

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 9 DECEMBER 1974

Remimeo

Cancels

HCOB 10 July 1964 Reissued 5 December 1974  
as Integrity Processing Series 6R

HCOB 10 July 1964 "Overts - Order of  
Effectiveness in Processing" remains  
as originally issued.

Cancels BTB 9 Dec 72  
"Why Overts Work"

Integrity Processing Series 6RA

EFFECTIVENESS OF OVERTS IN PROCESSING

(The data in this Bulletin has been taken  
from HCOB 10 July 1964. It is useful in  
Integrity Processing.)

ARC BREAKS

The commonest cause of failure in running overt acts is  
"cleaning cleans" whether or not one is using a meter. The  
pc who really has more to tell doesn't ARC Break when the  
Auditor continues to ask for one but may snarl and eventually  
give it up.

On the other hand leaving an overt touched on the case  
and calling it clean will cause a future ARC Break with the  
Auditor.

"Have you told all?" prevents cleaning a clean. On the  
unmetered pc one can see the pc brighten up. On the meter  
you get a nice fall if it's true that all is told.

"Have I not found out about something?" prevents leaving  
an overt undisclosed. On the unmetered pc the reaction is a  
sly flinch. On a metered pc it gives a read.

A pc's protest against a question will also be visible  
in an unmetered pc in a reeling sort of exasperation which  
eventually becomes a howl of pure bafflement at why the  
Auditor won't accept the answer that that's all. On a meter  
protest of a question falls on being asked for: "Is this  
question being protested?"

There is no real excuse for ARC Breaking a pc by:

1. Demanding more than is there or
2. Leaving an overt undisclosed that will later  
make the pc upset with the Auditor.

WHY OVERTS WORK

Overts give the highest gain in raising cause level  
because they are the biggest reason why a person restrains  
himself and withholds self from action.

Man is basically good. But the reactive mind tends to force him into evil actions. These evil actions are instinctively regretted and the individual tries to refrain from doing *anything* at all. The "best" remedy the individual thinks is to withhold. "If I commit evil actions, then my best guarantee for not committing is to do *nothing* whatever." Thus we have the "lazy", inactive person.

Others who try to make an individual guilty for committing evil actions only increase this tendency to laziness.

Punishment is supposed to bring about inaction. And it does. In some unexpected ways.

However, there is also an inversion (a turn about) where the individual sinks *below* recognition of *any* action. The individual in such a state cannot conceive of *any* action and therefore cannot withhold action. And thus we have the criminal who can't act really but can only re-act and is without any self direction. This is why punishment does not cure criminality but in actual fact creates it; the individual is driven below withholding or any recognition of any action. A thief's hands stole the jewel, the thief was merely an innocent spectator to the action of his own hands. Criminals are very sick people physically.

So there is a level below withholding that an Auditor should be alert to in some pcs, for these "have no withholds" and "have done nothing". All of which, seen through *their* eyes is true. They are merely saying "I cannot restrain myself" and "I have not willed myself to do what I have done."

The road out for such a case is the same as that for any other case. It is just longer. The processes for levels above hold also for such cases. But don't be anxious to see a *sudden* return of responsibility for the first owned "done" that this person *knows* he or she has done may be "ate breakfast". Don't disdain such answers in Level II particularly. Rather, in such people, seek such answers.

There is another type of case in all this, just one more to end the list. This is the case who never runs O/W but "seeks the explanation of what I did that made it all happen to me."

This person easily goes into past lives for answers. Their reaction to a question about what they've done is to try to find out what they did that earned all those motivators. That of course, isn't running the process and the Auditor should be alert for it and stop it when it happens.

This type of case goes into its extreme on guilt. It dreams up overts to explain why. After most big murders the police routinely have a dozen or two people come around and confess. You see, if they had done the murder, this would explain why they feel guilty. As a terror stomach is pretty awful grim to live with, one is apt to seek any explanation for it if it will only explain it.

On such cases the same approach as given works, but one should be *very* careful not to let the pc get off overts the pc didn't commit.

Such a pc (recognizeable by the ease they dive into the extreme past) when being audited off a meter gets more and more frantic and wilder and wilder in overts reported. They should get calmer under processing of course, but the false overts make them frantic and hectic in a session. On a meter one simply checks for "Have you told me anything beyond what really has occurred?" Or "Have you told me any untruths?"

The observation and meter guides given in this section are used during a session when they apply but not systematically such as after every pc answer. These observations and meter guides are used always at the end of every session on the pcs to whom they apply.

L. RON HUBBARD  
FOUNDER

LRH:nt  
Copyright © 1974  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

This is Reproduced and issued to you by  
The Publications Organization, U. S.