Staff Auditors.
Fran. Hldrs.   HCO BULLETIN OF FEBRUARY 18, 1960
HCO Secs.
Assn. Secs.   <u>HOW TO RUN O/W AND RESPONSIBILITY</u>

I have just yesterday finally sorted out the exact relation of overt/withold and responsibility as they apply to life and to auditing and have pretty well wrapped up the optimum auditing commands: therefore I want to get this data off to you as fast as possible and get it in use as soon as possible because here again is an increase in auditing effectiveness over and above our existing successes. In the next bulletin up I want to give you a revised form of a model auditing session and after that procedure O.T.3A. However you can use this following material right now and without those, and I recommend that you recognise what you have here as a modification which changes all earlier statements even if they seem to you slightly in conflict.

To begin: A person who does an overt act to another life form has already abandoned responsibility for that other life form. An overt act and a withold are evidently expressions of abandoning responsibility already extant and are therefore a manifestation of irresponsibility.

Therefore, for the sake of auditing skill as well as theory, overts and witholds are the same as irresponsibility.

When running overts and witholds, according to the evidence now to hand, you are actually running irresponsibility off the case. You are taking away the lower inversion of responsibility.

The way to run an overt/withold process is to choose a terminal with an E.Meter. Early in the case choose terminals that are specific and close to PT. When you have chosen the terminal by reason of its drop on the needle and its reality in the pcs life, you run on it the following:
     "What have you done to a -------?"
     "What have you witheld from a -------?"
When addressed to a specific terminal it is worded:
     "What have you done to -------?"
     "What have you witheld from-------?"

Now this may require up to thirty hours to flatten on some cases. But whatever you choose to do on a case then do that thing well. The tone arm may or may not go down on this process. But it will become very different. Try to end up the process with the tone arm lower than it was at the start. If the pc runs out of answers well thats it. Don't force him hard. Just go on to the second stage on the same terminal in a very generalized form.

By this time you have no more than discharged an irresponsibility and you have the responsibility all to handle. Indeed, according to the many cases I have now looked over, the tone arm may not even begin to come down properly or come up properly until the second stage is run and flattened.

The second stage process is responsibility. You take the same terminal you ran the O/W on and (if it was a specific form you now use a general form, i.e. O/W on <u>your</u> mother becomes responsibility on <u>a</u> mother) run as follows:
     "What responsibility have you taken for a -------?"

This is the process which will bring the tone arm down or up, but only when the O/W is fully flattened first.

This above combination of processes is the fastest and surest main line of auditing procedure now known. The above commands are far and above the best proven commands.

As you can see the slightly older process "What could you admit doing to a ------?" and "What could you withold from a ------?" are indeed manifestations of responsibility and factually are   . an index of responsibility. But when it comes right down to cases the above versions cover all cases and do it right.

What a lot there is to know about auditing today. Getting a combination of processes such as the above for the general handling of cases relieves us of the constant tension of what should I run and gives us time to concentrate on a perfection of running it extremely well.

An auditor ought to be adept at CCHs and running the above. He ought to be very sharp with an E.Meter and he ought to be able to run a model session with no blunders.

This done equals clearing people.

There is no substitute for training at the level of HCS/BScn. Running a s ssion right and handling an E.Meter and pc successfully are auditors skills. It must be admitted that very few auditors are possessed at this time of complete and near perfect auditing ability. I take my own responsibility for this and that responsibility lies in not having established an inflexible regimen of auditing. I did not do so because there was ample room for the improvement of techniques and auditing routines. But these last five months of work have brought us closer and closer to the exact right ways to handle cases and the exact processes to run on them. This has arrived with a much fuller understanding of what complexity man is accomplishing toward aberration with the fifty-five axioms. Man got pretty complicated in digging himself in. It has been my job to get pretty simple about digging him out.

The new key data which has emerged as clear cut fact includes as an invariable that the person himself dug himself in, lost sight of why, and is holding himself in a state of stupidity, aberration and even insanity. We suspected this for years, but a way to prove it and then give a person personal reality on it was not mapped through. Now it is as tough as this. If you run "What have you done?" "What have I done?" You can hold a tone arm inactive. Every gain is balanced with a counter accusation, which is to say a new overt, and so the process gets nowhere after a few questions. No, the pc did it all himself and must gradually come to realize that with total subjective reality through processing, not because the auditor told him.

The pc made the facsimile to restrain himself from ever doing it again. Basically good, he goes wrong by failing to keep his own high standards and so loses control of himself.

Another datum: A high tone arm shows loss of the ability to start or reach - a low tone arm (below the clear reading) shows the loss of ability to stop or withold.

In locating a terminal on an E.Meter (and why try to audit without one of these key tools) Remember that the needle drops only on those terminals that the pc still feels some responsibility for. There is some responsibility to be found on these. The drop does not mean that this is what is wrong with the case so much as this is that thing wrong with the case that can be remedied at this time. Overts don't even show up on a terribly irresponsible case until some responsibility is restored. But a rather irresponsible case run on the above procedures on any terminal that does drop will get changes away from the clear reading on the tone arm.

To clear a case it is not so much necessary to run everything off the case as it is to run whatever you run so well that the confidence of the case is restored. Restoration of confidence in being able to handle the bank and therefore life is a better goal than trying to flatten the whole case indifferently. What you contact, do it well no matter how long it takes. A good proceeding is to find anything close to PT and in the environment of a PC (PTPs give a real good clue) and then handle it with great thoroughness with the above procedure. Any constant restimulator of PTPs aches to be audited with the above and will do more for the case as a whole if the auditing is well done and thorough than running any amount of back track. Confidence is the keynote of clearing. That is what the PC lost on his way down.

Don't worry if the needle stays high or low and don't believe the PC is still hiding something from you. You can take the above run-down and do it all. The overts of the PC will eventually out. He doesn't tell you about overts at first because he doesn't see them as overts. They were all justified and the target has been lessened etc. etc. Then when he has O/W and responsibility run on any terminal that drops, his general responsibility comes up to a point where he knows an overt was an overt.

I trust the above will correct any small disturbances that have been occurring or any stalls you have been running into.

L. RON HUBBARD.