

Love
Hon

HCO Bulletin of 7 Feb 65

All Levels

Personnel

Whitcomb

Keeping Technology Working

De P Hat

De P Hat

~~Also Supervisors~~

Sup Hat

HCO Sec or Communicator

Asst Sec Hat

Not check on all personnel

HCO Sec Hat

and all new personnel as take

Staff Member Hat

we have some time saved on

passed the point of ~~too~~ achieving uniformly workable technology.

The only thing now is getting the technology ~~to~~ applied.

If you can't get the technology applied then you can't deliver what's promised. It's as simple as that. If you can ~~deliver~~ get the technology applied. you can deliver what's

promised.

The only thing you can be upbraided for by students or parents is "no results." ~~The only~~ Trouble spots occur only where there are "no results." Attacks from governments or monopolies occur only where there are "no results" or "bad results."

Therefore the road before Scientology is clear and its ultimate success is assured if the technology is

applied.

So it is the task
of the Assn or Org Sec,
the NCO Sec, the ~~DoF~~
Case Supervisor, the
DoF, the DoT and
all staff members to
get the ^{correct} technology applied
correctly.

Thus getting the correct
Technology applied
consists

- ~~1. Having correct technology~~
 - ~~2. Knowing of the technology~~
 - ~~3. Applying of the technology~~
 - ~~4. Enforcing correct application of the technology~~
- is correct and knowing ~~it is~~

5. Hammering out of
existence incorrect
applications or incorrect
tech

4

One: Having the correct
Technology;

Two: Knowing the Technology

Three: Knowing it is correct

Four: Teaching correctly the
correct Technology

Five: Applying the Technology

Six: Seeing that the Technology
is correctly applied

Seven: Hammering out of existence
incorrect Technology

Eight: Knocking out incorrect
applications

Nine: Closing the door on ^{any possibility of} incorrect

Technology

Ten: ~~the~~ Closing the door on incorrect application.

One above has been done.

Two ~~is~~ ~~working~~ ~~being~~ ~~accomplished~~
~~has been~~ ~~achieved~~
~~in many~~ ~~places~~ ~~by~~ ~~many~~.

Three is achieved by the individual applying the correct technology in a correct proper manner and observing that it works that way.

Four is being done daily successfully in most parts of the world.

Five is consistently accomplished daily.

6

Six is achieved by
instructors ^{and supervisors} consistently.

Seven is done by a few
~~but~~ is a weak point

Eight is not worked on
hard enough.

Nine is impeded by
the "reasonable" attitude of
the not quite bright.

Ten is seldom done with
enough ferocity.

Seven, Eight, Nine and
Ten are the only places
Scientology can bog down
in any area.

The reasons for this are

7

not hard to find. (a) Weak
certainly that it works
in Three above can lead
to weakness in Seven, Eight,
Nine and Ten. (b) Further,
The not-too-bright have
a bad point on the
button, ^{Self-}Importance. The
lower the I.Q., the
more the individual
is shut off from the fruits
of observation. (c) The service
faces of people make
them defend themselves
against anything they confront,
good or bad, ^{and seek to make it wrong,} (e) The bank
seeks to ~~preserve~~ knock out
the good and perpetuate the bad.

8

Thus, we as Scientists
and as an organization
must be very alert to
Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten.

In all the years I have
been engaged in research
I have kept my commu-
nication lines wide open for research
data. I once had the
idea that a group could
evolve truth. At the end
of a Century Century has
thoroughly disabused me
of that idea. Willing
as I was to accept
suggestions and data,

only a handful of suggestions (less than twenty) had long run value and none were major or basic; and when I did accept major or basic suggestions and used them, we went

astray and I repented and eventually had to "eat crow."
~~Participatory Technology Use and~~ ^{level}
~~been a group effort, if~~
~~in its formative stages~~
~~it has not been a group~~
~~effort I am therefore~~
~~safe in assuming it will~~
~~not be in its refinement~~
~~stages.~~

Insert on pg 9 of text
Page 1 of Insert

On the other hand there have been thousands and thousands of suggestions and writings which if accepted and acted upon would have resulted in the complete destruction of all our work as well as the sanity of per. So I know what a group of people will do and how insane they will go in accepting unworkable "technology". By actual record the percentages are, ^{about} twenty to 100,000 that a group of human beings will dream up bad technology to destroy good technology. As we could have gotten along without suggestions, then, we had
PTO

better ~~shall~~ steel ourselves to continue
 to do so now that we have made it,
 This point will of course be attacked as
 "unpopular", "egotistical" and "undemocratic."
 It very well may be. But it is also
 a survival point. And I don't see that
 popular measures, self-abnegation and
 democracy have done anything for Man
 but push him further into the mud.
 Currently, popularity endorses degraded novels,
 self-abnegation has filled the Southeast Asian
 jungles with stone idols and corpses, and
 democracy has given us inflation and income tax.
~~So what's so valuable about a social aspect~~

Insert pg 3

Our Technology has not been discovered by a group. True, if the group had not supported me in many ways I could not have discovered it either. But it remains that if in its formative stages it was not discovered by a group, then group efforts, one can safely assume, will not add to it or successfully alter it in the future. I can only say this now that it is done. There remains of course, group tabulation or coordination of what has been done, which will be valuable - only so long as it does

part pg 4

seek to alter basic principles
and successful applications.

The contributions that
~~was~~ were worth while in this
 period of forming the
 technology ~~was~~ ^{were} help
~~provided by~~ ^{in the form}
 of friendship, of defense, of
 organization, of dissemination,
 of application, ~~and~~ of advice
 or results and finance.

These were great contributions
 and were ^{and are} appreciated.

Many thousands contributed
 in this way and made us
 what we are. Discovery
 contribution was not
 however part of the
 broad picture.

We will not ~~be~~

11

speculate here on why
this was so or how I
came to rise above the
bank. We are dealing
only in facts and the
above is a fact -
the group left to its
own devices would not
have evolved technology
but with wild dramatization
of the bank, ^{called "new ideas"} would have
~~been~~ wiped it out.

Supporting this is the
fact that man has never
before evolved workable
mental technology and
emphasizing it is
the viewer's technology ~~the~~

he did evolve - psychiatry, 12

psychology, surgery,

shock treatment, whips,
duress, punishment, etc ad infinitum

So realize that we
have climbed out of the
mud by whatever good
luck and good sense
and refuse to sink
back into it again.

See that Seven, Eight,
Nine and Ten above
are ruthlessly followed
and we will never
be stopped. Relax them,
get reasonable about it,
and we will perish.

So far, ~~by~~ ^{while} keeping
~~about~~ myself in complete
 communication with
 all suggestions, I have
 not failed on Seven, Eight
 June and Ten ^{in areas I could supervise closely.} But it
 is
 not good enough for just
 myself and a few others
 to work at this.

Whenever this control
 as per Seven, Eight, Nine and
 Ten has been relaxed
 the whole organizational
 area has failed. Witness
 Egypt, Elizabeth, N. J.,
 Wichita. The early
~~organizations and groups.~~
~~Organize H.A.S.~~ They crashed

~~It only the four reasons~~
 only because I no longer
 did Seven, Eight, Nine
 and Ten. Then, when
 they were all messed
 up, you saw the obvious
 "reasons" for failure.
 But ahead of that they
 ceased to believe and
that ~~that~~ involved them
 in other reasons.

The common denominator
 of a group is the
 reactive bank. That's
 without banks have
 different responses. They
 Balance in Envelope 2

(Continues contents of
Envelope 1) 15
only have their banks in
common. They agree then
only on bank principles.
Person to person the bank
is identical. So constructive
ideas are individual and
seldom get broad
agreement in a human
group. An individual
must rise above

an avid craving for
agreement, ^{from a homogenized group} to get
anything decent done.

The bank-agreement
has been what has
made Earth a Hell -
and if you were looking

16

for Hell and found Earth,
it would certainly serve,
War, famine, agony
and disease has been
the lot of Man. Right
now the great governments
of Earth ~~are developing~~ ^{have developed}
the means of frying every
Man, woman and child
on the planet. That
is Bank. That is the
result of collective
Thought & Agreement.
The decent, pleasant
things on this planet
come from individual

actions and ideas that have
some hope gotten by the group & law.

→ Thus each one of
us can rise above
the domination of the
bank and then,
as a group of ~~men~~
~~do~~ feel being
achieve ~~the~~ freedom and
for ~~ever~~ reason. It is only
the liberated group, the mob, that
is ^{attractive} when you don't do
Seven, Eight, Nine and
Ten actively, you
are working for the
Bank dominated mob.

For it will surely, surely
(a) introduce incorrect technology

For that matter both laws are ourselves
are attacked by "public opinion" which they show is
no more effective group or their power themselves.

and swear by it (b)
 apply technology as inaccurately
 as possible, (c) open the
 door to any ~~secret~~
 destructive idea and
 (d) Encourage incorrect
 application.

It's the Bank that
 says the group is all
 and the individual nothing.
 It's the bank that says
 we must fail.

So just don't play
 that game. Do Seven, Eight
 Nine and Ten and you
 will ~~not~~ knock out of
 your road all the future
 thorns.

Here's an actual ^{in which a senior executive had to} example of a case ^{interfere} ^{because} ^{of a re-} ^{spin:} ~~told~~ Auditor Instructor A

To have Auditor B run
~~the~~ Process X on Preclear C
Auditor B afterward ~~told~~ told
Instructor A that "It didn't
work." ~~and~~ Instructor
A ^{was} ~~is~~ weak on 3 Three
above and ~~doesn't~~ didn't really
believe in Seven, Eight,
Nine and Ten. So
Instructor A ^{told the} ~~told~~ Case
Supervisor "Process X
didn't work on Preclear
C." Now this strikes
directly at each of One to

Six above ~~§~~ in
 Prelear ~~C~~, Auditor ~~A~~ B
 Instructor A and the
 Case Supervisor. It
 opens the door to
 the introduction of "new
 technology" and its
 failure.

What happened here?
 Instructor A didn't
 jump down Auditor B's
 throat, that's all
 that happened. This
 is what he should have
 done: Grabbed the
 Auditor's report and looked

21
it over. When a higher spec in
this case did so ~~by~~ ~~she~~ found
what the Supervisor after the rest missed
that Process X increased

Process C's TA to 25

TA divisions for the
session but that near
season end

Auditor B Qed and Aed
with a cognition and

abandoned the Process
while it still gave high TA.

X and went of running

one of Auditor B's
~~the one~~ which nearly spun Process C.

→ manufacture, Auditor

B's I.Q. on

examination turned out
to be about 75.

Instructor A was found to

have huge ideas of ~~this~~
 how you must never
 invalidate anyone, even
 a lunatic. The Case
 Supervisor was found
 to be "Too busy with
 Admin to ~~pay attention~~
^{have any time}
~~attention to~~ cases."

All right, there's
 an all too typical
~~a typical~~ example.

The Instructor should
 have done Seven, Eight,
 Nine and Ten. This
 would have begun this
 way. * Auditor ~~Process~~ B "That

Process X didn't work."

Instructor A: "What exactly

did you do wrong?"
Instant attack. "Where's
your auditor's report for
the session? Good.

Look here, you were
getting ~~to~~ a lot of TFA
when you stopped process
X. What did you do?"

Then the ~~two~~ supervisor
PC wouldn't have come
close to a spin and
all four of these would
have retained their
certainty.

In a year, I had four

instances, ^{in one small group} where the
correct process recommended
was reported not to
have worked. But on
review found that
each met had (a) increased
the TA(b) had been
abandoned and (c) had
been falsely reported as
unworkable. Also, despite this
abuse, in each of these four cases the
recommended ^{workable} process ^{worked} ^{in the case}
to the type which
might lead us up is
not the government
or the High Priests.
It's our ^{possible} failure to
retain and practice
our technology.

→ yes they were ~~not~~
reported as not having
worked!
months

Part 2 pg 1

Similar examples exist in ~~the~~ instruction and these are all the more deadly as every time instruction in correct Topology is flubbed, then the resulting error, uncorrected in the auditor, is ~~is~~ perpetuated on every pc that auditor audits thereafter. As for the, this and then are even ~~a~~ more important in a course than in an ~~HCC~~ ~~the~~ supervision of cases.

Here's an example: "A rave recommendation is given a graduate student" because he gets more TA on pcs than any other student on the course!" Figures of 435 TA divisions

pg 2

a session are reported. "Of course his model session is poor but it's just a knack he has" is also included in the recommendation. A careful review is undertaken because nobody at levels I to IV is going to get that much TA on pos. It is found that this student was never taught to read an S Meter TA did! And no instructor observed his handling of a meter and it was not discovered that he "overcompensated" nervously, swinging the TA 2 or 3 divisions beyond where it needed

Insert 2 pg 3

To go to ~~center~~ ^{place} the needle at "set". As everyone was about to throw away standard processes and model session because this one student "got such remarkable T.A." They only read the reports and listened to the brags and never looked at this student. The pe in actual fact were making slightly less than average gain, impeded by a rough model session and misworded processes. Thus, what was making the pe's win (~~stand~~ actual Scientology) was hidden under a lot of departures and errors.

Unit 2 pg 4

I recall one student who was squirreling on an Academy course and running a lot of offbeat whole tracks on other students after course hours. The Academy, ~~was~~ ^{students were} in a state of electrification on all these new experiences and weren't quickly brought under control and the student himself never was given the works on seven, eight, nine and ten so they stuck. Subsequently, this student prevented another squirrel from being straightened out and his wife died of

Insert 2 pgs

Cancer, resulting from physical abuse.
A hard, tough instructor at that
moment could have salvaged two
squirrels and saved the life of a girl.
But no, students had a right to ~~think~~
do whatever they pleased.

Squirreling (going off ~~at~~ into weird
practices for altering Scientology) only
comes about from non-comprehension.
Usually the non-comprehension is not of
Scientology but some earlier contact
with an offbeat humanoid practice which
in its turn was not understood.

When people can't get results from what

Mar 2 pg 6

they think is standard practice, they ~~was~~ can be counted upon to squirrel to some degree.

~~Thus it is the~~ The most trouble in the past two years came from orgs where an executive in each could not assimilate straight Scientology. Under instruction in Scientology they were unable to define terms or demonstrate examples of principles.

And the orgs where they were got into plenty of trouble. And worse, it could not be straightened out easily because neither one of these people could or would duplicate instructions. Hence, a debacle resulted in two places, directly traceable to failures of instruction earlier.

Part 2 pg 7

So proper instruction is vital. The D of T and his instructors, and all Scientology instructors, must be merciless in getting Four, Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten ~~in full force~~ into effective action.

That one student, dumb and impossible though he may seem and of no use to anyone may get some day be the cause of untold upset because nobody was interested enough to make sure Scientology got home to him.

With what we know now, there is no student we enroll who cannot be properly

Pg 8

trained. As an instructor, one should be very alert to slow progress and should turn the sluggards inside out personally. The system will do it, only you or me with our sleeves rolled up can crack the back of bad studenting and we can only do it on an individual student, never on a whole class only. He's slow = something is awful wrong. Take fast action to correct it. Don't wait until next week. ~~Faculty is~~ ~~the key note~~. By then he's got other messes stuck to him. If you can't graduate them with their good sense appealed to and wisdom shining, graduate them in such a

met 2 pg 9

state of shock they'll have nightmares if they contemplate squirreling. Then experience will gradually bring about three in them and they'll know better than to chase butterflies when they should be auditing.

When somebody enrolls, consider he or she has joined up for the ~~dot~~ duration of the universe - never permit an "open-minded" approach. If they're going to quit let them quit fast. If they enrolled, they're aboard, and if they're aboard, they're

pg 10

here on the same terms as the rest of us -
win or die in the attempt. Never let them
be half-minded about being Scientists. The
finest organizations in history have been
tough, dedicated organizations. Not one wimpy-
pamby bunch of party-waist dilettantes (sp?)
have ever made anything. It's a tough
universe. The social veneer makes it seem
mild. But only the tigers survive - and even
they have a hard time. We'll survive because
we are tough and are dedicated. ~~to do it~~
~~instruct~~ When we do instruct somebody
properly he becomes more and more
tiger. When we ~~do it all~~ ^{instruct} ~~do it~~ half-mindedly

Insert 2 pg 11

~~we lose our chance~~. and are afraid to offend, scared to enforce, we don't make ^{students into} good Scientists, and that lets everybody down. When Mrs Patty cake comes to us to be taught, turn that wandering doubt in her eye into a fixed, dedicated glare and she'll win and we'll all win. Humour her and we all die a little. The proper instruction attitude is, "you're here. So you're a Scientist. Now we're going to make you into an expert auditor no matter what happens. We'd rather have you dead than incapable."

pg 12

Fitting that into the economics of the situation and lack of adequate time and you see the crises we have to bear.

But we won't have to bear it forever. The bigger we get the more economics and time we will have to do our job. And the only things which ^{can} prevent from getting that big fast are ~~limited~~ areas in from One to Ten. ~~Keep that list down~~ ^{in mind} Keep those ~~covenants~~ and we'll be able to grow. Fast. And as we grow our shackles will be less and less. Failing to keep ~~those~~ One to Ten, will make us growless.

An Instructor or
Supervisor or Executive
must challenge ~~it~~
with ferocity instances
of "unworkability." They
must uncover what
did happen, what was
seen and what was
done or not done.

If you have ~~mastered~~
~~done~~ Part One and Two,
you can only ~~then~~
acquire Three, ^{for all} by
making sure of all the
rest.

We're not playing some minor game in Scientology. It isn't cute or something to do for lack of something better.

The whole agonized future of this planet, every man, woman and child on it, and your own destiny for the next endless trillions of years depends on what you do here and how with and in Scientology.

This is a deadly

serious activity. And
if we miss ~~that~~
getty out of the trap
now, we may never
again have another
chance.

Remember, this is
our first chance to
do so in all the
endless trillions of
years of the past.
Don't miss it now
because it seems
unpleasant or unsocial
to do Seven, Eight Nine
and Ten.

Do them and we'll win.
[Signature]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
SAINT HILL MANOR, EAST GRINSTEAD, SUSSEX

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 FEBRUARY 1965

REMIMEO
STHIL STUDENTS
ASSOC/ORG SEC HAT
HCO SEC HAT
CASE SUP HAT
DS OF P HAT
DS OF T HAT
STAFF MEMBER HAT
MISSIONS

KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING SERIES I

Note: Neglect of this PL has caused great hardship on staffs, has cost countless millions and made it necessary in 1970 to engage in an all-out international effort to restore basic Scientology over the world. Within 5 years after the issue of this PL, with me off the lines, violation had almost destroyed orgs. "Quickie grades" entered in and denied gain to tens of thousands of cases. Therefore actions which neglect or violate this policy letter are HIGH CRIMES resulting in Comm Evs on ADMINISTRATORS and EXECUTIVES. It is not "entirely a tech matter" as its neglect destroys orgs and caused a 2-year slump. IT IS THE BUSINESS OF EVERY STAFF MEMBER to enforce it.

SPECIAL MESSAGE

THE FOLLOWING POLICY LETTER MEANS WHAT IT SAYS.

IT WAS TRUE IN 1965 WHEN I WROTE IT. IT WAS TRUE IN 1970 WHEN I HAD IT REISSUED. I AM REISSUING IT NOW, IN 1980, TO AVOID AGAIN SLIPPING BACK INTO A PERIOD OF OMITTED AND QUICKIED FUNDAMENTAL GRADE CHART ACTIONS ON CASES, THEREBY DENYING GAINS AND THREATENING THE VIABILITY OF SCIENTOLOGY AND OF ORGS. SCIENTOLOGY WILL KEEP WORKING ONLY AS LONG AS YOU DO YOUR PART TO KEEP IT WORKING BY APPLYING THIS POLICY LETTER.

WHAT I SAY IN THESE PAGES HAS ALWAYS BEEN TRUE, IT HOLDS TRUE TODAY, IT WILL STILL HOLD TRUE IN THE YEAR 2000 AND IT WILL CONTINUE TO HOLD TRUE FROM THERE ON OUT.

NO MATTER WHERE YOU ARE IN SCIENTOLOGY, ON STAFF OR NOT, THIS POLICY LETTER HAS SOMETHING TO DO WITH YOU.

ALL LEVELS

KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING

HCO Sec or Communicator hat check
on all personnel and all new personnel as taken on.

We have some time since passed the point of achieving uniformly workable technology.

The only thing now is getting the technology applied.

If you can't get the technology applied then you can't deliver what's promised. It's as simple as that. If you can get the technology applied you *can* deliver what's promised.

The only thing you can be upbraided for by students or pcs is "no results." Trouble spots occur only where there are "no results." Attacks from governments or monopolies occur only where there are "no results" or "bad results."

Therefore the road before Scientology is clear and its ultimate success is assured *if* the technology is applied.

So it is the task of the Assoc or Org Sec, the HCO Sec, the Case Supervisor, the D of P, the D of T and all staff members to get the correct technology applied.

Getting the correct technology applied consists of:

- One: Having the correct technology.**
- Two: Knowing the technology.**
- Three: Knowing it is correct.**
- Four: Teaching correctly the correct technology.**
- Five: Applying the technology.**
- Six: Seeing that the technology is correctly applied.**
- Seven: Hammering out of existence incorrect technology.**
- Eight: Knocking out incorrect applications.**
- Nine: Closing the door on any possibility of incorrect technology.**
- Ten: Closing the door on incorrect application.**

One above has been done.

Two has been achieved by many.

Three is achieved by the individual applying the correct technology in a proper manner and observing that it works that way.

Four is being done daily successfully in most parts of the world.

Five is consistently accomplished daily.

Six is achieved by Instructors and Supervisors consistently.

Seven is done by a few but is a weak point.

Eight is not worked on hard enough.

Nine is impeded by the "reasonable" attitude of the not-quite-bright.

Ten is seldom done with enough ferocity.

Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten are the only places Scientology can bog down in any area.

The reasons for this are not hard to find. (a) A weak certainty that it works in Three above can lead to weakness in Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten. (b) Further, the not-too-bright have a bad point on the button Self-Importance. (c) The lower the IQ, the more the individual is shut off from the fruits of observation. (d) The service faces of people make them defend themselves against anything they confront, good or bad, and seek to make it wrong. (e) The bank seeks to knock out the good and perpetuate the bad.

Thus, we as Scientologists and as an organization must be very alert to Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten.

In all the years I have been engaged in research I have kept my comm lines wide open for research data. I once had the idea that a group could evolve truth. A third of a century has thoroughly disabused me of that idea. Willing as I was to accept suggestions and data, only a handful of suggestions (less than twenty) had long-run value and *none* were major or basic; and when I did accept major or basic suggestions and used them, we went astray and I repented and eventually had to "eat crow."

On the other hand there have been thousands and thousands of suggestions and writings which if accepted and acted upon would have resulted in the complete destruction of all our work as well as the sanity of pcs. So I know what a group of people will do and how insane they will go in accepting unworkable "technology." By actual record the percentages are about twenty to 100,000 that a group of human beings will dream up bad technology to destroy good technology. As we could have gotten along without suggestions, then, we had better steel ourselves to continue to do so now that we have made it. This point will of course be attacked as "unpopular," "egotistical" and "undemocratic." It very well may be. But it is also a survival point. And I don't see that popular measures, self-abnegation and democracy

have done anything for man but push him further into the mud. Currently, popularity endorses degraded novels, self-abnegation has filled the Southeast Asian jungles with stone idols and corpses, and democracy has given us inflation and income tax.

Our technology has not been discovered by a group. True, if the group had not supported me in many ways I could not have discovered it either. But it remains that if in its formative stages it was not discovered by a group, then group efforts, one can safely assume, will not add to it or successfully alter it in the future. I can only say this now that it is done. There remains, of course, group tabulation or coordination of what has been done, which will be valuable—only so long as it does not seek to alter basic principles and successful applications.

The contributions that were worthwhile in this period of forming the technology were help in the form of friendship, of defense, of organization, of dissemination, of application, of advices on results and of finance. These were great contributions and were and are appreciated. Many thousands contributed in this way and made us what we are. Discovery contribution was not however part of the broad picture.

We will not speculate here on why this was so or how I came to rise above the bank. We are dealing only in facts and the above is a fact—the group left to its own devices would not have evolved Scientology but with wild dramatizations of the bank called “new ideas” would have wiped it out. Supporting this is the fact that man has never before evolved workable mental technology and emphasizing it is the vicious technology he *did* evolve—psychiatry, psychology, surgery, shock treatment, whips, duress, punishment, etc., ad infinitum.

So realize that we have climbed out of the mud by whatever good luck and good sense, and *refuse* to sink back into it again. See that Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten above are ruthlessly followed and we will never be stopped. Relax them, get reasonable about it and we will perish.

So far, while keeping myself in complete communication with all suggestions, I have not failed on Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten in areas I could supervise closely. But it's not good enough for just myself and a few others to work at this.

Whenever this control as per Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten has been relaxed, the whole organizational area has failed. Witness Elizabeth, NJ; Wichita; the early organizations and groups. They crashed only because I no longer did Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten. Then, when they were all messed up, you saw the obvious “reasons” for failure. But ahead of that they ceased to deliver and *that* involved them in other reasons.

The common denominator of a group is the reactive bank. Thetans without banks have different responses. They only have their banks in common. They agree then only on bank principles. Person to person the bank is identical. So constructive ideas are *individual* and seldom get broad agreement in a human group. An individual must rise *above* an avid craving for agreement from a humanoid group to get anything decent done. The bank-agreement has been what has made Earth a Hell—and if you

were looking for Hell and found Earth, it would certainly serve. War, famine, agony and disease has been the lot of man. Right now the great governments of Earth have developed the means of frying every man, woman and child on the planet. That is bank. That is the result of Collective Thought Agreement. The decent, pleasant things on this planet come from *individual* actions and ideas that have somehow gotten by the Group Idea. For that matter look how we ourselves are attacked by “public opinion” media. Yet there is no more ethical group on this planet than ourselves.

Thus each one of us can rise above the domination of the bank and then, as a group of freed beings, achieve freedom and reason. It is only the aberrated group, the mob, that is destructive.

When you don't do Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten actively, you are working for the bank-dominated mob. For it will surely, surely (a) introduce incorrect technology and swear by it, (b) apply technology as incorrectly as possible, (c) open the door to any destructive idea and (d) encourage incorrect application.

It's the bank that says the group is all and the individual nothing. It's the bank that says we must fail.

So just don't play that game. Do Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten and you will knock out of your road all the future thorns.

Here's an actual example in which a senior executive had to interfere because of a pc spin: A Case Supervisor told Instructor A to have Auditor B run Process X on Preclear C. Auditor B afterwards told Instructor A that “It didn't work.” Instructor A was weak on Three above and didn't really believe in Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten. So Instructor A told the Case Supervisor “Process X didn't work on Preclear C.” Now *this* strikes directly at each of One to Six above in Preclear C, Auditor B, Instructor A *and* the Case Supervisor. It opens the door to the introduction of “new technology” and to failure.

What happened here? Instructor A didn't jump down Auditor B's throat, that's all that happened. This is what he *should* have done: Grabbed the auditor's report and looked it over. When a higher executive on this case did so, she found what the Case Supervisor and the rest missed: that Process X *increased* Preclear C's TA to 25 TA divisions for the session but that near session end, Auditor B Qed-and-Aed with a cognition and abandoned Process X while it still gave high TA and went off running one of Auditor B's own manufacture which nearly spun Preclear C. Auditor B's IQ on examination turned out to be about 75. Instructor A was found to have huge ideas of how you must never invalidate anyone, even a lunatic. The Case Supervisor was found to be “too busy with admin to have any time for actual cases.”

All right, there's an all too typical example. The *Instructor* should have done Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten. This would have begun this way. Auditor B: “That Process X didn't work.” Instructor A: “What exactly did *you* do wrong?” Instant attack. “Where's your auditor's report for the session? Good. Look here, you were getting a lot of TA

when you stopped Process X. What did you do?" Then the pc wouldn't have come close to a spin and all four of these would have retained their certainty.

In a year, I had four instances in *one* small group where the correct process recommended was reported not to have worked. But on review found that each one had: (a) increased the TA, (b) had been abandoned and (c) had been falsely reported as unworkable. Also, despite this abuse, in each of these four cases the recommended, correct process cracked the case, yet they were reported as *not having worked!*

Similar examples exist in instruction and these are all the more deadly as every time instruction in correct technology is flubbed, then the resulting error, uncorrected in the auditor, is perpetuated on every pc that auditor audits thereafter. So Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten are even more important in a course than in supervision of cases.

Here's an example: A rave recommendation is given a graduating student "because he gets more TA on pcs than any other student on the course!" Figures of 435 TA divisions a session are reported. "Of course his Model Session is poor but it's just a knack he has" is also included in the recommendation. A careful review is undertaken because *nobody* at Levels 0 to IV is going to get that much TA on pcs. It is found that this student was never taught to read an E-Meter TA dial! And no Instructor observed his handling of a meter and it was not discovered that he "overcompensated" nervously, swinging the TA 2 or 3 divisions beyond where it needed to go to place the needle at "set." So everyone was about to throw away standard processes and Model Session because this one student "got such remarkable TA." They only read the reports and listened to the brags and never *looked* at this student. The pcs in actual fact were making slightly less than average gain, impeded by a rough Model Session and misworded processes. Thus, what was making the pcs win (actual Scientology) was hidden under a lot of departures and errors.

I recall one student who was squirreling on an Academy course and running a lot of offbeat whole track on other students after course hours. The Academy students were in a state of electrification on all these new experiences and weren't quickly brought under control, and the student himself never was given the works on Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten so they stuck. Subsequently, this student prevented another squirrel from being straightened out and his wife died of cancer resulting from physical abuse. A hard, tough Instructor at that moment could have salvaged two squirrels and saved the life of a girl. But no, students had a right to do whatever they pleased.

Squirreling (going off into weird practices or altering Scientology) only comes about from noncomprehension. Usually the noncomprehension is not of Scientology but some earlier contact with an offbeat humanoid practice which in its turn was not understood.

When people can't get results from *what they think* is standard practice, they can be counted upon to squirrel to some degree. The most trouble in the past two years came from orgs where an executive in each *could not* assimilate straight Scientology. Under

instruction in Scientology they were unable to define terms or demonstrate examples of principles. And the orgs where they were got into plenty of trouble. And worse, it could not be straightened out easily because neither one of these people could or would duplicate instructions. Hence, a debacle resulted in two places, directly traced to failures of instruction earlier. So proper instruction is vital. The D of T and his Instructors and all Scientology Instructors must be merciless in getting Four, Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten into effective action. That one student, dumb and impossible though he may seem and of no use to anyone, may yet someday be the cause of untold upset because nobody was interested enough to make *sure* Scientology got home to him.

With what we know now, there is no student we enroll who cannot be properly trained. As an Instructor, one should be very alert to slow progress and should turn the sluggards inside out personally. No *system* will do it, only you or me with our sleeves rolled up can crack the back of bad studenting and we can only do it on an individual student, never on a whole class only. He's slow = something is awful wrong. Take *fast* action to correct it. Don't wait until next week. By then he's got other messes stuck to him. If you can't graduate them with their good sense appealed to and wisdom shining, graduate them in such a state of shock they'll have nightmares if they contemplate squirreling. Then experience will gradually bring about Three in them and they'll *know* better than to chase butterflies when they should be auditing.

When somebody enrolls, consider he or she has joined up for the duration of the universe—never permit an “open-minded” approach. If they're going to quit let them quit fast. If they enrolled, they're aboard, and if they're aboard, they're here on the same terms as the rest of us—win or die in the attempt. Never let them be half-minded about being Scientologists. The finest organizations in history have been tough, dedicated organizations. Not one namby-pamby bunch of pantywaist dilettantes have ever made anything. It's a tough universe. The social veneer makes it seem mild. But only the tigers survive—and even *they* have a hard time. We'll survive because we are tough and are dedicated. When we *do* instruct somebody properly he becomes more and more tiger. When we instruct half-mindedly and are afraid to offend, scared to enforce, we don't make students into good Scientologists and that lets everybody down. When Mrs. Pattycake comes to us to be taught, turn that wandering doubt in her eye into a fixed, dedicated glare and she'll win and we'll all win. Humor her and we all die a little. The proper instruction attitude is, “You're here so you're a Scientologist. Now we're going to make you into an expert auditor no matter what happens. We'd rather have you dead than incapable.”

Fit that into the economics of the situation and lack of adequate time and you see the cross we have to bear.

But we won't have to bear it forever. The bigger we get the more economics and time we will have to do our job. And the only things which can prevent us from getting that big fast are areas in from One to Ten. Keep those in mind and we'll be able to grow. Fast. And as we grow, our shackles will be less and less. Failing to keep One to Ten will make *us* grow less.

So the ogre which might eat us up is not the government or the High Priests. It's our possible failure to retain and practice our technology.

An Instructor or Supervisor or Executive *must* challenge with ferocity instances of "unworkability." They must uncover what *did* happen, what *was* run and what *was* done or not done.

If you have One and Two, you can only acquire Three for all by making sure of all the rest.

We're not playing some minor game in Scientology. It isn't cute or something to do for lack of something better.

The whole agonized future of this planet, every man, woman and child on it, and your own destiny for the next endless trillions of years depend on what you do here and now with and in Scientology.

This is a deadly serious activity. And if we miss getting out of the trap now, we may never again have another chance.

Remember, this is our first chance to do so in all the endless trillions of years of the past. Don't muff it now because it seems unpleasant or unsocial to do Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten.

Do them and we'll win.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER