needed a Sec

¹ His Email-address: push4change@hotmail.com

² The dichotomy which Push4Change described here is very superficial: Sea Org vs Missions!? In actual fact our enemy got control over Scientology from top down. It finished with the destruction of the GO in May 1977 and the legal take over by Lenske & Lenske in January 1977. Ron realized in HCOB 24. Jan. 1977 that he lost the control over his issue lines and never got the control over his commlines back later. The difference in the application of tech as described here started with the sea org, went down the hierarchy to the single org and finally to every mission and field auditor. – Today the Church accuses the independent auditors, that they don't use any ethics in their practice. My articles show why: because the application of ethics in the church is not based on LRH. See also FSB 20031204 RPEC - DIE AUSGEBURT SCHWARZER SCIENTOLOGY.

³ This degraded situation in the Sea Org is the final product of the take over team. The Sea Org started with the best trained auditors, with members audited to Clear and OT. It was the elite in Scientology. Today the Sea Org is degraded and controlled by non-Scientologists: by CST and RTC as I wrote in earlier FSBs. It was a long way to this current situation, that in the sea org one gets very few auditing and technical training.

Check a lot of the time, if you wanted to go on leave you needed a Sec Check, if your statistics were down you needed a Sec Check, etc.⁴

The problem is, these Sec Checks were mainly ordered by non-trained people⁵. The Case Supervisors were often non-Sea Org members who were paid on an hourly basis. They cared more about their pay and about avoiding the brutal Comm Evs and expulsions a pissed-off Sea Org executive could meet out at the least provocation, so they would case supervise these Sec Checks when they were out-tech more than 50% of the time. This goes to show you the lack of moral back bone of a lot of case-supervisors and how prone to cave in to tyranny most people are – even 'OTs.'⁶

Why were these Sec Checks out-tech?

First of all, most of these cases were not set up for them. No one took the time or trouble to look over the folders of the preclears.

No Folder Error Summaries were done. Or the FESes, as they are called, were very slipshod. Often the preclear or pre-OT was in the middle of another major action or had case difficulties which should have been handled before a Sec Check was done, like a botched interiorization/exteriorization rundown or a condition called 'out-lists'.

Many of these people had chronically high TA (a condition that would preclude Sec Checking until handled). This was handled by slapping tons of hand cream on the persons hands. But the TA was really high and although you could falsely get it down momentarily for the start of the Sec Check the needle would slowly rise until the TA was back to its true high tone arm position. These Sec Checks were very hard on these people, some of whom had horrendous problems and upsets that were not being addressed like severe chronic headaches, chronic illness, severe depression, demoralizing loss of a spouse or feeling guilty about being a poor parent. These types of things. Many Sea Org members in this type of condition would suffer through the Sec Check but only feel more degraded by it than helped.

On the other hand, when the rudiments (meaning the auditor would let the preclear talk about upsets and problems in life for a while until feeling better) were done before the Sec Check was started, and if the Security Checker was a good listener, sometimes the Sec Check would bring some relief. So they are a mixed bag.

Nonetheless, most Security Checking became institutionalized out-tech. It may be true or not true that Hubbard condoned them. But this type of thing was never exported in training outside of the Sea Org and the Guardians Office (later OSA). There is nothing in writing about conducting them the way they were conducted except for eligibility checks before doing advanced services. And these could be justified as it was felt to be too dangerous for the organization to be dealing with paedophiles, murderers, drug dealers and other criminals. No matter what is thought by people on ARS, the people receiving and giving these Security

⁴ The author tries to find an explanation for the misapplication within the sea org. But the WHY lies above the Sea Org: in RTC and CST, the governmental control over Scientology. They try to alter-is the Technology of Scientology to the SCIENTOLOGY RELIGION, which is cooperative with the state: The O/W W/U degrades the being instead of clearing it. This is similar to the development from the work of Jesus of Nazareth to the catholic church: Instead of healing (Jesus) they offer today confessionals, to make the person repent.

⁵ The whole concept of replacing the tech by ethics is not only by non-technical people, but by the non-Scientologists, who control RTC and CST. Another example is the fake HCOB 10. August 1973 PTS HANDLING on which I wrote an article first published on my website www.FreieScientologen.de/musptstech.htm and which I republish today as FSPL 15. June 2003 PERVERSION OF THE PTS-TECH.

⁶ This tyranny is created by the take over team of the government. As Ron states on the 1960ies: a well organized group of degraded beings can overwhelm even a single OT. As long as the Scientologists (and this includes the OTs) are not aware of the well organized take over by the government and organize themselves to handle this, we will loose.

Checks, to a large degree, felt that they were reasonable when used for eligibility, as long as they were not overdone as they have been on Solo NOTS.

But except for eligibility Security Checks, most seasoned auditors and case supervisors, if they have not become completely corrupted or cowed, would agree that these incessant O/W write-ups and Security Checks did more harm than good⁷.

I have to object the author Push4Change. As these ethics investigations were not only enforced by some cruel execs but were based on an LRH-issue: The Danger-Formula! The original publication of the danger formula was in HCO PL 23. Sept. 1967 NEW POST FORMULA THE CONDITIONS FORMULAS⁸. This PL did not change until today as far as I know⁹:

DANGER

1. By-pass (ignore the junior normally in charge of the activity, handle it personally).
2. Handle the situation and any danger in it.
3. Assign the area where it had to be handled a Danger Condition.
4. Handle the personnel by Ethics Investigation and Comm Ev.
5. Reorganize the activity so that the situation does not repeat.
6. Recommend any firm policy that will hereafter detect and/or prevent the condition from recurring.

The senior executive present acts and acts according to the formula above.

But this Danger-Formula does not mention any O/W W/Us nor extensive sec checks. Just an Ethics Investigation and Comm Ev, to find out, what happened and why the stats break down.

But this Dangerformula has been enhanced by LRH with the HCO PL 9 APRIL 1972 CORRECT DANGER CONDITION HANDLING which canceled HCO P/L of 7 Feb 70 "Danger Condition 2nd Formula"¹⁰. Here he introduced the 1st Dyn and the Junior Danger Formular and the Trouble Area Assessment and he mentions the request of O/W writeups:

⁷ I know of a former Sea Org member and New Era Pubs Staff – Eva Zacharias – who immediately after writing up her O/Ws died. That was about three years ago in Germany.

⁸ Quoted from the Book: Hubbard, LaFayette Ron, 1974, "Basic Staff Vol 0 - The Organization Executive Course Vol 0 - OEC 0", Los Angeles, Pubs Org U.S. Church of Scn California, the old original volume, reprinted March 1980!

⁹ In the 1986 release of the Basic Staff Volume [LRH 1986, "Organization Executive Course - Basic Staff Volume 0", Los Angeles, Bridge Publications, Inc.; ISBN: 0-88404-178-6] you find the **HCOPL 23.09.1967 corrected and reissued 05. Okt 1985 NEW POST FORMULA THE CONDITIONS FORMULAS** – but even in this issue the above quoted text for the formula is still nearly the same: Just a comma is replace by „and“: *... and handle it personally.* - Also in the 1991-issue: "Organization Executive Course - Volume 0 Basic Staff Hat", Printing 1991, Los Angeles, Bridge Publications, Inc.; ISBN: 0-88404-591-9: The same text like the 1985-issue, but here it claims to be the unaltered **HCOPL 23.09.1967 NEW POST FORMULA THE CONDITIONS FORMULAS!**

¹⁰ Found in Hubbard, LaFayette Ron, 1976, "Organization Executive Course - Volume 7 Executive Division", 2nd US-printing, Los Angeles, Publications Organization Worldwide, USA on page 409 or Hubbard, LaFayette Ron, 1976, "The Technical Bulletins of Dn & Scn - Volume VIII 1972 - 1976", First printing 1976, Los Angeles, Publications Organization Worldwide, USA page 82.

Junior Danger Formula

Where a danger condition is assigned to a junior, request that he or she or the entire activity write up his or her overts (contra-survival actions) and withholds (undisclosed contra-survival actions) and any known out-ethics situation and turn them in at a certain stated time on a basis that the penalty for them will be lessened but if discovered later after the deadline it will be doubled.

Still no reference how to write up O/W exists. These new formulas are also published in the Ethics Book issue 1974¹¹. This seems to have led to a practice, which LRH criticised later, as Push4Change shows next:

The following references will show some of these and also some of the Hubbard Communications Office Bulletins that were and are being violated by this type of Sec Checking and O/W write-ups:

HCO BULLETIN of 31 Aug. '74, NEW GRADE CHART:

GRADE II

Some orgs specialize in Grade II, especially on org staff. The pc is always getting Integrity Processing (Security Checking) or his O/W's pulled on so and so.

If you look on the Grade Chart you will find Withholds and Overts are Grade TWO.

Below Grade TWO lies Grade I (Problems) and Grade Zero (Communications). And below that is Dianetics and at the bottom of Dianetics is the Drug Handling.

Now how do you expect a fellow who has unhandled drugs (or omitted drug items because of "no interest") to even know (no Grade 0) that other people are around or that (Grade I) he is caved in with problems he's never cognited on?

And he's supposed to have enough responsibility to answer up on Grade II? With real overts and withholds?

This does not mean you must never Sec Check. It does mean that Sec Checks are no substitute for auditing or guarantee of innocence.

Grades are Grades and the Grade Chart sequence is correct.

HCO BULLETIN of 10 June '71, Issue I, C/S Series 44R, C/S Rules, Programming from Prepared Lists:

These rules apply:

Handle an Out Int RD¹² first.

Handle anything connected with 'Lists' first if Int isn't out. ...

Doesn't want auditing, why, is then handled if it read.

Next C/S to handle anything to do with rudiments, ARC Breaks, present time problems, and withholds take precedence in that order. ...

Anything that looks like a withhold comes next.

HCO BULLETIN of 3 Jan. '71, ILLEGAL AUDITING

¹¹ Hubbard, LaFayette Ron, May 1974, "Introduction to Scientology Ethics", Los Angeles, American St. Hill Organization; ISBN: 0-88404-015-1

¹² interiorization/exteriorization Rundown

Lists of withholds required of a crew member or staff member without proper sessioning are now illegal.

Confessionals which do not F/N must be reported to Qual¹³ as a failed session.

An Exam report is required after any Confessional.

Any auditing outside of sessions must be reported and if failed may become actionable.

Challenging people out of session as "having withholds" is illegal.

Auditing is done by auditors who are trained and is done on regular lines.

Contact Assists and Touch Assists are not only legal, they are mandatory when any injury occurs.

They must be followed by Exam reports.

L. Ron Hubbard

Founder

That's one of my favourites! Later on a long issue was put together to re-instate O/W write-ups¹⁴. I'm sure it is another tech compilation unit product¹⁵. Because there are so few auditors and because auditing is so expensive, in many areas Scientology has become like a big 12 step program¹⁶ of continually regurgitating worn out 'sins' over and over. (Writing up transgressions is one of the 12 steps). It's just that I think because it is less judgmental and because the other 11 steps are somewhat therapeutic that the 12 step programs may have more workability. At least they don't include punishment for the things you write up!¹⁷

But that is my opinion. I never liked doing O/Ws, but others have stated honestly that they have gotten gains from doing them¹⁸.

HCO BULLETIN of 30 Nov. '78, CONFESSIONAL PROCEDURE

"Sec Checking," "Integrity Processing" and "Confessionals" are all the exact same procedure and any materials on these subjects is interchangeable under these titles.

2. Make sure the person is well fed and well rested.

3. Start the Confessional. Model Session and rudiments are used.

(Recently, people are being asked for withholds and accused of having overts out of session and 'Sec Checking' is being done without doing rudiments first. Also, people are being Sec

¹³ the corrections division

¹⁴ This is HCOPL & HCOB 2. March 1984 O/W WRITEUPS, which was several times revised. I give more infos at the end of this FSPL about the outpoints in this reference.

¹⁵ Yes, at the end of the revised reference it says: Revision assisted by LRH Technical Research and Compilations.

¹⁶ This refers to the 12 Step Program of the AA = Alcoholic Anonymous, which includes exposition of ones sins.

¹⁷ Yes: although the HCOB says „The original copy of the O/W write-up must go into the person's pc folder, regardless of whether or not any copy is additionally given to the MAA or Ethics Officer” The actual practice is, that the O/W WUs are used legal wise against you by Ethics, even if you did not hand out a copy to Ethics. That was our personal experience as FSMs in the Class V Hamburg Org. So they also got rid of the confidentiality per the auditors code, which alone destroys any possible beneficial effect of the write-ups.

¹⁸ That is just a question of good luck. If you end off at a keyed-out-point, you are very lucky. But there is a big chance, that any heavy past-life-incident on the same chain get in restimulation, which the PC can not as-is himself in this **self auditing**. Then he will be in big trouble. It can destroy him. Look at that unlucky former Sea Org member I mentioned in Footnote 7, she died!

Checked by auditors who are not up to their level of processing. This has been known to cause great distress.)

I have surveyed 5 or 6 auditors who have a combined experience of over 100 years of auditing and not one of them has ever seen a written or taped Scientology reference that describes or condones "gang-bang Sec Checking." This must be either a very esoteric internal Sea Org issue or aberration or is a David Miscavige creation¹⁹. ...

The author Push4Change ends his article²⁰ with another speculation about the reason, why a good guy would alter-is the tech in such an amount. But that is another justification of the unfronted evil: They want us under their control and to go downscale.

The first issue of HCOB/HCOPL 2. March 1984 O/W Write-Ups is only two pages long. It says at the bottom: L. Ron Hubbard – Founder. And: LRH:CSI:pm:iw – which means, that someone unmentioned of CSI²¹ is also author of this issue!

This first issue is already in total contradiction to the above quoted LRH-issues, as it establishes self auditing on grade 2, which is out-tech. The same argumentation on the O/Ws, that they can be as-issued easily by application of Axiom 38, could also be applied to justify self auditing on every other charge: on engrams, on GPMs, Service Facs etc.

These two pages are revised by HCOB/HCOPL 2. March 1984R O/W WRITE-UPS rev. 24. April 1990²², but it does not mention what sentences were revised and why. It was a total rewrite and was 5 pages long! Later it was said, that this issue was not by LRH! That was very obvious, as who can claim that LRH revised something in 1990!? But RTC still issues hundreds of HCOBs and HCO PLs or revises them since 1986.

And that matter is more than a disrespect against LRH. It is in Scientology a high crime to write an issue under the name of LRH, to fake his authorship. This has been done for a long time²³. The "original" HCOB/PL 2. March 1984 is also not by LRH! It introduces the same self auditing which finally has the capability to make people ill. It is only more dilettantish than the later issues.

But that is not all! With the date of 12. Aug. 1996 RTC presents us a further revision: HCOB/HCOPL 2. March 1984RA O/W WRITE-UPS. AS I have only a German²⁴ copy of it in my GAT-course pack "Scientology Ethics Specialist Course", I have to retranslate the comment above the title on the revision:

Revised to remove data on end rudiments after O/Ws, what was never ordered by LRH or authorized by him. To include data on an E-Meter-Check after O/Ws, how it was originally authorized by LRH and to include several definitions for time, place, form and incident, as advised by LRH.

A compare between the two issues of 24. April 1990 and 12. Aug. 1996 shows, that in 1990 the PC at least got a final end-ruds-session and had a chance to find also the

¹⁹ Definitely the latter.

²⁰ This I don't quote to keep this issue short.

²¹ Church of Scientology International, another newly founded organization aside of RTC, CST, ASI etc.

²² 1990 was a very productive and busy year for LRH – four years after his alleged death!

²³ See my article „Since when did the falsification of LRH-Tech really start?“

²⁴ If someone could send me a copy of the english version I would be able to correct this FSPL and quote it directly.

basics on the chain and could end up F/Ning. Since 1996 he is left alone with his bypassed charge: The meter-check can be given by anyone, who has done the meter-drills and he just asks: "On this O/W Write-up, has anything been missed?" – If there is a read or no F/N, the PC is send back to selfauditing. If there is an F/N on this question, that is the end of the Meter-Check (not necessarily the O/W Write up!).

A group controlled by SPs likes these O/W write-ups a lot, as they can control "their people" with the knowledge of their overts. Especially if the write-ups are not only in the PC-folder but also in the Ethics-files. It is not even necessary to disclose any of such data (also I even experienced this in Hamburg Org²⁵): just the fear of such disclosure after any disconnect from the orgs keeps a lot of people down, on whom the orgs know i.e. any "crimes like false tax statements"²⁶.

So our enemy invests a lot of energy to keep us down and degrade us. We would be well advised to realize, that RTC has no scruple to fake LRH issues. This has been done since 1973²⁷ (and even earlier) and has been intensified since 1978. So watch out, not to use any black tech!

Andreas Grosz
Free Scientologists

Copyright © 2007 by
Dipl.-Ing. Andreas Grosz
All rights reserved.

²⁵ In Hamburg in 1999 I helped a friend and Scientologist to get in his tax statements and his ethics regarding taxes. He wrote down his O/Ws and handed this to the E/O. After this the org published an Ethics Order on him on the Public Notice Board about his out ethics regarding taxes!!!

²⁶ I know of a lot of disaffected Scientologists, who would never leave the org because of this fear of disclosure of their crimes, on which they still could be sued. That's why LRH always gave us this policy: abide by the laws! Otherwise you go PTS and loose your freedom.

²⁷ See HCO B 24. Jan. 1977 Tech Correction Roundup where Ron tells us this.