

**Free Scientologists**  
**Dipl.-Ing. Andreas Gross, Switzerland**  
**FS Bulletin of March 2, 2004**

Remimeo

**RPEC – THE SPAWN OF BLACK SCIENTOLOGY**

Someone wrote to me:

*Hello Andreas*

*One of my best friends has been on church lines for years but does not move anything forward – he does, however, take the last of his money there. After a lot of back and forth with several Sea Org Terminals, he has now come to the terrific conclusion that the bridge is currently irrelevant for him. Instead, he thinks he could become a straightforward person by doing RPEC.*

I know this course from other Scientologists. Once money has run out, you are still left with ethics in order to make some gains. In the CoS, "Ethics is the application for the little man<sup>1</sup>."

And RPEC promises one a standard tech way (without an accusation of self-auditing or squirreling) to have a look onto the Whole-Track.

I am referring to the reference HCOPL 19. 12. 82 RA II revised 26. May 1998 **Repairing Past Ethics Conditions (RPEC)**

I am not only basing my criticism on theoretical considerations but I have lots of practical experience with RPEC: during the Life Orientation Course (short LOC) in the early 90s, I have gathered a lot of RPEC experience with my Twin<sup>2</sup>.

The reference to RPEC shows up only in 1982 when the new management had SP declared the old management and Ron did not have any say in the CoS anymore. This is pretty suspicious to us but, unfortunately, not an argument for a nice Churchy who still considers HCOB's of the 90s for valid LRH statements ;-)

But even for a credulous Churchy it may be interesting information that the first revision of this HCOPL's only took place in 1990 and carried the following addition: "*Revised to leave out data that was not from LRH and add additional Tech by LRH regarding the handling of past ethics conditions. Revisions not cursive.*"

This means RTC admitted already in 1990 that the original HCOPL 19. 12. 82 II **Repairing Past Ethics Conditions (RPEC) was not authentic by Ron!!!**

---

<sup>1</sup>In the sense of a poor man

<sup>2</sup>Just like all other LOC students. Since everyone applied the squirrel tech, whatever had to happen did happen: they destroyed each other. The LOC ended catastrophically and represents a delivery wreckage of the Church. Although there is a lot of good LRH tech in the LOC, the RPEC brought the students down enough so that the LOC turned out to be a flop. To my knowledge, thus it is not being delivered anymore nowadays.

<p>REPAIRING PAST ETHICS CONDITIONS HCO PL 19.12.82 II  <del>available from the application of the condition formulas in present time. He can continue to have trouble in the area or on the dynamic on with the area or activity of the unhandled condition or on that dynamic.</del></p> <p><del>which the previously messed up or incomplete handling was done.</del></p> <p><b>THEORY</b></p> <p><del>If one has had a few wrong conditions or failures to apply correct conditions, he can become upset or disillusioned with the subject of Ethics and the conditions.</del></p> <p><del>It must be understood that this does not only apply to past conditions assigned (or misassigned, as the case may be) by a Scientology Ethics Officer or by one's senior.</del></p> <p><del>This doesn't just apply to Scientology. There are also conditions that occur in life or that are</del></p> <p><del>This not only applies to formal assignments or misassignments by Scientology Ethics Officers. Conditions occur in life that can go unreported or unhandled, and conditions get assigned by self or other dynamics.</del></p> <p><del>An example is somebody who had decided to commit suicide at some point in his life. He was either at Enemy or Treason at the time and it needs to be sorted out and he needs to be gotten through that condition for that period of time, and this applies to every other condition.</del></p> <p><del>A person jailed has been "assigned" a condition of Liability, and this condition just by that action. The formula would have to be applied if the person is to operate in the society in any higher condition.</del></p> <p><del>False or wrongly assigned conditions (such as being assigned a condition of Liability when you weren't in that condition) or failures to properly complete a condition formula at some time in the past can cause a person to have difficulty applying conditions in present time.</del></p> <p><del>The handling for the above is simply to handle in present time the correct condition for that situation or time period. This will clear up the area and the subject and the person will be able to apply conditions in present time without being hung up in these past failures and will not be denied achieve the miraculous wins available from this tech.</del></p> <p><del>It is done before the person starts to handle his present conditions so that these can be done without any attention on previous failures to apply conditions or false condition assignments.</del></p> <p><b>PROCEDURE</b></p> <p>1. The first step is to ensure that the person being handled fully understands the dynamics, the definitions of ethics and justice and what an ethics condition is, as well as each of the conditions and their corresponding formulas. He is not very likely to succeed in</p>	<p>REPAIRING PAST ETHICS CONDITIONS HCO PL 19.12.82 II  <del>handling conditions if he does not have a good grasp of them: the above.</del></p> <p>Only a person who has had little or no contact with the subject, you would first have him study over materials on the Dynamics, ethics, justice, the ethics conditions and their formulas, as covered in the book FUNDAMENTALS OF THOUGHT, and the data on the conditions found in the first four chapters of the book Introduction to Scientology Ethics.</p> <p>When he has studied these, go over the data with him and consult his understanding. Have him explain what a dynamic is, and give examples of each of the dynamics. Have him give you the definitions of ethics and justice and explain what a condition is, give examples of times he has observed people in each condition, and demonstrate each of the conditions formulas.</p> <p>Handle any confusion or question by referring to the materials, and finding and clearing up his misunderstood words.</p> <p>With a person who is experienced with the ethics conditions, it would still be wise to briefly go through this same step. Have him review the materials; give demos and examples; etc. Spot and handle any confusions or questions he may have. It cannot necessarily be assumed that because a person has been around a long time or has a lot of experience with the conditions that he fully understands them. Particularly if he has been sent to you or pulled in by you to handle conditions! Don't get into evaluation or invalidation with this step – simply consult the person's understanding.</p> <p>If the person has previously studied these materials, there is no need to redo this step; go on to step 2 of the procedure.</p> <p>2. Ask the person: "Have you ever been assigned a condition or assigned yourself a condition that you didn't fully reach the EP on or get the expected results from?" "Have you ever failed to achieve the expected end phenomena of a condition, whether the condition was actually assigned or applied or not?"</p> <p>If the answer is "No" and the person is happy about it, the rest of the rundown steps are not done as it would be unnecessary. But make sure that it is understood that this question is not limited or restricted to only those conditions formally assigned by EGs or executives to the person.</p> <p>3. If the answer to the above is "Yes", then the EG asks: "What was the lowest condition ever assigned that you didn't feel you reached the full EP on or didn't get what you didn't feel you achieved the expected results from?" end phenomena on?"</p> <p>Make sure you get the earliest time this situation occurred.</p> <p>For example, he may have been in Treason and not EP'd or not gotten the expected results</p> <p>He may have attempted to apply the Treason Formula a number of times – get without getting the expected end phenomena, or he may never have even tried to apply the formula, despite having been in Treason at various times in his life. Get the earliest time this occurred – occurred for the lowest condition which he doesn't feel he got the expected end phenomena on.</p> <p>4. When this question has been answered, ask him if it was a correct condition.</p> <p>5. If it was a correct condition, the person must now complete that incomplete formula: he must now either do the formula (if he failed to apply it) or complete it (if it was incomplete).</p>
---	--

Illustration 1: Two pages of my comparison of the 1990 RPEC-issue to the 1982 one.

The change from 1982 to 1990 is not remarkable because the RPEC may have been better in the beginning, no, it has always been rubbish. But the changes are so drastic that they leave an honest church member with only two conclusions:

The 1982 edition was either written by Ron, in which case the massive change of entire paragraphs, replacements of words and partial sentences etc. is such a huge invasion by the RTC that you have to at least call it a big lack of respect for LRH, if not even a massive change of the tech, which is a high crime according to the KSW-Policies.

Or the 1982 edition was not written by Ron. Then I don't know where the correction in 1990 (4 years after his alleged death) is supposed to have come from, which is more from Ron than the 1982 edition.

Interestingly, the changes of an edition are not highlighted in cursive anymore – which goes against previous principles of revising LRH editions. Previous editions are also removed and destroyed. Before, for example, the original editions were also printed in the old volumes so that everyone could backtrace the changes made. This, btw, is general practice in the documentation business of the industry and authorities in order to prevent mistakes.

I also have the second revision (RA) with the date "revised on May 26, 1998". No mention there either of why and what might have been revised. This revision, however, could have already been approved by LRH because with immediate reincarnation of his death, the new, young LRH could have already been 12 years old at the time ;-)

This much to the authenticity of any of the church editions.

### Now about the content

When precisely looking at the procedure, you can see yourself why it cannot be right:

After the mandatory step 1 (learning the procedure before applying it), you ask yourself during step 2 if you have **ever** failed to successfully apply an ethics formula:

#### ***2. "Have you ever failed to achieve the expected end phenomena of a condition, whether the condition was actually assigned or applied or not?"***

This question alone shows that the RPEC is utter nonsense. You can never reach a condition with RPEC so that RPEC is not necessary anymore. No matter how much you clean up, you will always have to answer this question with a YES.

This would be as if Ron antedated a question during Auditing of Overt/Withholds to find out whether or not the PC should be relieved of O/W's: "Have you ever done an overt-act?"

The reference goes on: ***"If the answer is "No" and the person is happy about it, the rest of the steps are not done as it would be unnecessary."***

Since every living thing, however, has neglected at some point to use the formula correctly, everyone will have to answer the question honestly today with a YES. Even after thousands of RPEC lessons the answer will still be YES because this question does not even take these repairs into account.

This is the kind of stupidity found in new references that lead new people (who still dare to think logically) to the conclusion that not all LRH tech can be so ingenious and leads to the most desolated strains in older people while trying to somehow justify the idiocy. Only little children will dare to yell in Church: "But the emperor is not wearing anything!"

In step 3, you ask: ***"What was the lowest condition that you didn't feel you achieved the expected end phenomena on?"***

So: Since we already have a few quadrillion years on our backs by now and just now know and try to apply the ingenious ethics formulas by LRH, it is pretty safe to assume that there have been sufficient opportunities to fail in every single condition. - The answer that is most likely correct for everyone would be "confusion".

In this step one asks to pose the question when it happened for the very first time. So you go back a chain and look for the beginning. Without an e-meter you roam a chain of states of confusion completely by yourself and without any possibilities of corrections. Or as the text suggests – a chain of states of betrayal: ***He may have attempted to apply the Treason Formula a number of times without getting the expected end phenomena, or he may never have even tried to apply the formula, despite having been in Treason at various times in his life. Get the earliest time this occurred for the lowest condition which he doesn't feel he got the expected end phenomena on.***

I find that quite impetuous. You are sent onto the Whole-Track without any meter support and the help of an auditor and you are supposed to find the beginning of a chain of confusion or betrayal conditions. What if you can't find the beginning? If it can't dissolve that way? – Too bad, you're just stuck up in shit's creek. – Bad luck! Unfortunately, "LRH": has not provided a repair for this.

In number 4 you ask yourself ***if it was the correct condition***, i.e. whether or not you thought you were in Betrayal or actually in Power. If it was the wrong one, the right one will be established and used to continue with work.

But let's stick to this example: deepest condition: a confusion. When was the earliest confusion. This question, when answered correctly, would most likely lead to an intense implant at the be-

gining of the time track<sup>3</sup> where one was beaten unconscious and confused with the aid of great energy and not really able to escape.

Even with the support of an e-meter in the session, it is one of the most difficult events for the PC that one will only emerge from successfully with a lot of patience and precise application of the LRH processes. – But the CoS leaves the RPEC students alone with this question and simply refers to the formula for confusion to get back out. Maybe it works and if not, there are still the gentlemen with the white jackets that want to take care of you then...

So you go up from one condition to the next until you have reached the Normal level.

Since we have maneuvered our way down step by step as big OT's on the Whole Track, one will come across huge Overts in RPEC, which one would have made far back in the past.

Now you might find such a huge Overt where entire planets have been destroyed or only millions of jews have been gassed or something like that (I have only picked the smaller possible Overts so the readers can still confront me). You recognize that it was a big betrayal on humanity and then deal with enemy and doubt and make the decision to rather be a nice guy. But then you have a problem with the Liability Formula: How do I fix the damages caused? .....

My keyboard does not even yield so many points as to demonstrate my commlag on this question!

However, the text emphasizes step 5 like this:

*"He applies the formula to such a non-handled condition, not to a current situation or anything else. He uses a formula that was not used earlier or he completes an old, incomplete formula. Let him conduct each and every step of the formula. ...*

*Sometimes the formulas require the person to go somewhere or do something in order to handle the condition. With a person of the public it may be necessary for him to go into his office or home to complete the formula. Now, you will let him perform it right away after determining that it is what it takes and that he knows what he will do. He may want to make amends for something, communicate with someone or put something right. He obviously needs to perform the necessary steps in order to get through the condition."*<sup>4</sup>

The restriction "**with a public person**" from the above-written paragraph is quite interesting. They don't want to risk that Staffs leave their position in order to make any amends in the world. This is the step at which not only realizations are expected in the lower conditions, but something has to really happen in the world ("in 3U"). – Therefore: Staffs don't have the right

---

<sup>3</sup>The so-called R6 bank that is audited on the Clearing-Course. The PC has to solo-audit an hour a day for about a year in order to confront and dissolve the rather big load in these implants bit by bit.

<sup>4</sup> Sorry, I have no English version of this 1998-revision of that RPEC-HCOPL at hand, only 2 different German issues. If you have one, please send a copy to me. Thus I translated this back from my german version which says: *Sie wendet die Formel auf jenen nicht gehandhabten Zustand an, nicht auf eine gegenwärtige Situation oder irgendetwas anderes. Sie führt eine Formel durch, die früher nicht angewandt wurde, oder schließt eine alte unvollständige Formel ab. Lassen Sie sie jeden Schritt der Formel durchführen. ...*

*Manchmal erfordern es die Formeln, dass die Person irgendwo hingehen und etwas tun muss, um den Zustand zu handhaben. Bei einer Person aus der Öffentlichkeit ist es vielleicht notwendig, dass sie in ihr Büro oder nach Hause gehen muss, um eine Formel abzuschließen. Nun, Sie lassen sie das direkt durchführen, nachdem Sie festgelegt haben, dass es das ist, was es braucht, und dass sie weiß, was sie tun wird. Sie will vielleicht Wiedergutmachung leisten, mit jemandem in Kommunikation gehen oder etwas in Ordnung bringen. Offensichtlich muss sie die notwendigen Schritte durchführen, um durch den Zustand hindurchzukommen.*

In the 1982-issue the step 5 is this: *"If it was a correct condition, the person must now complete that incomplete formula. He is applying the formula to ... unhandled condition, not a present time situation or anything else. He is completing an old incomplete formula. Have the person do each step of the formula.*

to really elaborate their Conditions extensively – or: It works differently with Staffs: They are Staffs and, therefore, no matter what they produce or how much shit they create in their position – they are so upstat that it makes up for all prior burdens. I didn't just make this up, there are many Staffs and Sea Org Members who really think that way of themselves!!!

Now: Let's assume someone took out a loan of one billion Credits several thousands years ago in the galactic confederation in order to start a self-employed business as a Space Trucker (even space freighters are really expensive!). Unfortunately, he did not make it and messed it all up: pirates etc. – You know the stories. Since he was not able to pay back the loan and to scare off other debtors, he ended up on the prison planet Blito-P3 and does RPEC there. He remembers his debts during that RPEC.

According to the Liability Formula, he has to acquire the one billion Credits (or a similar value, i.e. in gold bars) after all in order to have a good standing with his friends again, the intergalactic bankers. Maybe they will even pick him up again then...

Can someone please tell me what other value such programs, that you impose on yourself (handling of enormous debts or making amends with millions of dead people), are supposed to have other than completely overwhelming a PC? Without confronting a gradient with his biggest or at least oldest Overts and request amends?

Interestingly enough, the ethics officers left it at appointing the Conditions and left you alone with the question of how to ever escape this. You can't, of course.

The correct way out has been described by Ron: It is called "Gradients". You only determine your **current** Condition according to the current games and work up one step. When in Power, you extend the game, you are ready to take on a larger area of responsibility. Thus, you can get out step by step and reach Power.

But confronting something with their darkest conditions without gradients on the total time track and then asking them: "what do you have to do to ever get out of there" is simply suppressive because it is always overwhelming.

If that worked, you would be able to handle your entire case at one shot.

But the described end phenomenon of the RPEC looks really puny:

### ***END PHENOMENON***

***„The result of this action is that a person will now be able to look at his current conditions with a restored ability to apply the ethics conditions to himself and get all the gains available from these formulas”***

So a nice, little, manageable matter that is really necessary to do. Who does not want to reach that?

The end phenomenon does not match this procedure! It is not consistent. If I really were to found my earliest confusion and walk up through the Conditions step by step, I would be out of the game. I would have reached everything there is to reach: Tone 40, Static, OT etc.

Actually, the procedure – as shown above – will only degrade oneself: You put your nose into your darkest times, bring this low Condition into the present and only feel bad. The program you are supposed to do then cannot be implemented, so you agree that you have to stay at the lower level.

Whose intention is it that you and I ascribe to a lower Condition and believe we could never apply Conditions to present situations before old things have been rectified? – Well: Exactly those traitors of Scientology who have taken over the place and want to turn it into the dark so that no one wants to know anything about it anymore.

And RPEC is one of their most severe projects: how maliciously did they laugh about us when they concocted over and decided this thing at the conference table in L.A.

And we still try to make some sense of such references and do it somehow the right way. All graduates of the LOC that I knew were crashed shortly after the course. The delivery of the LOC Course itself was abandoned shortly after. But the course is "of course also from LRH", no doubt. Ron has dictated a lot into the feather of David Miscavige after his "body dropping" in 1986. Who believes that? Well the idiots!

Best regards and much success

Andreas Gross  
for the  
Independent Scientologists