

BASIC ADMIN COURSE

Colour, Screen, read only (unsuitable for print) (CS, Colour, Screen
Compiled 13. March 2022

a) Table of Contents, in Checksheet order:

1.	61-05-26	QUALITY COUNTS.....	1
2.	61-05-29	QUALITY AND ADMIN IN CENTRAL ORGS.....	3
3.	70-05-30	CUTATIVES.....	5
4.	63-04-25	DUTIES OF A STAFF MEMBER	9
5.	69-02-05	CODE OF A SCIENTOLOGIST	13
6.	68-01-10	POLITICS, FREEDOM FROM	15
7.	70-11-02	THE THEORY OF SCIENTOLOGY ORGANIZATIONS.....	17
8.	65-04-18	CONTESTS AND PRIZES	23
9.	57-02-28	HATS	25
10.	65-07-01	HATS, THE REASON FOR.....	27
11.	59-09-15	HATS AND OTHER FOLDERS.....	29
12.	66-01-07	LEAVING POST WRITING YOUR HAT	31
13.	61-04-11	HOW TO DO A STAFF JOB	33
14.	59-08-19	HOW TO HANDLE WORK.....	35
15.	65-05-01	ORGANIZATION THE DESIGN OF THE ORGANIZATION.....	37
16.	65-04-06	ORG BOARD AND LIVINGNESS	41
17.	66-01-04	SCIENTOLOGY ORGANIZATIONS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM: DISPATCHES.....	63
18.	66-03-30	THE THREE BASKET SYSTEM.....	69
19.	71-10-25	COMM ROUTING HOW TO TIE UP A WHOLE ORG AND PRODUCE NOTHING	71
20.	63-04-10	WHAT AN EXECUTIVE WANTS ON HIS LINES.....	75
21.	63-12-27	THE "MAGIC" OF GOOD MANAGEMENT	79
22.	65-03-05	POLICY: SOURCE OF.....	85
23.	65-03-13	THE STRUCTURE OF ORGANIZATION WHAT IS POLICY?.....	89
24.	65-04-23	PROBLEMS	99
25.	65-05-16	INDICATORS OF ORGS	103
26.	65-10-13	DEV-T DATA – EXECUTIVE RESPONSIBILITY	107
27.	66-02-28	DANGER CONDITION DATA WHY ORGANIZATIONS STAY SMALL	109
28.	66-11-06	STATISTIC ANALYSIS	117
29.	70-11-25	POLICY AND ORDERS	123
30.	70-12-06	THIRD DYNAMIC DE-ABERRATION	129
31.	70-12-14	GROUP SANITY	135
32.	70-12-30	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL.....	151
33.	71-03-25	VALUABLE FINAL PRODUCTS	155
34.	71-12-03	EXCHANGE.....	159
35.	65-04-16	HANDLING THE PUBLIC INDIVIDUAL	163
36.	68-11-21	SENIOR POLICY	169
37.	71-02-09	EXECUTIVE MISBEHAVIOUR	171
38.	65-08-24	CLEANLINESS OF QUARTERS AND STAFF IMPROVE OUR IMAGE.....	173

39.	59-09-04	COMPLETED STAFF WORK (C.S.W.) – HOW TO GET APPROVAL OF ACTIONS AND PROJECTS.....	175
40.	64-11-17	OFF-LINE AND OFF-POLICY YOUR FULL IN-BASKET	179
41.	65-01-31	DEV-T	189
42.	65-02-08	DEV-T ANALYSIS.....	193
43.	69-01-27	DEV-T SUMMARY LIST	197
44.	69-01-30	DEV-T SUMMARY LIST ADDITIONS	203
45.	69-10-27	DEV-T	209
46.	72-02-29	CORRECT COMM	211
47.	65-03-17	ADMINISTERING JUSTICE.....	215
48.	65-03-07	OFFENSES & PENALTIES.....	217
49.	67-09-23	NEW POST FORMULA - THE CONDITIONS FORMULAS.....	225
50.	65-05-25	THE FIVE CONDITIONS	231
51.	65-09-01	ETHICS PROTECTION	257
52.	64-10-27	POLICIES ON PHYSICAL HEALING, INSANITY AND POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES	259
53.	67-03-22	ALTER-IS AND DEGRADED BEINGS.....	265
54.	72-05-03	ETHICS AND EXECUTIVES.....	267
55.	68-12-26	THE THIRD PARTY LAW	273
56.	64-09-08	OVERTS, WHAT LIES BEHIND THEM?	277
57.	67-02-12	THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF LEADERS	279
58.	66-03-01	WHAT IS GREATNESS?	291

b) Table of Contents, in chronological order:

1.	57-02-28	HATS	25
2.	59-08-19	HOW TO HANDLE WORK.....	35
3.	59-09-04	COMPLETED STAFF WORK (C.S.W.) – HOW TO GET APPROVAL OF ACTIONS AND PROJECTS	175
4.	59-09-15	HATS AND OTHER FOLDERS.....	29
5.	61-04-11	HOW TO DO A STAFF JOB	33
6.	61-05-26	QUALITY COUNTS.....	1
7.	61-05-29	QUALITY AND ADMIN IN CENTRAL ORGS	3
8.	63-04-10	WHAT AN EXECUTIVE WANTS ON HIS LINES.....	75
9.	63-04-25	DUTIES OF A STAFF MEMBER	9
10.	63-12-27	THE "MAGIC" OF GOOD MANAGEMENT	79
11.	64-09-08	OVERTS, WHAT LIES BEHIND THEM?	277
12.	64-10-27	POLICIES ON PHYSICAL HEALING, INSANITY AND POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES	259
13.	64-11-17	OFF-LINE AND OFF-POLICY YOUR FULL IN-BASKET	179
14.	65-01-31	DEV-T	189
15.	65-02-08	DEV-T ANALYSIS.....	193
16.	65-03-05	POLICY: SOURCE OF.....	85
17.	65-03-07	OFFENSES & PENALTIES.....	217
18.	65-03-13	THE STRUCTURE OF ORGANIZATION WHAT IS POLICY?.....	89
19.	65-03-17	ADMINISTERING JUSTICE	215
20.	65-04-06	ORG BOARD AND LIVINGNESS	41
21.	65-04-16	HANDLING THE PUBLIC INDIVIDUAL	163
22.	65-04-18	CONTESTS AND PRIZES	23
23.	65-04-23	PROBLEMS	99
24.	65-05-01	ORGANIZATION THE DESIGN OF THE ORGANIZATION.....	37
25.	65-05-16	INDICATORS OF ORGS	103
26.	65-05-25	THE FIVE CONDITIONS	231
27.	65-07-01	HATS, THE REASON FOR.....	27
28.	65-08-24	CLEANLINESS OF QUARTERS AND STAFF IMPROVE OUR IMAGE.....	173
29.	65-09-01	ETHICS PROTECTION	257
30.	65-10-13	DEV-T DATA – EXECUTIVE RESPONSIBILITY	107
31.	66-01-04	SCIENTOLOGY ORGANIZATIONS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM: DISPATCHES.....	63
32.	66-01-07	LEAVING POST WRITING YOUR HAT	31
33.	66-02-28	DANGER CONDITION DATA WHY ORGANIZATIONS STAY SMALL	109
34.	66-03-01	WHAT IS GREATNESS?	291
35.	66-03-30	THE THREE BASKET SYSTEM.....	69
36.	66-11-06	STATISTIC ANALYSIS	117
37.	67-02-12	THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF LEADERS	279
38.	67-03-22	ALTER-IS AND DEGRADED BEINGS.....	265

39.	67-09-23	NEW POST FORMULA - THE CONDITIONS FORMULAS.....	225
40.	68-01-10	POLITICS, FREEDOM FROM	15
41.	68-11-21	SENIOR POLICY	169
42.	68-12-26	THE THIRD PARTY LAW	273
43.	69-01-27	DEV-T SUMMARY LIST	197
44.	69-01-30	DEV-T SUMMARY LIST ADDITIONS	203
45.	69-02-05	CODE OF A SCIENTOLOGIST	13
46.	69-10-27	DEV-T	209
47.	70-05-30	CUTATIVES.....	5
48.	70-11-02	THE THEORY OF SCIENTOLOGY ORGANIZATIONS.....	17
49.	70-11-25	POLICY AND ORDERS	123
50.	70-12-06	THIRD DYNAMIC DE-ABERRATION	129
51.	70-12-14	GROUP SANITY	135
52.	70-12-30	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL.....	151
53.	71-02-09	EXECUTIVE MISBEHAVIOUR	171
54.	71-03-25	VALUABLE FINAL PRODUCTS	155
55.	71-10-25	COMM ROUTING HOW TO TIE UP A WHOLE ORG AND PRODUCE NOTHING	71
56.	71-12-03	EXCHANGE	159
57.	72-02-29	CORRECT COMM	211
58.	72-05-03	ETHICS AND EXECUTIVES.....	267

c) Table of Contents, in alphabetical order:

1.	65-03-17	ADMINISTERING JUSTICE.....	215
2.	67-03-22	ALTER-IS AND DEGRADED BEINGS.....	265
3.	65-08-24	CLEANLINESS OF QUARTERS AND STAFF IMPROVE OUR IMAGE.....	173
4.	69-02-05	CODE OF A SCIENTOLOGIST	13
5.	71-10-25	COMM ROUTING HOW TO TIE UP A WHOLE ORG AND PRODUCE NOTHING	71
6.	59-09-04	COMPLETED STAFF WORK (C.S.W.) – HOW TO GET APPROVAL OF ACTIONS AND PROJECTS	175
7.	65-04-18	CONTESTS AND PRIZES	23
8.	72-02-29	CORRECT COMM	211
9.	70-05-30	CUTATIVES.....	5
10.	66-02-28	DANGER CONDITION DATA WHY ORGANIZATIONS STAY SMALL	109
11.	65-02-08	DEV-T ANALYSIS.....	193
12.	65-10-13	DEV-T DATA – EXECUTIVE RESPONSIBILITY	107
13.	69-01-30	DEV-T SUMMARY LIST ADDITIONS	203
14.	69-01-27	DEV-T SUMMARY LIST	197
15.	65-01-31	DEV-T	189
16.	69-10-27	DEV-T	209
17.	63-04-25	DUTIES OF A STAFF MEMBER	9
18.	70-12-30	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL.....	151
19.	72-05-03	ETHICS AND EXECUTIVES.....	267
20.	65-09-01	ETHICS PROTECTION	257
21.	71-12-03	EXCHANGE.....	159
22.	71-02-09	EXECUTIVE MISBEHAVIOUR	171
23.	70-12-14	GROUP SANITY	135
24.	65-04-16	HANDLING THE PUBLIC INDIVIDUAL	163
25.	59-09-15	HATS AND OTHER FOLDERS.....	29
26.	57-02-28	HATS	25
27.	65-07-01	HATS, THE REASON FOR.....	27
28.	61-04-11	HOW TO DO A STAFF JOB	33
29.	59-08-19	HOW TO HANDLE WORK.....	35
30.	65-05-16	INDICATORS OF ORGS	103
31.	66-01-07	LEAVING POST WRITING YOUR HAT	31
32.	67-09-23	NEW POST FORMULA - THE CONDITIONS FORMULAS.....	225
33.	65-03-07	OFFENSES & PENALTIES.....	217
34.	64-11-17	OFF-LINE AND OFF-POLICY YOUR FULL IN-BASKET.....	179
35.	65-04-06	ORG BOARD AND LIVINGNESS	41
36.	65-05-01	ORGANIZATION THE DESIGN OF THE ORGANIZATION.....	37
37.	64-09-08	OVERTS, WHAT LIES BEHIND THEM?	277
38.	64-10-27	POLICIES ON PHYSICAL HEALING, INSANITY AND POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES	259

39.	70-11-25	POLICY AND ORDERS	123
40.	65-03-05	POLICY: SOURCE OF.....	85
41.	68-01-10	POLITICS, FREEDOM FROM	15
42.	65-04-23	PROBLEMS	99
43.	61-05-29	QUALITY AND ADMIN IN CENTRAL ORGS	3
44.	61-05-26	QUALITY COUNTS.....	1
45.	66-01-04	SCIENTOLOGY ORGANIZATIONS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM: DISPATCHES.....	63
46.	68-11-21	SENIOR POLICY	169
47.	66-11-06	STATISTIC ANALYSIS	117
48.	63-12-27	THE "MAGIC" OF GOOD MANAGEMENT	79
49.	65-05-25	THE FIVE CONDITIONS	231
50.	67-02-12	THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF LEADERS	279
51.	65-03-13	THE STRUCTURE OF ORGANIZATION WHAT IS POLICY?.....	89
52.	70-11-02	THE THEORY OF SCIENTOLOGY ORGANIZATIONS.....	17
53.	68-12-26	THE THIRD PARTY LAW	273
54.	66-03-30	THE THREE BASKET SYSTEM	69
55.	70-12-06	THIRD DYNAMIC DE-ABERRATION	129
56.	71-03-25	VALUABLE FINAL PRODUCTS	155
57.	63-04-10	WHAT AN EXECUTIVE WANTS ON HIS LINES.....	75
58.	66-03-01	WHAT IS GREATNESS?	291

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 26 MAY 1961

Issue II

(Reissued on 21 June 1967)

Remimeo
All Staff
Tech Hats
Qual Hats

*A message to the Executive
Secretaries and all Org Staff*

QUALITY COUNTS

Clearing is now in the reach of every Scientologist.

Excellent Auditor training is now in the reach of every Academy.

And these are the only things in the long run that will count.

When I see an Organization staff panting after newspaper publicity or going mad on the subject of dissemination, and at the same time turning in to me bad results and poor student quality, I know somebody has their targets mixed up.

Quality is the *only* thing that counts. If quality in training and processing is not given first rank and constant priority by Secretaries or Executive Secretaries, then all the administration in the world will not make the grade for any Central Org.

Deliver the goods. That's a crude way to put it. But if you want a new and better civilization you won't get it by advertising or worrying what people think of you. You will get it only by releasing and clearing people and sending them out into the society to get the show on the road in all branches of human activity, including Scientology.

I know we have been a long time without clearing people. But we're clearing them now. What does it take to clear people? It takes highly skilled and tightly supervised auditing. It takes good technology. It takes good technical application.

If you'll forget about how easy it is to mob students all up in a class and actually confront each student as an individual, make sure he knows every essential step he has to know, make sure *all* his questions get answered, you'll have auditors that can audit.

Will you *please* put attention on raising technical skill in the HGC, releasing people, clearing people, and on the quality of training in the Academy to the end of getting every student capable of all the steps necessary to release people.

I have made the grade technically in the field of research. Now it's time to drop all the booboo's and nonsense. All you have to do in an Org is release and clear people and turn out

auditors who can release people and keep in contact with the public and treat them well and you're over the top.

This morning I received a cable from an Org. An urgent cable. Did it say, "How do you assess for a Pre-Hav level" or something sensible? No, it didn't. It said, "Send us some biographical data for a newspaper article." I spit. That Org is doing the lousiest job possible in Technical and is all worked up to get publicity. What's this? *Do* they think a society in this shape will approve Scientology into power? Hell no! And to hell with this society. We're making a new one. So let's skip the approval button from a lot of wogs and settle down to work to make new people and better people. *Then* maybe you'll have a society.

Right here and right now this policy is laid down in concrete with an atomic branding iron: **The first and primary goal of an organization is delivering the foremost technical quality that can be delivered in its area.**

All right. I've made my technical target bang in the bull's eye. You can release and clear. You can train auditors well. Well, Christ! Let's do it, do it, do it!

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ph.jp.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 29 MAY 1961

CenOCon

QUALITY AND ADMIN IN CENTRAL ORGS

The function of the Administrative Personnel in a Central Organization is to make technical quality possible and get it delivered to Scientologists and the public.

Administration is no unimportant function. On the contrary, I had to work in Scientology a long time before I found out that in the absence of good administration, technical quality is impossible. At first I counted on high calibre business men to do it. Then I found, after 1954, that they didn't have a clue and that their use had led us on a bad course. So we had to develop and learn administration and we are winning on it.

An administrative personnel is there to keep the lines moving and the function of his post operating.

Administrative personnel gets Scientology to the public, keeps the public happy and the organization solvent.

Administrative personnel are there to keep Administration out of technical hands and let technical work.

Administration gets the public in and out, keeps communication going, gets the data to tech and keeps the Org from going broke.

Administration is, however, owed something by technical. If Administration gets people in for service it is only right that that service, when rendered by technical, be the highest possible quality.

For if Administration in all departments is not backed up by quality technical achievements, then administration is betrayed.

If one keeps, as in accounts, collecting money for service rendered by technical, then accounts has a right to demand that it was good service or else the accountant, in collecting, betrays.

Therefore, Administration may at any time, just as technical may demand good Admin, demand of technical that it produce and hold its own.

As of this moment there is no excuse of any kind for any technical failure in any Central Org.

The moment we got all the tools, it showed up that technical often had not understood any of the tools it already had. A clear cut, simple routine as it now exists makes Auditing and Training a problem in black and white. Either it is done or it isn't.

If results are not forthcoming for any person as of now, then somebody is goofing. And it won't be any small goof.

It is working out that goofs are of this magnitude:

Auditor does not know anything about reading a meter but has been kidding us one and all that he or she knew;

Auditor has not the vaguest on how to handle rudiments;

Auditor couldn't security check Krushchev and find a crime;

Auditor has no clue about assessment;

Auditor just doesn't even report to session.

That would be the sort of thing it would take to keep Scientology from working on every case. The errors are *gross*, never slight, if a case doesn't move.

All right. Admin personnel do their job. Therefore they have a right to expect tech will do its job.

The whole source of low units is tech failure. Bad tech makes it almost impossible to get pcs or students in. Therefore Admin has a right to raise hell over bad tech. A graph drops. ARC breaks gleam clear to anyone. Admin, working at a less interesting job, has the right to scream loud enough to be heard on Arcturus. Because *that* took a fantastic, large technical goof to achieve.

None can now say all is changing in Tech. The only thing that's changing is the communication and information to get tech to do its job.

Low units, lack of enough personnel, lack of new executive personnel all trace to tech failure in the past.

Now is the time to make good. We *can* release people *easily*. Why not do it? We can clear people. Why not do it?

A high executive in a Central Org who had had a tech department that was failing, failing, failing owned up the other day to "having all the data but being too busy to study it." He meant, obviously he was too busy to do his job. And a Joburg Security Check found out why.

All staff members, Tech and Admin, of a Central Org, each one or altogether, has a right to demand that every tech person knows his business and does the job.

All staff personnel in a meeting or by petition has a right to demand certain personnel be sent to Saint Hill to be trained.

All staff personnel has a right to demand that any or all staff personnel be given a *Joburg* Security Check, WW Sec Form 3, by somebody who knows how to give one.

All staff personnel has a right to demand practical and functional releasing and clearing 1. of staff 2. of executives and 3. of the public who buys our service.

If we're going to put a new world here, we better get going on the project. It isn't as if we could fool people forever.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jl.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 30 MAY 1970

Remimeo

IMPORTANT

CUTATIVES

In the period up to 1966 we were plagued by an occasional obsessiveness to **add** to any process or policy. Additives made things unworkable.

After 1966 when I left the post of Executive Director WW, a new condition set in. Checksheets, processes, intensives, grades began to be **cut down**.

This we can dub a **cutative** impulse to coin a word.

So persuasive were its advocates that even I was persuaded to agree to some points of it so you need not feel bad if you were gulled into buying the idea of shortening things in order to produce a quicker result.

No one really saw where the trend was going.

In 1970 a survey I have just completed has shown that this effort was so complete that the following had been broadly accomplished:

- A. Training no longer included enough Scientology materials to make an effective Scientology auditor in many places.
- B. Grades had been shortened from 50 hours 0 to IV to 2½ minutes.
- C. The End Phenomena of grades and processes were discarded.

The end result has been:

- 1. Few skilled auditors.
- 2. Shrunk and struggling Scn orgs.
- 3. A field that is disappointed in results – for they think they have had grades and haven't.
- 4. People coming into Advanced Orgs to be cleared who have **no** lower grades actually run and so they can't make any upper grades.

In effect Scientology was thrown away. From total workability it was cut down to occasional result.

I saw the first impulse of this in an executive long since dismissed from Saint Hill as a constant overt no-case gain case who agitated constantly to remove tapes from the Saint Hill Course. As 90% of the data on the SHSBC is on tape I merely thought he had gone over to the enemy and ignored him. Some others, however, had the same idea and started labeling basic books and bulletins "Mere Background Data" or saying "We don't use that now" or "That's

old and you only look at it for interest". Thus the laws of listing and other phenomena were thrown away.

Recently I found the reason Case Supervisors failed is that they just don't know "The Original Thesis" and "Evolution of a Science" or "Scn 8-80" or "Scn 8-8008". **When I demanded they *study* these books they became capable of handling cases.** They did not know what they were handling – the mind – and so how could they be sensible in ordering what was to be run on a case?

Back in 1950 we used to have a small bunch of goony birds, ex-psychologists, ex-lunatics. They were constantly demanding a 2 second action that totally cleared someone. Behind this was an inability to concentrate attention or even to work. These were people striving for total effect instantly. Yet they couldn't run with reality on any process heavier than "How are you?" and they never saw a wall – they saw a mock up of it!

So the impulse of **do it *all now now*** that destroyed any sanity of psychiatry is always around.

A student with a one item checksheet who does it in one minute is the ideal course to such.

A preclear run for 2½ minutes to total top grades becomes an ideal auditing session to such.

Such things just aren't real. And such unreality got into the lines too hard and is being escorted right back out right now.

The following policies are in full force and are to be backed up fully.

1. Course checksheets may not be cut, edited or reduced after a fully approved checksheet is issued for use on any course.
2. No grade may be awarded for which all processes of that grade have not been run and where the end phenomena of that grade is not attested to singly and fully by the preclear before an examiner.
3. Anyone found relegating basic materials to unimportance, by reason of age or volume is to lose his post and certificates.
4. Any statistic claimed which is achieved by downgrading materials or grades or falsely pretending an end phenomena has been achieved for pcs, or skill by auditors shall result in the dismissal of the division head presenting it.
5. No suppressive person with a fat ethics file and no case gain may hold any executive position in a Scientology org.

If you in any org or franchise are having any field or financial trouble you need not look further than errors pointed out in this Policy Letter.

"Dianetic Triples" awarded after 1½ hours of processing, "multiple declares" after 10 minutes from 0 to IV, using checksheets from which all basic material has been cut, the fail-

ure to realize gains and abilities and success have to be worked for to be true, are at the bottom of any trouble any org or franchise is having.

Beginning with the Pol Ltr of 10 May 1970 a more honest era has began.

Scramble around and put it right.

Deliver Scientology not a Cutative.

LRH:dz.nt.ka.aap

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 25 APRIL 1963

Central Orgs

DUTIES OF A STAFF MEMBER

(Re-issued and slightly amended from HASI Pol Ltr of August 7, 1958)

Attach this bulletin to the inside front cover of your staff member hat folder.

1. Each staff member is responsible for seeing that organization policy is carried out. If – you see another staff member at variance with organization policy, it is your duty to advise them direct – if that fails, advise the Association Secretary.
2. Abide by the working hours of the organization – arrive on time, keep a set lunch hour. If you need to change your lunch hour, check with your department head¹ for okay. A post not covered throws randomness into the organization.
3. Keep your own desk, equipment and quarters neat and orderly. See that papers are not scattered on your own desk and in your office.
4. If you see doors open with nobody on post, close or lock the door.
5. All staff members are responsible for seeing that their doors are locked in the evenings, lights turned off, recorders off, coolers off, cigarettes not left lighted. Leave your office clean and neat.
6. See that your supplies are adequate – order before you give out.
7. Make your daily pickups to and from the Comm Center, or see that this has been done by HASI or HCO Communicator.
8. If you change your residence or telephone number, report this information to personnel, your department head, Reception, and the person in charge of Evacuation Plan.
9. Know well the Organization Board. Know the various posts and who covers them.
10. Abide by the purchase order system of the organization.
11. Be courteous and helpful to students and preclears on our premises, and anyone else who calls by. Refer people to the correct terminal. Take responsibility to see that they get to the right terminal, even if you have to walk them to the terminal's desk.

¹ Editor's note: The Org Board of 1963 had departments instead of divisions which are used today.

12. Abide by the Policy of Outside Auditing, i.e., HCO Pol Ltr of October 16, 1962, "No staff to Audit private pcs".
13. Keep your attire as presentable as possible. A good presentation to the public creates a good impression upon them.
14. If you see something around the premises which needs repairing, report it to the Director of Administration².
15. Make your posts or post real to other staff members and the field.
16. Answer people's questions. Understand the question, answer it, make friends.
17. Attend Staff Meetings.
18. Keep your bulletins and policy letters in proper hat folders: Technical bulletins in a gold or orange folder marked "Technical Bulletins", your own hat bulletins in your hat folder or folders (blue) and all other bulletins not technical and not your hat, in your "Staff Member" hat folder (yellow).
19. Review your hat folders periodically. Refresh your memory regarding your duties. If they are not current, bring them up to date.
20. If you receive a dispatch which does not concern your post, re-route it. Do not attempt to handle any and every dispatch coming to you which is not your hat. (1) You are introducing randomness on your own post, and (2) you are handling something which another person should know and handle.
21. If you see another person off post, it is your duty to advise them direct. If this fails, advise their department head. Try to be helpful to them in this regard, not chop them. Help them get back on post.
22. If the Organization Board does not reflect the reality of your posts, report this to HCO.
23. If you occupy more than one post, and you find that you do not have enough time to devote proper attention to another of your hats so that the job is lagging or not getting done, it is your duty to iron this out with your department head in order to remedy the situation. If it is found that one of your posts is being neglected due to lack of time available to cover it, the department head may take this up with Dir Admin or Assoc Sec in order to get that particular hat worn properly. If a person has too many hats, or if the workload has increased to the point that one of your hats is not being worn due to lack of time to devote to it, much randomness can occur within the organization itself and in the field. If you occupy posts in several departments, always consult the department head under which your post exists.
24. You are responsible for following the **dispatch system** and the **colour flash system** of the organization (see HCO Policy Letter of April 8, 1958)³.

² Editor's note: Is today Director of Department 9, Dept. of Records, Assets and Material

³ Editor's note: see also HCO PL 4 Jan 66 III Scn Orgs Communications System Dispatches

25. If you have questions concerning your duties on any post, check with your departmental head.
26. When you change posts, be sure to report to Personnel, Dir Admin and HCO Sec, so that your file can be changed accordingly.
27. To the best of your ability, help your fellow staff members. Staff members are a team, not opponents. If you see a person not doing his job, or doing it poorly, give him a hand – give him some suggestions for him to look over – this works better than merely chopping him up. Maybe he really doesn't know any better. It is to *your advantage* to assist your fellow staff members. When you assist them to do a better job, it results in a larger pay check for you. When you chop them in person or to their backs, you are cutting your own and the organization's throat. If you see how they could improve their job, tell *them*, not somebody over the back alley. Confront them. Help them.
28. Each staff member is responsible for the organization itself. For its physical appearance – its personnel – its performance. It cannot properly perform unless each staff member makes it do so.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jw.rd

[HCO P/L of 7 August 1958 and this 25 April 1963 re-issue are substantially the same, the main amendments being the change of Org post titles reflecting Org Board evolution in the period.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 5 FEBRUARY 1969R
(Revised 25 May 1973)

Remimeo

Press Policy

CODE OF A SCIENTOLOGIST

The Code of a Scientologist as per "The Creation of Human Ability" is withdrawn. It is reissued as follows:

As a Scientologist I pledge myself to the Code of Scientology for the good of all.

1. To keep Scientologists, the Public and the Press accurately informed concerning Scientology, the world of Mental Health and Society.
2. To use the best I know of Scientology to the best of my ability to help my family, friends, groups and the world.
3. To refuse to accept for processing and to refuse to accept money from any preclear or group I feel I cannot honestly help.
4. To decry and do all I can to abolish any and all abuses against life and Mankind.
5. To expose and help abolish any and all physically damaging practices in the field of Mental Health.
6. To help clean up and keep clean the field of Mental Health.
7. To bring about an atmosphere of safety and security in the field of Mental Health by eradicating its abuses and brutality.
8. To support true Humanitarian endeavors in the fields of Human Rights.
9. To embrace the policy of equal justice for all.
10. To work for freedom of speech in the world.
11. To actively decry the suppression of knowledge, wisdom, philosophy or data which would help Mankind.
12. To support the freedom of religion.
13. To help Scientology orgs and groups ally themselves with public groups.
14. To teach Scientology at a level it can be understood and used by the recipients.

15. To stress the freedom to use Scientology as a philosophy in all its applications and variations in the humanities.
16. To insist upon standard and unvaried Scientology as an applied activity in ethics, processing and administration in Scientology organizations.
17. To take my share of responsibility for the impact of Scientology upon the world.
18. To increase the numbers and strength of Scientology over the world.
19. To set an example of the effectiveness and wisdom of Scientology.
20. To make this world a saner, better Place.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ldm:nt

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 10 JANUARY 1968
(Reissued from LRH SEC ED 56 INT June 14, 1965)

Remimeo
BPI

POLITICS, FREEDOM FROM

1. I hereby declare Scientology to be non-political and non-ideological.
2. Politics and ideology may be no part of any decision to train or process individuals, and any such interrogation shall cease to be a part of any application for training, processing or membership.
3. This does not change any policy relating to suppressive persons. It does delete any words in any form which seek to bring about a statement of political allegiance or antagonism.
4. It must be kept in mind and brought forward emphatically that Scientology does not work in the absence of official control and no matter who sought to use its principles, has uniformly failed in the hands of non-Scientists and organizations not controlled by the Central Organizations of Scientology or myself.
5. The reason for this declaration is the consistent disaster visited upon her "allies" by the United States government and the efforts of that government since 1955, stepped up since 1963, to seize Scientology in the United States rather than forbid or stop it and the role played by the United States in inspiring the Victorian State attacks in Australia. Scientology technology is no longer offered to the United States government in any effort to assist her in political ends. Our participation extends only to our willingness to process U.S. officials as individuals unconnected with their political aims, if as individuals they are not debarred by other existing policies relating to treating the insane or our Ethics system.
6. All statements attacking any political entity or ideology are hereby withdrawn and cancelled in any lectures or literature.
7. Scientists may be members of any political group on this planet without restraint only so long as these individuals or that group do not attempt to seize Scientology for their own warlike ends and so make it unworkable or distasteful by invidious connection.
8. Scientology is for a free people and is itself on this date declared free of any political connection or allegiance of any kind whatever.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jp.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 2 NOVEMBER 1970

Issue II

Corrected and reissued 7 Nov 70

Remimeo

Org Series 12

**THE THEORY OF
SCIENTOLOGY ORGANIZATIONS**

This "HCO Bulletin" 21 Sept 58 explains how a Scientology organization differs from "the industrial ideal".

The industrial idea of organization is a cog wheel type organization with each member of it totally fixed on post, doing only exact duties, with all cog wheels intending to mesh. The industrial idea does not differentiate between a *machine* and a human or live organization.

The product laws (Products 1, 2, 3 and 4 as given in the Org Series) apply to both a live organization and a machine organization and any organization. Since a live and a machine organization hold these laws in common, the industrialist confuses the live organization and the machine organization.

HCO P/L 29 October 70, Org Series No. 10 "The Analysis of Organization by Product" also carries a mention of this difference between a live and a machine organization.

As the industrial idea has already been mentioned in this Org Series, and as this Org Series mainly applies to live (not machine) organizations, and as people tend to fall into a machine organization pattern (and also to use a live organization to *not* know their own speciality best) this earlier issue on live organization is published in full:

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
LONDON

(Issued at Washington)

HCO BULLETIN OF SEPTEMBER 21, 1958
For All Staff Member Hats

THEORY OF SCIENTOLOGY ORGANIZATIONS

An organization is a number of terminals and communication lines united with a common purpose.

The actions of an organization can all be classified under the heading of particle motion and change. To analyze a post or a department or an organization, make a list of each particle it handles (whether types of bodies, types of comm or any other item) and follow each item from the point it enters the post or department or organization to the point it exits. If a particle isn't handled *properly* and passed along *properly* there is a confusion or a dead-end. To organize an organization requires more than theory. One has to inspect and list the particles and get their routes and desired changes of character enroute. Then he has to see that terminals and comm lines exist to receive, change and forward the particle. All types of particles belong to somebody, are handled some way, come from somewhere and go somewhere. There are no confusions when lines, terminals and actions exist for each type of particle.

Judgment and decision are needed in every staff post. If the handling of items are just "petty details" then so is your fellow man a "petty detail".

There are no labourers in a Scientology organization. We are all managers of these particles.

Routes of handling are not orders to handle but directions to go. A route is not necessarily correct for all cases. It is only correct for most cases. Robots can't handle livingness. Robot organizations and robot civilizations fail. They only *seem* to work – like the commie empire *seems* to work until you find out everyone is starving to death in it. A *perfect* organization is not a machine but a pattern of agreements. A route is only the *agreed upon* procedure. It is not only occasionally broken, it now and then should be. The terminals involved make the agreement or the route doesn't work. A route along terminals that never agreed is no route but a labyrinth. People agree to postulates they can understand and appreciate. Hence, a route and handling begins with a particle, develops with a theory, comes to life with an agreement and continues to work because of judgment and decision.

The routing, the comm lines, the pattern of an organization do not do the work. The work is done by living beings using good sense and skill. The organizational pattern only makes their work easier and lessens confusion and overburden. Governments, armies, big research bureaus reduce themselves down to routes and titles. They don't work. They don't do work. They allow for no human equation. Therefore, slave societies (composed only of routes and unthinking terminals) are always beaten eventually by free peoples. There is a point where routes and exact procedures become unworkable, just as there is a point, facing a volume of work, that individuality and no teamwork becomes unworkable. An optimum organization is never severely either one. Total individuality and total mechanization alike are impossible. So if you or your department or your organization seem to be too heavily inclined to either one, *yell* don't talk. A bad organization will fire you and you can do something more profitable. A good organization will listen. **But** – always have a *better* idea than the one in use. Grumbling, refusing to work don't work. A better idea, talked over with the terminals on either side of you, put down in concise writing, submitted, will be put into action in a good organization. Of course, there's always a chance that the new proposed handling throws something out of gear elsewhere. If it does, you have the right to know about it.

An "organization" doesn't get the work done. As an orderly plan it helps its terminals get the work done. The staff as individuals do the work. An organization can help or hinder getting the work done. If it helps, it's good. If it hinders, it should be examined thoroughly.

An organization can work wholly at "taking in its own laundry". All the work that gets done is the work generated inside the shop by unreal routes and weird changes of particles. This is a government circa mid-20th Century. Its highest skill is murder which in its profundity it makes legal.

A totally democratic organization has a bad name in Dianetics and Scientology despite all this talk of agreement. It has been found by actual experiment (LA 1950) that groups of people called on to select a leader from among them by nomination and vote routinely select only those who would kill them. They select the talkers of big deals and ignore the doers. They seem to select unerringly the men of average skill. That is never good enough in a leader and the people suffer from his lack of understanding. If you ever have occasion to elect a leader for your group, don't be "democratic" about it. Compare records as follows: Take the person who is a good auditor, not just says he is. Take the person who has a good, not necessarily the highest, profile and IQ. Take the person who can grant beingness to others. And look at the relative serenity and efficiency of any past command he may have had. And even then you're taking a chance. So always elect temporarily and reserve the right of recall. If his first action is to fire people, recall him at once and find another leader. If the organization promptly prospers, keep him and confirm the election by a second one. If the abundance of the organization sags in a month or so, recall and find another. Popularity is some criterion – but it can be created for an election only, as in the U.S. Select in an election or by selection as an executive the person who can get the work done. And once he's confirmed, obey him or keep him. He's rare. But beware these parliamentary procedure boys and girls who know all the legal and time wasting processes but who somehow never accomplish anything except chaos. A skilled, successful leader is worth a million impressive hayseeds. Democracies *hate* brains and skill. Don't get in that rut. In the U.S. War between the States militia companies elected their officers with great lack of success in battle. They finally learned after tens of thousands of casualties that it was skill not popularity that counted. Why be a casualty – learn first. Democracy is only possible in a nation of clears – and even they can make mistakes. When the majority rules the minority suffers. The best are always a minority.

WHAT IS YOUR JOB?

Anything in an organization is your job if it lessens the confusion if you do it

Your being exactly on post and using your exact comm lines lessens confusion. But failure to wear another hat that isn't yours now and then may cause more confusion than being exactly on post.

The question when you see you will have to handle something not yours is this: "Will it cause less confusion to handle it or to slam it back onto its proper lines?"

Example: A preclear wandering around looking for somebody to sell him a book. You see him. The book sales clerk isn't there. The books are. Now what's the answer? You'll create

a little confusion if you hand him a book, take his money and give it to the book sales later. You'll create confusion for your own post and the organization if you go chasing around trying to find "book sales terminal". You'll create a feeling of unfriendliness if you don't help the preclear get his book. Answer it by deciding which is less confusing. You'll find out by experience that you can create confusion by handling another's particles but you will also discover that you can create confusion by not handling another's particles on occasion.

The only real error you can make in handling another's particles is to fail to tell him by verbal or written comm exactly what you did. You stole his hat for a moment. Well, always give it back.

Remember, in a Scientology organization every Scientologist on staff potentially wears not just his own but *every* hat in the organization. He has to know more jobs than his own. Particularly jobs adjacent to his post. He often has to do more jobs than his own because those jobs have to be done and he sees it. A non-Scientology member of an organization is only limited in what he can do in the organization by lack of know-how. But the limitation is applicable only to instruction and auditing. But a Scientologist: he may find himself wearing any hat in the place including mine. And others may now and then wear his hat.

A staff member gets the job done of (1) his own post, (2) his department, and (3) the whole organization.

People who are always off line and off post aren't doing their own jobs. When we find somebody always off post and in our hair we know if we look at his post we'll find a rat's nest. So there are extremes here as well.

HOW TO HOLD YOUR JOB

Your hat is your hat. It is to be worn. Know it, understand it, do it. Make it real. If it isn't real it is *your* fault since you are the one to take it up and get it clean with an Executive. If he doesn't straighten it up so you can do it, it's still your fault if it's not done.

You hold a job in a Scientology organization by doing your job. There are no further politics involved – at least if I find out about it there aren't. So do your job and you've got a job. And that's the way it is.

But on post or off, we only fail when we do not help. The "public" only objects to us when we fail to help or when we fail to answer their questions. So we have two stable data on which to operate whether we're on post or not:

Help people!

Answer people's questions exactly!

When you don't you let everybody down.

NEATNESS OF QUARTERS

- The public knows us by our MEST -

A part of everyone's hats is keeping a good mock-up in people, offices, classrooms, quarters.

Keep your desk and your Mest neat and orderly. It helps.

And when you see things getting broken down or run down or dirty, fix them or clean them or if you can't, yell like hell on the right comm line.

THE DISPATCH SYSTEM

The Dispatch System is not there to plague you but to help you.

Except when you've got to have speed, *never* use an inter-office phone to another terminal. And never write a dispatch and present it and you at some other point at the same time. That's "off-line" just as a phone is "off-line". A good use of the organization's lines reduces confusion. The other guy is busy, too. Why interrupt him or her unnecessarily with routine that should go on the lines? You'll usually get an answer in the same day or at least in 24 hours. The organization's comm lines are pretty good. They make it possible for this small handful of us to get more things done in this society than any other organization on Earth in terms of actual accomplishment.

A comm line can be jammed in several ways. Principal of these is *entheta*. Ask yourself before it goes on the lines – it's bad news but is it necessarily important? Another is *overburden*. Too much traffic jams a line. Too long a dispatch doesn't get read. Another is *too little* data. That can jam a line but thoroughly. It takes more dispatches to find out what goes. Another way is to by-pass the line itself – this jams the terminal. The final way, in broad classes, to jam a comm line is to *put erroneous data* on it.

The last is a pet hate of Scientology people. Generally its form is "everybody knows". Example: "They say that George is doing a bad job", or "Nobody liked the last newsletter". The proper rejoinder is "Who is Everybody?" You'll find it was one person who had a name. When you have critical data omit the "everybody" generality. Say who. Say where. Otherwise, you'll form a bad datum for somebody. When our actions are said to be unpopular the person or persons saying so have names.

IN SUMMARY

A post in a Scientology organization isn't a job. It's a trust and a crusade. We're free men and women – probably the last free men and women on Earth. Remember, we'll have to come back to Earth some day no matter what "happens" to us. If we don't do a good job *now* we may never get another chance.

Yes, I'm sure that's the way it is.

So, we have an organization, we have a field we must support, we have a *chance*.

That's more than we had last time night's curtain began to fall on freedom.

So we're using that chance.

An organization such as ours is our best chance to get the most done. So we're doing it!

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:rr.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 18 APRIL AD 15

Gen Non-Remimeo
Exec HATS
Magazine Article
Franchise
Field Staff Members Hats

CONTESTS AND PRIZES

In Scientology, we have a policy about **contests** and **prizes**.

The surest way to break a lot of hearts is to run a contest in which only a minority get prizes. That is very homo sap.

In Scientology we never offer minority type prizes.

Our **contest** must be planned so that **every entrant** gets a prize or *the* prize.

This comes from the nature of Scientology itself. Scientology is the only "game" in the Universe where everybody wins.

We must mirror this fact and punch it home whenever we can.

From this various policies develop: Scientology is open to all people.

In certificates and status the road is open to all Scientologists who can qualify level by level.

On any offering, anybody can have it if he or she qualifies.

We have lots of certificates and grades.

There are no exceptions. Anybody has a chance to go up in certificates, staff status and case gain and state of beingness.

Our posts are something else. Bill's top attainment is his recovery of self. His attainment is not becoming Joe.

Our posts we hold in trust as our appointed place. Though gained by ability, posts are not prizes. They are responsibilities we hold to help.

Therefore we do not seek each other's posts.

We respect the other fellow whatever his status and give him his right to win the biggest prize of all, himself or herself. That prize is won by dedicated exact application of Scientology and full support of our mission in our organizations and the public.

Organized, we can each one win the biggest prize that can be offered – a full recovery of self.

As a team, helping one another, respecting each other's posts, our seniors and juniors on staff, and following our admin and tech procedures, we keep the door open and make the grade ourselves – the Top can't be reached without help, without organization, without the policies that coordinate our actions and the exact technology we apply.

So we don't offer minority prizes. We symbolize in every contest an open door for case and status gain for all by giving everyone a prize in any "contest" we hold.

And we hold our posts, not as something to be contested for, but as a competent teammate in a strong and well coordinated operation in which each one does his job.

There is no greater game in the Universe than Scientology, for it is the only game in which everybody wins. And that places it far above all other games and makes it the game of games where everybody gets the ultimate prize of self – and sound companionship as well.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:mb.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
LONDON
HCO BULLETIN OF 28 FEBRUARY 1957
Issued at Washington

ALL STAFF, U.S. and
LONDON

HATS

Every Staff Department head in every organization should have a folder in his desk in which to place all written material and bulletins which apply to his job.

This is not a casual action. It is vitally important. It is his "hat".

This folder should be labelled, for example, "Director of Processing", or "Indoc Instructor", or "HCO Secretary", or any such post.

The folder should then receive, after study, any policy letter or executive order or HCO Bulletin applying in general or in particular to that job.

If you do not have a complete hat, obtain from HCO or elsewhere the missing pieces.

Also, and this is very important, write up and paste into the front of the folder a full description of your job.

Only in this way can we have use of such orders and bulletins. Only in this way could you be relieved in an orderly fashion for a vacation or transferred to another post.

Please do this at once. Whoever is in charge of supplies can make a folder available to you.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 1 JULY 1965
Issue III

Remimeo
Basic Staff Hats

ALL DIVISIONS

HATS, THE REASON FOR

HAT: Slang for the title and work of a post in an org. Taken from the fact that in many professions such as railroading the type of hat worn is the badge of the job.

Organization consists of certain people doing certain jobs.

Disorganization consists of each person wearing all hats regardless of assignment.

In a smooth organization that runs well and succeeds **each person wears his own assigned hat.**

When a person has a job that belongs to another hat than his own, he passes the job to the other hat.

Each staff member is a specialist. He specializes in his own hat.

When people wear only their own hats then one has terminals in the org. If terminals exist then communication can flow correctly. If communication can flow correctly then work gets done and the org can get in income.

Terminal – a point that receives, relays and sends communication.

If people present each wear any old hat or all the hats, then no terminals exist, no communication can flow properly, work can't get done and there is no income. There is chaos and it is an unhappy place.

In a green org staff members don't know what other staff members do. So they don't know where to send things so they do them themselves. Worse, they don't even know there is an org there. It is quite pathetic. Like rookie troops or militia or a mob. Of course the place goes broke.

You can tell a good executive. He only hands out despatches and work to the correct hats. A lousy executive hands the work to anyone handy, regardless of title. He's in apathy and doesn't know there's an org there.

The whole theory of successful organization is to have posts that only do specific things, to have sections and departments and divisions which specialize, and to have people who only wear their own hats and know who is wearing the other hats and send *their* work to them.

A train crew has a Conductor. He wears a Conductor's hat. It has an engineer. He wears the engineer's hat. It has a fireman. He wears the fireman's hat. Where do you think the train would get to if each of these three didn't know who were the other two? The Conductor wearing the engineer's hat would mean no fares. The fireman wearing the Conductor's hat would mean no steam. And the engineer wearing the Conductor's hat would mean no train going anywhere.

So beware of wearing other hats than your own, or of being ignorant of what other hats are being worn. For nobody will get anywhere and you'll find yourself overworked, dismayed and unhappy.

Each person to his own job and damn the fellow who tries to give you things which aren't your hat and doesn't know there's an org there.

Realize that the basic theory of organization is this:

1. So long as each knows and wears and works at his own hat only, things will be smooth.
2. And so long as each person knows what the other hats around him do, he can give them *their* work when it comes his way and all will be successful and smooth.

If you let somebody steal your hat (do your work for you that you are supposed to do) that person will soon have you in trouble or have your job so snarled it can't be done.

If you don't know who in the org is supposed to do what and make them do their own jobs when those drift your way, you'll be overworked like mad.

If somebody tries to get you to do something that isn't your job on the org board then **file an ethics chit for job endangerment**. For at the very least that person is reducing income by not knowing the lines and posts of the org.

When you are assigned an additional duty, make sure it is also properly in your department or division or you'll be messed up.

Don't permit people to mess up hats around you or *you* will be in chaos.

Only organization can make your job smooth. And wearing your hat and doing your own job and knowing and making other people wear only theirs and do their own job, is the total secret of organization.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:mh.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 15 SEPTEMBER 1959
Issue II

CenOCon

HATS AND OTHER FOLDERS

There are three classes of folders permanently assigned to each staff member of HCO and the Central Org.

The first of these is a hat folder. In it should be included only the hat write-up and policies issued which directly relate to the individual post.

The second of these is a technical folder into which one places all technical bulletins issued. These must never be put in one's hat folder.

The third of these is an organizational folder. All bulletins and policy letters relating to one's job but only by reason of being a staff member are included in this folder.

These folders are the following colours for your info and ready reference:

- Hat Folders are Blue
- Staff Folders are Yellow
- Technical Folders are Goldenrod.

THE KEEPING OF THESE FOLDERS

The responsibility of keeping these folders straight lies with the individual staff member.

One must always have all the write-ups and policies governing his job ready to hand in his hat folder. The reason for this is basically to keep the structure of the organization in writing and straight for reference by the staff member. There is also a great advantage here in having a complete hat folder in one's desk when one is not present, for his duties and functions can be looked up and done by another when he is on vacation. Further, when one is promoted or posts are changed there is always a loss of the bits and pieces, and the person new on post needs constant guidance from the member leaving it unless all these bits are in the hat.

Random despatches, technical bulletins, general staff bulletins are never put in one's hat folder. To do so is to thicken the folder up to a point where it cannot be used for ready reference. This defeats the purpose of the hat folder for the staff member himself and for his possible temporary relief.

Letters and policies governing the fact of being a member of staff, such as rules and regulations of HCO or the organization and hours and schedules for this and that, all belong in the staff member folder. This should include no technical.

All technical bulletins, policy letters and other technical matters, and even one's own notes on the technical aspect of keeping one's job straight, belong in a separate technical folder which, accumulating, becomes very valuable to everyone.

This then is the way we keep our posts and positions and functions straight in HCO as well as in Central Organizations.

These three types of folders are stored handily in one's desk and are the only pieces of paper allowed in one's desk. (Never make despatches or comm material vanish off the lines and into a desk.)

If these three folders are in good order one has a ready method of checking over all sides of his job and all policies relating to his job. If one has his folders it is possible to break down his job into various parts when the volume of the post gets too high so as to have exact write-ups of instructions to pass over to newly acquired assistants.

Unless we have some visible record of our posts and functions we can easily get into a confusion of lines and actions, which has been known to bring chaos to an organization to say nothing of much extra work and Dev-T to its individuals.

We have long since found that the old time 'organization chart' was inadequate for our complex functions and actions. We have also found that memory is inadequate in the supervision of posts and functions.

Your attention to and care of these three types of folders is recommended.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:brb.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 JANUARY 1966

Remimeo
Staff Hat

Urgent

**LEAVING POST
WRITING YOUR HAT**

(A copy of this should be clipped to every transfer order issued in an org but failure to do so does not relieve the transferee of responsibility.)

On changing post, it is *vital* for the staff member (executive or general) to write up his or her hat for the post being vacated.

A copy is furnished the HCO Exec Sec WW.

A person is still considered to also be on any post he is vacating until:

- (a) A new person is provided for the post.
- (b) He or she has written up a complete hat giving the duties, lines and peculiarities of the post.
- (c) Turned the hat over to the new staff member and a copy to HCO Exec Sec WW.
- (d) Turned over all the equipment and supplies of the post and gotten a receipt for them signed by the new person on the post.
- (e) Sent a copy of the items in (d) to the Supply Officer.
- (f) Settled the new person in the post so that it is operating.

If these are not done, an organization goes to pieces on expansion as it loses its lines and terminals and functions through promotions.

Staff members not doing the above may be called upon as responsible for the actions, failures and materiel of a post for up to 2 years after leaving it and his or her pay may be debited for any losses or damages in the post vacated without complying with the above even though the loss or damage was done by a successor.

Note that a person ordered to a new post is also responsible (regardless of any other action by another to fill it) for seeing that the post is competently filled before he is legally off it. This is of long standing custom.

None of this exempts Personnel or executives from filling posts, writing hats or accounting for materiel or supplies. But the staff member leaving a post has the greatest responsibility.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ml.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 11 APRIL 1961

CenOCon

HOW TO DO A STAFF JOB

If you want a higher level of dissemination and a higher unit or salary, the way to obtain them is simple.

1. Do your own job.
2. Insist that the other staff member do his – but don't do it for him or her.

Example of error: HCO Sec is so busy being D of P or D of T, no hats or tech bulletins get checked. Result: randomness. Assn Sec is so busy being Dir of Accounts, no executive supervision and assistance occurs. D of P does so much Admin, no technical results happen. Etc., etc.

You can wear several hats. The point is, do *them*, not other hats.

Every time you do the other fellow's job for him or her, you cover up a camouflaged hole. People who are camouflaged holes make Dev T. The next thing you know you are protecting the ineffective, have a large number on staff and get no work done and get no unit.

Let the ineffective either sink or get audited. Don't protect them.

Do *your own* jobs.

Refuse to do the other fellow's.

Make ineffective staff members look like ineffectives by leaving the hole open, not hidden.

Don't hide bad work from executives. Your game is not to protect the goofballs but to get a show on the road.

So please do *your own* job and do it well.

Even if an executive asks you to do somebody else's job – don't. Say, instead, "Am I transferred?" If the answer is no, tell him to get lost. I'll back you up.

Do *your own* jobs. What are they?

And you'll see – you'll have wider dissemination and higher income.

Every hour you spend off post doing somebody else's job is an hour lost off your lines. They catch up with you. Only then could you become frantic, overworked, dispersed.

So *please*. Do your own job and let the other fellow reap the hurricane if he doesn't do his.

I do my own job. I have pretty exact hats. They are Research, Writing, Dissemination, Goals, Justice and higher level personnel. Every time a staff member goofs, it tends to roll on up and knock my hats sideways.

So please *handle* your own job. That way the world will prosper and so will we.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ph.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 19 AUGUST 1959
(Re-issued as HCO Policy Letter of 29 May 1963)

CenOCon
SHSBC Students
Franchise
Field

HOW TO HANDLE WORK

Do it Now.

One of the best ways to cut your work in half is not to do it twice.

Probably your most fruitful source of Dev-T is your own double work.

This is the way you do double work.

You pick up a despatch or a piece of work, look it over and then put it aside to do later, then later you pick it up and read it again and only then do you do it.

This of course doubles your traffic just like that.

One of the reasons I can handle so much traffic is that I don't do it twice. I make it a heavy rule that if I find myself handling a piece of traffic, I handle it, not put it into a hold or a later category.

If I happen to be prowling through my basket in the Message Center Stack to see what's there, I do what I find there.

If I am given a message or a datum that requires further action from me, I do it right when I receive it.

This is how I buy "loafing time".

Now I'm not trying to hold me up as a model of virtue as the man who always does his job; I do many jobs and many hats; I am holding myself up as an ambitious loafer and as a buyer of valuable loafing time.

There's no need to look busy if you are not busy.

There is no need to fondle and caress work because there isn't enough of it.

There's plenty of work to do. The best answer to work of any kind is to do it.

If you do every piece of work that comes your way **when** it comes your way and not after a while, if you always take the initiative and take action, not refer⁴ it, you never get any traffic back unless you've got a psycho on the other end.

⁴ Encyclopedic Dictionary (1889): 7. to defer; to put off; to postpone

In short, the way to get rid of traffic is to do it, not to refer it; anything referred has to be read by you again, digested again, and handled again, so never refer traffic, just do it so it's done.

You can keep a comm line in endless foment by pretending that the easiest way not to work is to not handle things or to refer things. Everything you don't handle comes back and bites. Everything you refer has to be done when it comes back to you.

So if you are truly a lover of ease, the sort of person who yawns comfortably and wears holes in heels resting them on desks, if your true ambition is one long bout of spring fever, then you'll do as I suggest and handle everything that comes your way when it comes and not later, and you'll never refer anything to anybody that you yourself can do promptly.

That people begin to point you out as a model of efficiency, as the thing expected to cop the next world's speed record, that articles begin to appear about the marvels you are creating, is all incidental. You and I know we did it so we could be lazy and not have to work. For it can be truly said that the way to all labor of a long and continuous grind is by putting off the action when the message is received and in referring it all to somebody else, that's the way to slavery, to tired muscles and tattered brains; that's the route to baskets piled high.

So come loaf with me.

Do it when you see it and do it yourself.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jw.vmm.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 1 MAY AD 15

Issue III

Gen Non-Remimeo
Hang Near New Org
Board varnished
over or relettered

ORGANIZATION

THE DESIGN OF THE ORGANIZATION

As our Org Board and Org pattern we have not only an Org Board but a "philosophical system", which gives us the levels of able and extra able beings and an analysis of one's own life as well.

If you look at the levels written above the departments you find the spans of *the Bridge* which are followed to Release, Clear and OT. You can easily see which ones are missing in one's own life and the lives of others. These are the upper end of the awareness scale.

When you look at the department names you can see what is missing in your own life.

You can also see where your post or your job breaks down, for every job has all these "department names".

When you look at the Division names you see what the Cycle of Production must be in this Universe to be successful. By studying this you can see why other businesses fail. They lack one or another of these divisions.

Although the organization seems to have a great many departments, and would fit only a large group, it fits any org of any size.

The problem presented me in deriving this board was how to overcome continual org changes because of expansion and applying it to organizations of different sizes. This board goes from one person to thousands without change. Just fewer or more posts are occupied. That is the only change.

The staff ratio here is one administration person in the five non-technical divisions to one technical person in the Technical and Qualifications Divisions (excepting only staff staff auditors and field staff members who count as Admin personnel). Staff is added *in rotation* amongst the non-technical divisions every time a technical person is put in the Technical or Qualifications Divisions.

The board is entered from the left and proceeds to the right.

It is actually a spiral with 7 higher than and adjacent to 1.

The organization corrects itself through the Review Division, under the authority of the 7th Division.

Organizations go in phases. The phases agree with the Cycle of Production.

A forming org, unable yet to function fully, is a **Class Zero Org**. It is only at Recognition and gives a Class Zero Course only and uses only Grade Zero processes. When it can give a Level 1 Course and use Grade 1 processes it is a Class 1 Org. And so on. The HGC of the org may not process above the class allowed in the Academy. The Review Case Cracking Unit only may use processes above the class of the Org and then only when its Review personnel are so authorized by Saint Hill.

There are two tendencies Man has that this board resolves.

Man's systems are based on groups and masses of people.

Every person on *this* Org Board is "statistized". That means the job he does is a statistic that can be verified. He is not lost in a group.

The tendency of filling up every box indicated on an organization chart (which Man usually does) is checked by the formula that there must be only one Admin staff member for every tech as above. Thus Divisions 4 and 5 are heavy with personnel containing five times as many as all the other divisions.

In expanding, each department acquires seven sections, every section then acquires seven sub-sections, every sub-section acquires seven units.

At this time of issue we find Scientology itself just at the end of its Dissemination Cycle (Division 2) and just entering upon the Organization Cycle (Division 3). There will be a full and long Organization Cycle. This will eventually be followed by a Qualifications Cycle in which we adjust civilization. After that will come a Distribution Cycle in which we use Scientology elsewhere in the Universe, and then will come the Source Cycle again, finding us all on a higher plane.

This pattern will probably be in use for a very long time.

This board is one of the *very* few things in Scientology which is not completely new. It is taken from an ancient organization and which I have refined through considerable experience by adding Scientology and our levels to it. It is based on an extremely successful pattern.

This org pattern is designed not to make money or Scientologists as one might think. Its whole purpose is to make the "Ability to Better Conditions", which is the mission of Scientology.

THE LEVELS

Your main interest in this board is of course its levels.

There are over thirty-two levels to the left of the board, covering the average human states.

Our board shows how we move up onto the Bridge at Communications (Level 0), and then progress division by division to Level VII. One Division equals one Level left to right.

The abilities recovered in these levels are marked above the department names (Communication, Perception, Orientation, Understanding, etc.) and take us all the way to a new state at VII.

As he progresses along this line left to right, a level is given the person each time a division is passed.

At Level V we find we can move people from the lowest human states onto the Bridge, before we ourselves exit at the top.

Thus we leave behind us a Bridge.

In 1950 when I said "For God's sake Build a Better Bridge," I had to do it on my own.

But here it is, not only a bridge but also an organization to carry the weight of the spanning, a very needful thing.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:mh.jp.cden

[*Note: See HCO P/L 15 December 1969, Class of Orgs, OEC 0 page 254, which cancels classes of Orgs and permits any official Org to "perform and teach any Class or Grade up to IV".*]

Org Board and Livingness

A lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard

on the 6 April 1965

Thank you.

Well now, today – today is a red-letter day. Today is quite a day. This is about the first day I ever brought notes to a lecture. So I want you to mark this down. And what is the date?

Audience: April 6, AD 15.

April 6, AD 15. So you want to mark that date down: "Ron brought some notes to the lecture."

Now, today – you have been hearing a lot about organization and reorganization and re-re-reorganization. And I'm about to give you a talk on the new org board for all organizations over the world. And you will find that your notes on this will probably be fairly scrambled. The whole thing will be published in *Auditor* 8 – the whole org board – and there will be HCOB – pardon me, HCO Policy Letter 3 April 65 released, which gives the basic organization in detail. And there's a lot of stuff gone in on this, and actually I've been working on practically nothing else for weeks. Of course, I've been working on everything else for weeks, too, you see? But my concentration has been on this, and it sort of stopped the – nobody will believe this. People are somewhat alarmed with the number of policy letters coming out and so forth. Those are parts of the new hat book, and they're simply being released to get them out so they won't cause randomness, because when we send the new hat books off to the printers, we'll – probably we'll have them in 68-1970, and that – a bit of missing data between now and then might prove very catastrophic here and there.

So you notice that around orgs and so forth these things are being released as just General Non-Remimeo. Non-remimeo means that they're cut on a stencil and just run off and a few copies are sent to each org.

Anyway, you will be seeing a lot of this org board. And I'm merely pointing out to you about this, that there is something about it to understand. There's a great deal about it to understand. And the first – the first is that the org board does not change regardless of the size of the organization. It may get longer at the bottom, but it doesn't change in its significant characteristics, departments, divisions or anything else. They remain constant, and it doesn't matter if it's a Class Zero Org consisting of three guys trying to lift their heads up off the pavement as an organization. or an organization of 200,000 staff members; it would be the same org board. And I know that startles you, but I almost told you the real figure: two billion.

This board is – this board has a lot of back history, and it is a refined board. And I may as well tell you the truth here amongst us girls. This is a refined board that I spoke to you about in an earlier lecture of an old galactic civilization. And you say what's that doing amongst us? Well, we applied Scientology to it, and found out why the civilization eventually failed. They lacked a couple of departments and that was enough to mess it all up. And they only lasted eighty trillion. We'll be going a lot longer than that, so we want to get something substantial. We don't want these temporary fly-by-night affairs, you know.

Matter of fact, practically every government of this planet has fallen on its head before it was even heard of. They go up and vanish so quick that history is practically unable to keep track of them. I'll bet you – I'll bet you – just yesterday; just the other day: 1500 B.C. – you cannot tell me the primary civilization which was in exist... That's right, I thought you couldn't. You don't know what government was in power in Europe and the Middle East in 1500 B.C. You see? Just that little, tiny, tiny span of time. What is that, thirty-five hundred years. You don't even remember. Temporary. Makeshift. Didn't understand. Nobody had ever been to school about org boards; didn't know anything about it.

Now, actually there've been lots of schools about org boards. They didn't have Scientology, but they did have org boards. There have been some of the wildest org boards that have ever been invented. Don't consider the United States Army has any org board; it doesn't. Armies don't have org boards; they have *command charts*! *Hmph!* You want to see the picture of a suppressive person, look at an org board of a military organization. It goes: commanding general, adjutants, officers, nobodies. Everyplace except the Mexican Army. And that has commanding generals, and that's all. [laughter, laughs] It'll be like our City offices using this board for the first time, and it'll look like the Mexican Army because everybody'll be top brass. Two ranks of top brass.

Now, our org board – our org board is erected to stay there, and therefore has been worked out very carefully against various known philosophic principles, so that it is itself a philosophic machine and in a very short time you're going to see this org board in a Comm Center, where the public is able to walk by it, become a jam spot. I can – I can assure you it's going to become a jam spot, and you're going to get little despatches from communicators saying, "Can't we put the org board behind a door or something, so we can get some work done?" No, that isn't the thing to do. It's just make the Comm Center bigger – you see, elementary – and just put a duplicate board in there the public can stand in front of. Say on it, "Don't look at this board; look at that one," you know, so as to get them out of the road, because you're not going to be able to keep people off of this board.

That sounds very funny, very funny. How come an organization board could suddenly move up into such prominence? Well, you'll see before this lecture is over.

Now, the main thing to know about these things is a command chart is only one tiny, two-bit little function; that's a minor function of an organization chart. Because an organization chart must take care of *function*, and it must take care of the *activity*, and it must take care of *what happens*. And you look on an army's organization board and you don't find anyplace to refer a lost battle. Well, that's pretty interesting. What do you do with lost battles? I can just

see an army signalman trying to put a lost battle someplace in an army org board. He's trying to look for the guy's basket. Where do we send this lost battle?

Now, let me tell you why they fail. This is the principle, and this is a principle of this universe: *If the function is not expressed, it will be worn unknowingly by everybody.* And you can write that down in letters of fire right on the frontal structure where it comes to organizations – right on the front of your skull so you can look at it as a thetan. Write it backwards, of course, so that you can look at it properly.

The function that isn't expressed is worn by everybody. This, therefore, becomes very important when I say, "Where do you put the lost battle?" Well, just that all by itself, and that's a very minor point, would of course eventually defeat the organization with such a board, because its decay is on automatic. But of course man's reactive bank being the way man's reactive bank is, of course he'd invent such an org board.

Now, where you have, then, one of these org boards, you have a frailty that goes along which is almost the same order of magnitude as what I just told you – the function which isn't expressed on the org board is worn by everyone unknowingly, see (and you can make a note of that because that's very important) – is the other monitoring function which gives us bureaucracies, and that is: *When you put a box on an org board, it will be filled.* And that is at war with the other function.

Now, let's look at these two contradictory data, and they are almost of comparable magnitude. If we don't express the function on the org board, it will be worn unknowingly by everyone. And the other datum, if you put a box, a square or a function on an org board, they will assign people to it. Inevitably and invariable, you will find this to be the case. Those two things then are at war and have not been solved by organizations of the past.

So, in the effort to stay within the realm of possibility with regard to personnel – economic possibility, population possibilities and so forth, within that realm – then they drop functions off the org board because they can't have an organization that big, because this again is a hidden datum that people will fill the box. They'll put somebody in that box. You got a box there; it says, "Adjutants – Adjutant's Boot Shiner." Oh, you'll find an Adjutant's Boot Shiner show up. He may be totally unnecessary. Maybe adjutants have ceased to wear boots, but he'll be there. And if they've neglected to take mules off of the US Army charts, you're going to find mules and mule helpers and mule holders and mule curriers, and I'll bet you there's some place in the United States Army right now that's just got *tons* of mules. I'll just bet you.

And I'll bet you in reforming the cavalry charts when they turned them over to mechanized – people who like animals don't like machines, so they turned over the cavalry and mechanized it, you see, on the theory that cavalry goes across countryside or something. But they forgot to take the spurs off the officers, don't you see? So, therefore, I know definitely that they forgot to take some spots out of their org boards. And you're going to find some mighty peculiar things if you went sneaking around a cavalry regiment today. They're mechanized. They're in tanks, you know, and they got motorcycles and armored cars and jeeps, and all that sort of thing – officers still wearing spurs. They sure raise the devil with tank upholstery, too, getting in and out of tanks. [laughter] But if you – if you looked around there, you

would see some peculiar things. And if you went and look at their org board, why, it isn't there.

Now, if there are – no tank repairmen, or anything like that were provided for, you wouldn't find them there.

Now, oddly enough, man, when he works as a team, must have policy or he is not a team. He cannot work as a team without policy, so all he works as is a bunch of individuals. Even bad policy, you see, will at least make a team out of him. Do you follow? It isn't whether the policy is bad or good. It's does it exist and is it followed? Fortunately, I don't write policy on the basis "any old policy is better than no policy," but it so happens... (There'll be somebody cursing his head, unable to get this through his skull at some time or another. Probably going to remember this line on the tape and hold it up to me. You probably better cut it out.) But that's true. Any policy is better than no policy because that is what makes the team. It's simply the agreement. It's the extant agreement, and if there isn't an extant agreement, then you have individualized action.

When you get individualized action, even though this is occasionally very spectacular and very successful – which hangs the auditor in a lose – in a win, you see, and then makes him lose afterwards... This very spectacular individualization of action within the rest of the team, weirdly enough, even though it occasionally wins a battle, in actual fact does more harm than good. Because it sets an example of breaking policy, which then breaks up the team.

The worst team you ever wanted to see is one composed of "all-stars" taken at random as the starring players, with spectacular individualities from each of the winning teams of a country. I don't care what game you're playing, if you want a really stinking team, get those boys, because they're running according to the different policies of their different coaches, don't you see? And they are already, by "all-star" players, preselected as doing something that was very noticeable, which means they didn't even follow their own team policy. So now you group all these fellows together in a mess, and each one – each one is magnificent and a collective mess. And they probably could be licked by any little batch of high-school kids on the same game, who *were* welded together by policy. "When Bill does that, I do this. That's it. That's play sixty-four. What's play sixty-four? Well, when Bill does that, I do this and then Joe does that." That's just policy.

Now, you see, if they were facing some individuals who were very, very good individually, and those individuals they were facing had no policy, do you see that these three guys on the organized team could easily defeat the other team because they're defeating – there actually, in basketball, would be five men against one, not a team. In other words, each member of an unorganized team – each member of an unorganized team – is standing naked and alone. And so any small group, no matter how small, as long as it's more numerous than the one, can rather easily defeat one.

So we in Scientology, compared to the world's population, are a relatively small group. We tend to be a lot of ruddy individualists, which is fine in our private life, but our organizational actions must be coordinated. And if we knitted together our organizational actions and our functions across the world, and we had a good similarity of action, good du-

plication from organization to organization, and then we grooved this in and put this together very nicely... Who else on this planet is following policy? Nobody. Even the commies, who are the closest to organized people, have such rifts about policy that nobody knows whether to follow Lenin's policy or Stalin's policy or Khrushchev's policy or the new coexistence policy, see, or the old revolutionary policy – whatever that was. And you probably do not realize that there are about – well, I know – I know myself of three or four brands of communism, and therefore I would say there are probably three or four hundred, you see, because I'm not a – I'm not a – to use a difficult word – a "buff" on the subject, you know?

You ever hear of a fire buff or a police buff? He's the fellow, whenever he hears the police sirens, goes out and jumps in his car, you know, and follows the police car. Or he's the fellow that follows the fire engines to the fire. And he's – the railroad buff – why, he's always down looking for old steam engines and so forth, and he's asking for a ride on the cowcatcher or something like that. "Buff." I'm not a communist buff. I don't – I don't follow them up very much because it won't be necessary, see? I just don't like to become a buff to an impermanent fixture. There's no future in it. And they're really not long for this world.

Why? Well, there's two good reasons why. One, they themselves – they themselves aren't that good. They're a temporary Earth civilization. One of these temporary things that goes away in, what? A flicker of an eye and they're gone, see? Up one minute, down the next. Disappeared. Down-the-drain type of – type of operation. So they couldn't be going very long, and their duration alone doesn't make them very worthy as an opponent, see?

They wouldn't be... Now, you say, "What do you mean 'duration' – they wouldn't be here long? They'd be here long enough." Well, maybe they'd be here long enough for atomic fission, but we're working on that one, too.

Now, the point I'm – the point I'm trying to make out is that if you were better organized, and then organizations were better organized, you wouldn't have to do anything spectacular about the other organizations. Do you follow? This will not, then, engage you in a war with the other organization. We don't want a war with these organizations. And oddly enough, I have traced every single blowup we've had back to a *wild* departure from policy – very simple, primary, known policy.

Melbourne blew up on the refund policy. They just didn't follow any part of the refund policy. That's rather incredible. Our policy is when somebody – somebody isn't satisfied and so forth and wants his money back, we promptly give him his money back. We also tell him, "Well, you're through with Scientology," but that has nothing more to do with it. We don't want to stand around taking his money and giving it back and taking his money and giving it back. The devil with that. It's too hard on the Accounts Department. So we just say, "All right. You've had it. There's your money. Bye-bye." And that's been policy since heck was a pup. And Melbourne didn't give the man his money back. No-o-o. And when they did give him his money back, they didn't follow the rest of the policy. They didn't get a quitclaim from him. So he turned right around and sued them. They gave his money back and he sued them. Pure idiocy. Then, Melbourne is rather expert at departing from policy, and you needn't cut that off the tape. [laughter]

That's where they come a cropper, you see? They are not part of the team. And you will find all the symptoms of individuation present, which is they yammer at the other teams, see? They cuss the other teams out. They're always getting ARC broke about the other teams, do you see? And they just individuate more and more and more and follow policy less and less and less and all of a sudden they aren't there anymore, unless somebody intervenes with heavy cavalry.

Now, if we're going to make our forward progress – we have a lot of good organizations through the world, of which Melbourne is one of them now. (I have now acked them.) The situation is that these are placed in rather strategic areas. They're placed in strategic areas to spread a sphere of influence.

And when those spheres of influence meet on their own borders, we don't want them to be different and create a ridge; we want them just to flow smoothly out and meet. You follow? It's all rigged to do so.

Now therefore, if we are a good team, and if we watch our individual cases, and we come right on up the line as people, as beings, and we *also* are part of the team, then we won't get into all the trouble we got into as roaring, screaming individuals way back on the track. In other words, we can make it all the way because we've kept order all the way.

Right now we could turn people loose... It used to dismay me – I've already faced this problem – it used to dismay me when I would clean somebody up as a case, and then he'd get into busy-busy-busy activity of some kind or another and go tearing off in a big busyness and not do anything for the forward motion. Because normally he would go out there and he would go for a while and he'd be all right, but after a while, why, he'd sort of cave in – loneliness and other things, you see? This was a bum show. So obviously, then, we weren't making our way with his case.

So we find out that case stability depends upon the smooth organization of individuals. See? Sensible as that. And then we'll be able to make it all the way. And without an organizational shove back of that, then the guy goes up, and I don't care whether it's a thousand years – I don't care whether it's ten years, a thousand years or ten billion years – why, there he is in the theta trap, or there he is going downhill again, or there he is with all this stuff plastered all over his face, and he can't figure out what it is, and he's now forgotten how to run 8-C or Touch Assists. Well, you see, it'd be a temporary affair, and like an Earth government, wouldn't be worth doing.

Now, it isn't that anybody is trying to weld everybody together to the end of time, but I should say offhand that every person and being, and so on, who is going up with Scientology ought to take Scientology up with him. Seems only fair. And then you'll find things will work out fairly smoothly and very easily.

Now, what do you fall back on when you come a cropper all by yourself out in the far reaches of this particular planet? What do you fall back on? You fall back on an organization. You fall back on me. How could I be there at all if there wasn't an organization to take care of the action? Do you see?

So an organization is not a necessary evil or not some reason why, and so forth. The organization is there to serve Scientologists and to handle the thing and the public and spread it out and so forth. There's lots of reasons why it's there, but this isn't a lecture on purposes. But remember that it is a coordinated activity and therefore, it must be very close to flawless. Because once you put one of these things in brass and start it – you know, you put it in concrete and you start it rolling – if it's almost right, you've had it, because it will become an all-devouring monster and fail by the germs of its own destruction. And the thing that destroys almost any organism is its own germs. It's the things it laid in. It's the things you did, not what were done to you.

The only way you can come down is for having made a mistake yourself. There must always be that prior mistake. Sometimes it's very slight. Sometimes you couldn't possibly have hoped to have predicted the action would go the way it went, but it did go in some fantastic tangent to the way you expected it to go from that particular point and you had made a mistake, and there one starts down. You make enough of those things and you're really going down. But it takes quite a few.

What's interesting is an organization watching its general income curve go down, doesn't realize when I look at it I am not looking for a *thing* that is making it go down. I'm looking for the hundred thousand. I'm looking for the gross errors, but the lots of them. They're not really ever composed of one major error, one howling, major error. That – if you go around looking for that, you make the same mistake that has been made by every philosopher that I have ever read. He's made a mistake. It's contained on this chart. And what's contained is this:

He says, "What you must have is understanding." "What you must have is understanding," says the old philosopher. "Now please, please, please, please. What you must have is understanding..."

Boy, that is an error that I myself fell into and have carried on for a very long time, until I was drawing up this org board the other day and recognized the flaw. It's understandings. It's plural.

It's a sort of a trick. You look at something and you're trying to understand this thing. You're looking for one big thing to understand. And it isn't composed of one big thing to understand; it's got about fifteen or twenty little ones. That's the biggest – probably the biggest single bug there is in philosophy anywhere – that philosophers looked for understanding. They looked for an understanding. I can tell you quite frankly there's 265 times 6 *separate* dynamic urges in man – separate, basic, principal dynamic urges in man. 265 times 6. And there's 265 times 6 times 18 separate causations. Now, the big understanding there is that they exist. And the other understanding is, is it was an effort to make them so numerous that nobody could embrace them.

Well, all right, let's get to the next point on this org board rather slippily and rapidly. I hope I've made my point that there is some necessity for organizational action. It must be smooth; there must be policy.

The next point is that it must be comprehensible. It's got to be knowable. If there were no system by which it went together, it would put everyone who read it on a memory basis. If

it didn't cross-categorize and if it didn't do various things, if you weren't – couldn't classify various types of communication, various types of duties or functions and so on, it'd just become a madhouse. It'd be chaos itself. So *the org board must express the functions, duties, sequences of action and authorities*, and boy, that's a lot to express.

On a two-dimensional board you're going to express the potential duties, well, of a couple of thousand staff members and bring it down to one staff member. And the one staff member is not going to be any different than the two thousand, two-hundred thousand, two million, two-hundred million, two billion staff members. See? What are we looking at? Boy, that's a philosophic conundrum, isn't it? Enough to give you a headache to think of it.

How are you going to take an organization that would accommodate and define and delineate the duties – this was the – this was the principle on which I operated – of two billion staff members and reduce it down to one staff member? Well, actually, when I first started out it would go up to about a hundred staff members. You could get it as big as a hundred before you needed a brand-new org board – and that means the organization would have to be torn apart and thrown away – or you could bring it down to three and that's as low as you could get it. You could only get it to three.

And I was stuck between three and a hundred or thereabouts. And I said that isn't good enough, and I started cracking me brains trying to figure out – might as well crack my brains; I don't want to get damaged myself. So I said – I set myself the artificial problem of making it so that it would go up to two billion (this is totally just theoretical, just so I'd have a *bzzzt* figure, you know, big) and down to one person. And that was the span of action, duty, function, organization and form.

Well, that's why you're going to see people looking at this org board and jamming up things and so forth: because – hold your hat – it gives the cycle of raw meat to OT. It gives the cycle of actions a person would undertake from the public. So it became a public org board, too, because the public looking at it enters from the left and proceeds straight on through to the right. That's all. And it must take care of him properly all the way along the way. It must therefore be the way. It must therefore be the route.

Now, following the laws and principles of how you make a channel and what you do to keep the channel rolling and keep an impulse on the channel: You must of course have an impulse into the channel. The edges of the channel must be held firm. The barriers in the channel must be removed. The noncompliance of forwardings in the channel have to be taken care of, and the distractions must be removed from the borders of the channel. And there must be some place for something going down the channel to arrive at. Must be a place for it to start from and a place for it to arrive at. And we have defined life, and life without that channel won't exist. That's livingness. Livingness is going along a certain course, impelled by a purpose and with some place to arrive.

It consists mostly of removing the barriers in the channel, holding the edges firm, ignoring the distractions and reinforcing and reimpelling one's progress along the channel. That's life and that's this org board. It's dreamed up with malice aforethought to put somebody on it and shove him straight through. It's rigged – it's rigged to remove the distractions, rein-

force the edges, pick up the barriers, take care of the noncompliance, reimpulse any particle on the line with a place for it to go. It does all these things.

Now not only that, it gives you all the levels that will now exist for the Gradation program; all the levels for the Gradation program. And this is where Clear fell out of the hamper suddenly after all these years. Suddenly took a look at it and found exactly where Clear fitted. Clear is a sort of a baby OT. He hasn't learned to walk yet, but frankly there's nothing, nothing to erase between Clear and OT except the physical universe. His next bank, of course, is the physical universe. And I don't think he's going to go around and erase that in a hurry, but he could go before it or go after it, couldn't he? He wouldn't have to erase it. But that's a Clear. A Clear is a baby OT. So that occurs on the board. Well, you take a baby; he's in beautiful condition, but he sure as hell can't walk. Did you ever notice? You follow?

He is Clear as a bell, you know. I mean, you could ring him and he'd gong for hours. Beautiful condition. He's got lots of experience if he could only call on it. I ran into this head-on myself. I don't know if you've read the bulletin yet or not. Is it in your hands?

Audience: Yes.

Yeah, all right. I don't know what you thought about that. Gave you a terrible shock, I imagine.

But a Release, we've been looking at release for a long time. It's very funny. I've never been able to get anybody to check out a Release or a Clear. They have big arguments – big arguments about a Release. There's only one question they had to ask, but they'd never seem to be able to say that anybody was really Release. And big arguments ensued about Clear. Well of course, I had to be within shooting range of this exact position on the forward travel, and so forth, before I could suddenly say, "Ah, for God's sakes. Ah, what the devil." You know? I got all the right answers, and we got the right answers all the way to the top. That's what's so funny, you know? Nineteen fifty-five, Philadelphia Lectures, you know? This is very funny. They tell you all about an OT.

Creation of Human Ability, published here in England ages ago, got the steps in it which you now undertake. Of course, you can't take those steps with a reactive bank in your road, because it reactivates the bank and the bank shoves you back down again. It's wild business. You see? So there it was and I looked it right. So I decided, "Well, Ronnie," I said, "the only thing you can do is just confess. Just fess up to it. All right, that's the way it is." Because we'll leave it to the universities to make popularity with data, and we ourselves fare best when we simply tell what we know when we know it. And this is a case in point.

[For the 2nd time in the lecture, a jet plane flying overhead can be heard] (That's one of these new jet fighters; they're practicing. Well, we haven't got any OTs in the class to go up and give him the idea how to land, so we'll go on.)

So these points have to show up on this board. They have to be taken care of on this board, because this board isn't taking care of one kind of being. It isn't taking care of thetan-wog-class, spun-in X-2, see? I'll be a son of a gun if the board isn't taking care of all of these types of beings. And they're different types of beings as they go on up the line, don't you see? They'll act differently and they'll behave differently, so therefore we had to move up in the

direction of accommodating this fact, and so the easiest way to do that and so forth was simply to express the various stages on the org board itself and match them to the departments of the org board. So you find each department of the org board expresses one of these conditions.

Now, I knew nobody else would want to take the original basic point on the horizontal line, so I did. And that's the first organization that we ever had in Scientology. And that was the Office of L. Ron Hubbard, and that's Department One, you see? That's the Office of L. Ron Hubbard. That's the old Phoenix, Arizona office I first put together, and it eventually became HASI. Well, what's more elementary than that? And I tried and figure out what else would go on this, because I knew there was something a bit odd here, and so on, and I suddenly realized we had forgotten a piece of our own track – in Scientology track. And that was the first organization of Scientology, and strangely enough, it is still functioning. It functions just exactly like that.

And when we tried to straighten out Saint Hill here the other day, we found out that the only things wrong – I found out, the only things going wrong here in my perimeter is that the lines which are always in on the Office of L. Ron Hubbard never had been connected at Saint Hill. But they were trying to go in all the time, but nobody had connected them up. There's always an LRH Communicator, and he normally – he has lots of multitudinous duties of one kind or another. And the – such a person – such a person has a lot of things to do. And this person has – well, he handles signatures for one thing, and authorities and signatures. And you'll see these things coming in, and they're typed up in various parts of the organization. They're scattered all over the organization.

People wonder, "Well, how long am I going to have this line?" You know? "It doesn't seem to belong..." Well, it belongs in the Office of L. Ron Hubbard, of course. It's a letter written up for my signature, or it's a certificate for my signature, or it's something else for my signature. That's just one of these many functions, see? There are a whole bunch of these little things. There is "Where is my file of policy letters," don't you see? There's that kind of a function. There's all kinds of little functions of this particular character that doing without them and scattering them around the organization elsewhere winds everybody kind of up in the soup.

Now, therefore, that stuff is all corralled and that's under the first department. But the main thing to know about the first department is that it is an issuance of conditions. We have some conditions now which are hung around people's heads because – for this excellent reason: that if they exceed a condition, if they try to be in one condition when they're in another condition...

I'll give you an idea. They try to be in a Condition of Emergency when they're in a Condition, let us say, of Affluence – you know, they got lots of money, and they try to act like they're in a Condition of Emergency, they will very shortly be in a Condition of Emergency. Do you see? And reversely, weirdly enough, if they are – try to be in a Condition of Affluence while they're in a Condition of Emergency, boy, will they be in a Condition of Emergency.

I found a whole bunch of formulas here of one kind or another which regulate the steps which should be taken – these are basic policy – they regulate the steps that should be

taken for any given condition of an organization or its department. So the name of that area is conditions, and that's the point of conditions. And that announces conditions, but of course, if you Hobson-Jobson this around, when somebody comes in, what does he tell you about? He tells you about conditions. He tells you about his conditions, or he tells you about the conditions of the world. He's always got a condition in mind. And that's what lies from there off the board into raw meat, you see?

You have – the first cognition is that there is a condition. That's the first thing a person has got to learn: that there is a condition. The world is drifting around; they think there are lots of people who take care of the mind, and they think there are lots of doctors around that heal everything, you know, and they think there are governments that are taking care of their citizens. They're in some happy little theetie-weetie dream, you know? And they've never really looked at the conditions, you see? This guy is going around and he isn't the least bit aware of his own condition. Not even the least bit aware of his own condition. You know what's going to happen to him? Do you realize that very shortly he'll be dead? That's the condition he's in. He's going to die. And do you know that you could look somebody right straight between the eyes and tell that with the greatest of truth. He's going to die. It seems so ordinary to a human being that he should die that it doesn't ever occur to him as a condition. It's a condition of his day-to-day life. He's getting older, so he's going to die.

When you say this to somebody, it puts him into a little bit of a state of shock. You say, "You're going to die. That's the condition you're in. You're going to die." And do you know the whole medical profession and all insurance companies have built all of their business on that one statement: "You're going to die." That's the condition. That's the condition of the human race.

So it actually goes from death, see, into the first part of our board, which is, we say, "At this point of the board it's not necessarily true that you're going to die. Yes, well, if you keep on going the way you are, you're going to die; but it's not necessarily true at this part of the board. You don't *have* to die. And that's a condition of Scientology, see? You don't have to get sick, and these things don't have to happen to you. In other words, conditions can be bettered." You get somebody to realize his condition and so forth.

So we get a whole new battery of processes, by the way, that come out underneath this thing that we've always taken for granted and which has made it difficult for us to sell the individual Scientology. And by applying those various processes, you, becoming accomplished in these things, will be able to walk out on the street and tag somebody. And it doesn't matter whether you tag him or he tags you, why, in short order, if you handle this thing right, you're just looking at a Scientologist right there. Because what have you done? You've put him into the first condition, which is a realization that such a thing as Scientology exists, and that's the first condition you're trying to establish in a being. And it gives you the drill of exactly how you do this to anybody, whether he's a paranoid or a nut. And the only person you wouldn't convince and so forth would be somebody who was utterly unconscious, like a psychiatrist. Now – the fellow is too far gone. You can't talk to a dead man about it because he isn't there.

Now, this isn't a matter of death. These conditions can be very high. And the funny part of it is that all processing from that point there on always contains a condition. This is, then, in common to the remainder of the chart. So as you move in from left to right, this one always carries along slightly with it.

But after you've had a condition, what have you got to do? Well, an old-time auditor like you ought to know you'd better communicate with it, so that is our next department. And we have the Department of Communications, and the name of the level is communications. That's all.

Now that we've got the guy so he knows a condition and he can communicate, he can now find out some more by perceiving. So the next point is perception. The next department must be perception, and that is the Department of Inspections and Reports. Elementary. If you think it over for a moment, you'll find out that communication must precede perception. Very, very delicate little point here.

Now the next line after this is orientation. After you've perceived, you know where you are. So you have something known as orientation. You can orient yourself. If you're ever having a nightmare, all you've got to do is open one eye and find out where you are, and you cease to have a nightmare. Most elementary process I know of. And so it is in life. This fellow comes along and he's been having nightmares up to this point that he calls life. And he then, being aware that conditions can exist, and being able to communicate with those conditions, perceives, and so orients himself and finds out that he has been living in a thing called a nightmare. You see he would, just like that. So that these earlier stages, now, are walking along with us, see? We haven't met this next one yet, but there it is.

In the next step, after one has achieved orientation, is of course understandings. But orientation weirdly enough is the Department of Compilation. After you see where you are, you note it down. After you put a few of these notes together and so forth, they add up to a compilation of orientation, and you can hand them to people and they can orient themselves, don't you see? But you can't hand them to people without understandings. You've got to compile them into understandings, do you see? Organizationally we're tracking. You get – I'm subtly shifting from case to organization, don't you see?

Understandings, of course, is what else but the Department of Publications. They would, of course, publish what's to be understood. Do you follow?

But a preclear – he had run into a condition, he communicated with it, perceived what it was, oriented himself in it, now he would understand it. So his level at this point would be understandings. He would be able to attain understandings, and not, for God's sakes any more – please, we've had the error too long – he doesn't attain at that point understanding. He unders... he gets understandings. And his understandings, of course, have been compiled under orientation: He took notes and he put them all together and they became understandings. Well, of course, they can become published. He can now say, "Look what I understood." He can now tell people what he understood. He can now tell himself what he understood. And I think that's all understanding is, is telling yourself.

So, we now run into the next department, which is really the Department of Promotion, called Department of Prom-Reg – Promotion and Registration. And that's Prom-Reg, but

what do you guess it's under? It's under purposes. That's all a Prom-Reg ever handles, by the way. They're handling people's purposes. If they ever handle anything else but their purposes, they're in trouble. If they don't alter, change, shift or enforce purposes, they don't ever get anybody to appear anyplace on a course or in an organization. As far as the pc is concerned, why, he has arrived at purposes.

And if you count these very carefully, conditions is one, communications two, perception is three, orientation four, understandings is five and purposes is six; which puts our PE and HAS off the chart where it belongs and reorients by taking advantage of the missing five that we had without changing anything but a few class numbers, gives us our same certificate scale and holds stability on R6, which everybody knows most. They don't pay much attention to the rest of the numbers, but R6 they do pay attention to.

And Department of Prom-Reg is the sixth department, and it also happens to be the sixth level and it's also the sixth grade, which – that's the sixth pc grade, and that's the sixth auditor grade, don't you see? And what has he achieved at that point? Well, he's gotten rid of all the false purposes and he knows what his purposes are. And he's achieved a state of Clear. Now, that's all HCO. We have got no further now than HCO. And HCO is a double-barreled-department division and it's the only one there is.

I'll track back. There are numerous other of these things, but I'll have to cut you in on what this is all about here. And the numerous othernesses of all this is that HCO has always had a post called HCO Dissem Sec – HCO Dissemination Secretary. And the HCO Secretary takes care of the conditions, communications and perception. In other words, takes care of the Office of L. Ron Hubbard, the Department of Communications – that's everybody in the org's communications, not just HCO – and the Department of Inspection and Reports, which includes of course OIC and cable data and justice and Committees of Evidence and lawyers and – anything that you would inspect and report on, see, is contained in that area. So it's very easy to understand what is grouped under that.

You'll see somebody studying this board wondering where something goes and then all of a sudden he goes clink. Well, of course, it couldn't go anyplace but there, and sure enough it goes there. In other words, it's a board that lends itself to understandings.

So the Dissem Sec takes over at the Department of Orientation. The HCO Dissem Sec takes over at the Department of Orientation and has the remaining three departments which are, of course, Compilation, Publications and Promotion. Now, frankly, you could say, "Well, why do we call all that HCO?" Well, actually it can't work by itself because the original formula which led us into Scientology was, having known the conditions, I found it was necessary to communicate with them in order to perceive, orient myself in them, and with the resulting understandings find out what my purpose really was.

And so that was a formula, and it was the original formula by which we moved in. But I have put the thing in order, not as it was expressed at that time – it was expressed nearly like that – but I put the thing in order so that it is clarified. So if it led to this much technology, it must have been a whale of a purpose. Must have been quite a purpose in itself, and to knock it out at this particular time would probably be to knock the whole basis out from underneath everything. So we keep that as HCO, and we say that's all HCO. But HCO now has two secre-

taries, but one is not the HCO Secretary. She's still top dog. You've got the HCO Dissem Secretary taking care over Department of Compilations and having three departments under her.

Now, the three departments, the first three departments under the HCO Secretary, are Division One. That's Division One, and that simply means communications. That's their speciality because it's the center action of it, and that's the communications division, but you would call it the HCO Division merely because we know it as that over long periods of time.

Now the next one, Division Two, which takes care of the Department of Compilation, Publications and Promotion, would be the Dissemination Division – *Division*. Dissemination Division. The division has three departments. Now, you'll see the purpose for these very shortly.

Now, there are six of these divisions. That's a lot of them. And we're going to find something very weird that they missed way back on the trackspace operaesque. I will explain to you what it is. It's a staggerer. And that is, all you've got to do is cross two divisions on a hat, and from that point on, you have jammed the ability of the organization to expand. And that is the secret.

To the degree that you then cross hats on this chart – that is to say, somebody tries to wear a hat of Division Two and a hat of Division Four – if you carefully, in actual experience, look over the thing very carefully and wonder why in the name of God everything is going to pieces and everybody seems to be very upset and so forth, you look over the org board very fast and you'll see that Josie Ann is on HCO Dissemination and also on Field Activities. And that seemed logical to somebody, but somehow or another it is absolutely jammed into a horrible mess. And you go in and look at her basket, their comm station, and you will find out that it is stacked so you just can't see over it. The lines lock at these points and six is irreducible.

Actually the six is irreducible. You can't call it really an organization until it has six people in it, one for each division. And the degree that it won't expand is the degree that you cross those divisional hats. And when an organization gets just so big, you cross departmental hats at your peril. When it's very small, you can cross departmental hats; but when it gets very big or just mediumly big, you start crossing departmental hats, you'll find out that all the traffic is piling up at that point. They're just making a horrible logjam.

In other words, what I'm talking about here is we've got six separate activities and these separate activities – as you look into them – these separate activities go on a basis of... Your first one is communication. Now, if you don't have – see, that's Division One (we call it HCO) – you don't have communication, why, you're in pretty bad trouble. Have you ever noticed anybody who was out of communication? I think that you very possibly have used the word occasionally. Well, he's in pretty bad shape. But if somebody doesn't disseminate at all, they never put out, they could be in communication but they never give out anything. They would talk to you, but they never give anything out, one way or the other. You'd find that was pretty bad, and they'd be pretty sick. So that's actually One and that's Two. Dissemination, then, would be Two.

And then if we look this over very carefully, if somebody isn't neating the organization together, if there isn't an Organization Division, there's nobody looking after the organization.

Well, the organization then wouldn't be there. It'd just be these other divisions floating out into the air, you see? So you've got to have an Organization Division and that's Three.

And – I want to write it big enough so that you can see it, or I'd string them all out in one line the way they should be.

And you then come in here and you've got to have a – you've got to have a Technical Division, because that's what we're in. That's the know-how. And even if you were making beans or spaghetti, you'd still have to have a Technical Division. Why? Because this is the – this is what you do! It isn't what you know. That's clear back up in the other line, see? But it's what you do. That's the technical activity, and we're particularly in technical, so therefore, it's the doingness of the technical, not the technical sitting there all by itself, don't you see? And that, of course, is Four.

And your next lineup, immediately after your technical, is the point that has been missed in all org charts on this planet and back to eighty trillion years ago. You can't make a product – just make a product. That is not possible. Times change, things alter. You can't just say it's a product. And nobody does, oddly enough, but they don't have it on their org boards. And sooner or later they neglect it. They've got to qualify the product. Got to qualify it. They've got to say, "This is how it behaves, and this is what it does," and then they got to go back and straighten up in the manufacture of the product anything that went wrong in making the product that made it fall down in qualification so that it couldn't meet the conditions which it was going to be used under. Do you see? So this was an absolutely vital step.

And no factory actually does miss this. When they do miss this, they've had it. They keep pouring out automobiles. I think – I think once in a while... The Lincoln, the Lincoln car of – I think it was about the 58 model or the 59 model – this was missing. And they sold those things madly (to important people, too, because it took that much to buy it), and just gave themselves the worst name you ever heard of, because out that thing went, and its electrical connections promptly started failing all over the place. It had never had any inspection on put-together, and the distributors hadn't got this step on their org board in their garages, and so on, out through the country, so they filled up their service bays and showrooms with non-running Lincolns. You couldn't repair any Lincoln because all the Lincolns they'd sold had come back. Nothing could move on the line because, the qualification step having been missing, you now had the whole product unmoving. Even if it did go out, it was rejected. So they left this up to the public; so the public was doing this step. You see, somebody had to wear the hat. You follow that? And inevitably somebody has to wear the hat if it's missing on these things. It's very, very amusing. So that's your Qualifications Division, and it – I'll go into what composes it, but that's the outfit that takes care of that little step.

And then you've got here your Distribution Division which is Six. And it's very funny that we would have a Distribution Division. That sounds very weird, because you have to make up your mind what we're distributing.

And it's very amusing. You go over this lineup – I mean the stuff I've been over here the last few weeks – I say it cracked my brain. I didn't want to get in the road of it. Spare myself. Just fantastic numbers of small points that would keep coming up and have to be answered, like "What do we as Scientologists make?" "What do we produce?" "Are we – is an

organization marketing Scientologists?" And you know, it's not! It's not even vaguely. An organization is simply selling Scientology.

And you say, "Well, wait a minute. Wait a minute. Then what is Scientology?"

Scientology is the ability to change conditions. Pretty interesting, isn't it? You got that? Scientology is the ability to change conditions; the technology of how you change conditions. That's it. And we've been wearing that by changing Scientology. [laughs]

Now, I hate to put it into this kind of category and so forth, but if we were selling soap powder and somebody said, "Well, what's this do?" Let's say that he was a bog-wog out from the wog-bogs, and – bogwalker from the middle of Bogtown – and he said, "What's this stuff do? It's pretty. It's kind of sticky to the hand, and what's it do?" and so forth.

And you say, "It is a marvelous preparation!"

"Yeah," he says, "What's it do?" and so forth.

And you say, "It's beautiful. It's very beneficial."

He says, "What's it do?"

We have to tell him eventually that it is something that changes shirts from dirty shirts to clean shirts. And we would only miss if he didn't know that a clean shirt was desirable. And out in the public we're dealing with a bunch of very dirty wogs. [laughter] They don't know that a clean shirt is desirable. Before something can be sold, it has to be able to do something. Well, we know a lot of things Scientology can do, but a lump-sum statement of what it can do comes back from the beginning of this channel that we go through here. It can change conditions.

It's pretty interesting because anything that could change any conditions anywhere would have to be a very, very well regulated group because it'd tend to fly to pieces with the greatest of ease. We'd have to be able to be a group so that we could decide amongst us what conditions were to be changed eventually. And if we ourselves didn't decide this but we all went off individually changing conditions, it would look pretty chaotic. Because the weird part of it is, is we've got in our hands the universal solvent. It'll dissolve anything.

Well, what do we put it in? Well, we'd better put it into an organizational form and decide what we're going to dissolve with it, because we are the only things that could hold it. Nothing else could. We're the only things that could carry it, hold it, handle it or do anything else with it.

What's very hard for people to see, then, is they haven't got the flakes of soap. But it could be described to them very easily. But you'd first have to, in the Department of Condition, indicate to them that clean shirts were desirable. "Today's man wears clean shirts!" You got that?

And do you know you have numerous agencies propagandizing just the reverse in the field of the mind? "Be glad you have a dirty mind! All artistic impulses come from your dirty mind!" [laughter] "Buy our dirty minds!" It's quite remarkable, but it's true. There's books right out there on the stands at Smith's that – you can at least order them through Smith's –

selling you the idea of how marvelous it is to be nuts. Man's halfway bought the idea, so we've got a long way to start.

I remember some Scientologist that was working down in the middle of Africa... The main point is to know where you start. When you know where you start, you can promptly start. You get the idea?

Some Scientologist working down in the middle of Africa in soil conservation, so forth, finally found out what was wrong with the soil conservation program – is, the natives to which the government was seeking to teach soil conservation didn't know that soil conservation had any value of any kind. Soil conservation – the preservation of their land – had to be sold to them because they were a nomad tribe, and they had already had a solution to it. Every time the soil unconserved, you moved. And they didn't recognize they were running out of Africa to move into. So that had to be taught to them. But that couldn't be taught to them because they were out of communication. So you had to play the condition against the communication against the condition against the communication, and you all of a sudden got somewhere. And they were able to move up the program.

But it was basically a condition – condition had not been seen, viewed, indicated, felt, experienced. But at that level, it sort of has to be by osmosis. You see, you haven't got much communication. That's what takes genius, you see? You haven't got much communication, you haven't got much perception involved with the thing and yet somehow or another – this is what you are up against, you see – somehow or another you've got to get through to the bloke that clean shirts are desirable. Do you follow that?

Well, it's very funny, to – very, very amusing if you come right down to it, to compare Scientology to a box of soap. But let me tell you something: If you were trying to sell the Kohinoor diamond, you had certainly better get into the marts of trade and find out how they're purveyed. Just how would somebody go about selling anything? Do you see? How would you disseminate anything? How would you handle anything? You would have to figure out what the lines were, not in the marts of trade but just what existed amongst man. You'd have to be quite real, otherwise you'd be sitting in a little island, completely divorced from the rest of existence – a very undesirable condition. How many auditors are sitting around the world right now in little islands, totally enclosed and barricaded against the world one way or the other for not being able to communicate, see? All you've got to do is show them how to indicate – to the wog or anyone – how to indicate that a condition of clean shirts is desirable, see? And then show them: org board, clean shirt – *pzoom*.

And they say, "Hey-y-y."

And you wait. Somebody will be rushing in to tell you, "I just had the damndest idea. Do you know what I've just found out? Huh! You know, when you talk to people it makes a difference."

Big four-star... And now you'll know what you've been trying to process, see? It's worse than this. I'll tell you more about it very rapidly here.

But these are your divisions. These are your six divisions, and those six divisions add up in this particular direction. If you cross any of these lines, if you cross two of these lines, if

you've got communication-dissemination crossing, I assure you that your dissemination out is going to block your communication in. If you had all of your mailings, for instance, running only on your org despatch lines you're not going to – not going to hear from anybody. So your dissemination would have been in vain.

Now, when it comes to organization, if there isn't somebody holding the organization there financially, mest-wise, its buildings and that sort of thing, you're going to be in trouble, that's for sure, because there's going to be no place to sit. Now, that doesn't bother an OT, but this organization also contains, at its left-hand end, raw meat, and they sit down.

Now, if you don't produce anything – if you don't produce anything – and there's no activity going on this thing, you never wind up with anything to distribute. That's obvious. But here, if you don't look over the qualifications of what you're distributing and so forth, you'll wind up with no distribution either. But the funny part of it is that every time you let a person who trains students examine them, something goes wrong. One of the oldest policies we have. So we can't cross those two divisions.

Once more in this, let's suppose this fellow, this fellow was crossed entirely with technical. You know, the Distribution Division made up all of the product. I don't think they'd distribute anything. Furthermore, if this fellow wasn't actually a Distribution Division and so forth, he would change the product. Do you see? So actually over here he's got to hold that product just as it is. That's what he is distributing. That's what's coming off the assembly line and that's what he's distributing. Do you see? And so that's got to be a held standard and a distributed action.

Now this, oddly enough, you could – if you understood this thing from A to izzard – you could probably walk into Gestetner's or Standard Oil or something and start explaining this to some executive, and there'd be further executives and the vice-presidents and general managers, and you would stand about eighteen ranks deep in their top officers before you stood up. Because they look at this stuff and they say, "Oh, my God." You know? "Oh, my God, yes. Oh, yes!"

Well now, what's all this, "Oh, yes?" You can take your own life on this org board – you can take your own life, all the (this isn't a completed org board) – you can take your own life and you can find out what one of your divisions is missing. You, personally! See? What one of your divisions is missing? Is it your Dissemination Division? Well, what does dissemination add up to with you? I don't know, but you can reinterpret it into your own actions. Your Organization Division, maybe that's missing. You know, everything is all chaotic, or maybe your Technical Division, your service or action or production, or what you're producing. Maybe you're not making anything. Maybe you're distributing nothing that you have made. Don't you see? Your Production Division or – which is about the same as your Technical here. This is just Hobson-Jobsoned over into the Scientology organization, don't you see? But this is activity.

Now, your next one over here, maybe you're not qualifying what you make. Maybe you don't say, or maybe you don't pick it up as it comes off the line, say, "That rings, that's a good one," you know? "That rings, that's a good one." Maybe you aren't qualifying anything you are doing, don't you see? Maybe as it comes down the line, you say, "That rings," and it

doesn't ring at all, and you don't have any place to put it. [laughter] You wind up wearing nothing but bum things that don't ring. [laughter]

And then after you've got a product – after you've got a product – do you know that some people don't distribute it? You know, they leave it right there. If you ever want to see somebody get stacked up, it's somebody whose Distribution Division is out. And that's pretty catastrophic.

Now, just to go over this very rapidly – and this probably really is several lectures – we got here – we got up as far as purposes, and that was the level six. But the rest of the lineup I will just read rapidly. There is the Department of the Organization. It takes care of financial planning, it takes care of papers and that sort of thing, and balance sheets and records and inventories and all that sort of thing. And then you've got your Department of Finance (our old Department of Accounts) and so on. But what is this thing, Department of the Organization? Now what part of existence does it occupy? Well, it occupies direction, of course. After you – but by level, after you've got purposes all cared for, boy can you have direction. Interesting, isn't it?

And then when we've got the direction cared for, why, direction, going in any direction, requires energy or makes energy, and so energy is your Department of Finance in an organization here. And then, the funny part of it is that do you know you have to apply energy to a body to make the body work something in order to get activity. Some way or another you've got to apply your energy to something, so the body of the organization is the Department of Materiel. Elementary, but that holds all the buildings and places and repairs them and cleans them and cares for things and of course personnel, as a body, is materiel. Not as a thetan, but as a body they're materiel. So you have to feed them and house them and do various things like that.

Now we get into – there's a missing point here which has got to be drawn in – this is Estimation. And do you know that anybody who engages in activity (which is the next step) without estimation is in a hell of a time. Did you ever try to engage in an activity without estimating? Just try it sometime. Reach for doorknobs that aren't there, step for step landings which are one step up from where you thought they were. You're going to have an awful time very shortly.

So you've got to have body, estimation, activity. And by getting body, estimation, activity, production, you determine a result. You don't determine a product. In other words, after the body has acted – you see, after you've estimated and it's acted – what are you going to get? You're going to get a result. Why are you going to get a result? You – why don't you get a product? Well, that's the mistake people make. They think that they get a product. They don't get a product at that stage, they get a result, you see? So here's your result and now we've got to have – and this title here Hobson-Jobsons around – we've got perfection or correction. It could be either way, but correction isn't quite it. We actually have, at this point, review. We've got to review this thing. And after we've gotten through with reviewing it, we then have a product.

Now, we've got a product. And what do we do with a product? Well, you know, you could have a product and not do anything with it, as I said before, so we have to clear it. And

that is the wildest pun that is on this board because, of course, clearing really belongs clear down here. That's OT. But we have to have it there because that action is a case, because at that point we had better start clearing somebody else. And that's what starts the whole thing over again. So it's a self-feeding, circular machine, not a flat one. You follow? We get our Field Staff Member system and so forth. So clearing the product, we get more to clear. So that, of course, is the Department of Clearing.

Now, any function which we have ever had fits rather neatly in this structure. We can put it almost down with the greatest of ease. There's more can be said about this. It can be written up more precisely. Probably be able to read it for a long time. But the funny part of it is, you can take *this* level, this conditions, communication, perception, orientation, understandings, purpose, direction, energy, body, activity, production, result, review, product, clearing – you can take that one *brrrrrt* and you can analyze whether you're doing good or bad. You can take that and you can say, "How – where are my activities falling down? Where are my activities falling down?" And you just take that, *brrrrrr*, and you'll spot one, and you'll be very happy with it until the following day when you find out you hadn't paid any attention to that one. And the next thing you know, it has done a complete analysis for you of the life you are living and what you're doing. And it's just as neat...

And if you're holding a post or something of that sort – do you see, that would straighten up your life, if – and even on – life on a job – but if you were holding down a post, you weirdly enough would have to have here the departmental functions. You, an individual, would have to have each one of the departmental functions in order to get rolling. So the figure on this is six, sixteen. Six, sixteen. There are six divisions; there are sixteen departments, and so each department then has primarily six sections with sixteen subsections, each one of which now may have six divisions with sixteen subdivisions. But it doesn't matter whether you have a staff member, a department, a section, a division, a little unit detached out to take care of the Swami Bami Hospital that the medical profession has just surrendered. There are still stethoscopes and uncoiled bandages lying down on the front lawn from the battle that was fought there, and they've surrendered, and you send a little unit over to take care of this place, you see?

You're going to be able to barely get away with it if you detach somebody from Divisions One and Two, another somebody from Divisions Three and Four and another somebody from Divisions Five and Six. Their lines are going to jam very shortly, but you could just get away with it. It's a good temporary hit-and-miss proposition, but the funny part of it is you really – to hold the place – you're going to have to have six people there. You're going to have to have Division One, Division Two, Division Three, Division Four, Division Five and Division Six represented. You will see how that works out. But if you're going to hold it any length of time and so forth, and if you're actually going to have a going concern, then you're going to have to have their proper departments underneath those divisions. Otherwise you start going mad.

And then if you're going to hold it for a long time and it's going to expand, well then, by George, you're going to have to have the six subsections under each department. And then if you're really going to go for broke, you're going to have to add the sixteen factor underneath that. In other words, the whole board goes crisscross. It's always the same board; it al-

ways expands in exactly the same direction, and you have actually six divisional hats. You have six divisional hats and each divisional hat knows all the departmental hats. You can train anybody in on this, and you can train people in with a little bit on the other divisions and a great deal on his own division. It only gives us six hats, with of course one staff member hat.

And that is the organization that's going to carry us along the line. Now, it's – you say it hadn't been released. Well, it's been released. We've been working on it for fifteen years. And we had a ball in putting this thing together, and we know more about organization than we can shake a stick at. We've tried practically every form known to man, and in putting this thing together, ways we have jammed, the mistakes we have made are just suddenly coming into view as exactly why they were made and so on.

This is going to be put together and will be released as an actual org board in the near, very near future. And we'd put it out like this: it's going to have classes of orgs, and that merely depends – we have solved the thing. We say there are two admin members for every tech member, and that is how big the organization can be.

You can put two admin on for every tech you put on and if you just keep that up, then it gets up – a certain number of people, gives you a certain class of org, don't you see – but then you just say, "Everybody below you and every function below you is – you're responsible for." We don't say there are missing hats in this organization; we say, "Every hat below you, you're responsible for. Every empty hat below you, you're responsible for at any given time." So it wouldn't matter how big the board got; every hat below them, don't you see?

We've only got one HCO Secretary. She's got three departments under her. God knows, how many other things. And you say, "See all those functions? They're yours." She eventually will get somebody to handle one, and the functions below that person, don't you see, and the functions below that. So it's very simple to work out who, what is where. And it's a functional board, and it crisscrosses, and it should work out rather smoothly.

Be posted here, by the way, in a matter of about thirty days in most organizations. But you will see the public around taking a look at it. And may I recommend to you this org board. May I recommend to you – look over its sixteen departmental significances with regard to your own life and look over the sixteen departments with regard to what you are doing in life. And I think you are ready for a lot of cognitions.

Now you say, "What happens above Clear?"

Well, actually an OT goes through all those upper stages.

Thank you very much.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 4 JANUARY 1966
Issue III

(Revises HCO Policy Letters of 8 April 1958 and 13 December 1962)⁵

Gen Non-Remimeo

SCIENTOLOGY ORGANIZATIONS
COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM:
DISPATCHES

An intra-organizational dispatch is a simple thing. You can keep a copy if you wish, but only one copy (the original) goes and comes back.

When writing a dispatch, address it to the **post** – **not** the person. (If a person changes post, or leaves, if you address the dispatch to the post, it will be received by the new occupant of the post, but if you address it to the person, then if the person leaves it may not be received and handled.)

Set up a dispatch as follows: (for information or advice) Example:

Mimeograph Officer

(date)_____

Supply Officer

Dear _____,

Your order of..... (message).

(complimentary close)

Signature_____

or for a request or an order:

⁵ both HCO PL's mentioned here have been cancelled in the meantime.

Mail Clerk

via Dir Comm

(date) _____

HCO Area Sec

Dear _____

Please see that.....(order or request).

(complimentary close)

Signature _____

This form is used so that when it is ready to be returned, an arrow can be drawn pointing to the post to which it is to be returned, eliminating the need to write it. If the message is one that should go in your hat, either put it in your hat and acknowledge sender, or write it up for your hat, returning the original to sender. If the dispatch comes to you from a junior always insist the junior has attested "it is okay". If you in turn wish to send it on, you too must attest "it is okay" and send it on. If it is not ok return the dispatch to the originator stating briefly why it is not ok.

The receiver handles the dispatch and retains the dispatch until such time as it has been completely handled. If it is a matter which involves days or weeks, you can dispatch the sender stating that such and such is being attended to and expected to be complete within a certain time –but retain the original dispatch until job is done, then return it to sender marked "**done**". Do not return the original with "It's being attended to". Originals only return with "**done**" or "Can't be done". Otherwise the communication stays incomplete.

When replying to a dispatch, put down the date of the message. Dispatches are handwritten. Executives, other than Exec Secs, should not have their dispatches typed by a secretary except where the dispatch contains large volume.

COLOUR FLASH SYSTEM FOR DISPATCHES AND LETTERS

The colour flashes for paper for divisions are as follows:

HCO Division 1 – Gold

HCO Division 2 – Light pink or violet

Division 3 – Deep Pink

Division 4 – Green

Division 5 – Grey

Division 6 – Yellow

Division 7 – Brown [Public Division Flash Colours

Division 8 – Orange added per HCO PL 23 May 1969.]

Division 9 – Blue or White

White paper is also used for letters to the field, business houses, Board minutes, and for manuscripts and research notes.

Copies of letters written are on the colour flash of the division writing the letter.

WRITTEN REQUESTS

If you have a request, put it in writing. Do not go to the person and expect him to carry your request around in his head. Personnel are not supposed to present their body, nor their body with a dispatch to other personnel except for actual conferences which are kept to a minimum. Few things need conferences. Dispatches take care of 99% of organizational business.

COMM CENTRE BASKETS

The Comm Centre contains a basket for each staff member. Each basket is tagged with the person's name and underneath the name is their post or posts. Each person is responsible for delivering his own dispatches to the proper baskets and for picking up daily his own dispatches. Do not fail to pick up your dispatches at least twice a day (once in the morning and once in the afternoon – make your own schedule). But do not let dispatches pile up in your basket.

In larger orgs a Comm Centre and separate Divisional Comm Centres may be instituted. The Comm Centre would consist of one basket for each division plus a basket for L. Ron Hubbard and an outer org **out** basket. Each divisional comm centre is placed in the divisional working area with a basket for each staff member in that division plus a divisional in-basket and a divisional out-basket. An HCO dispatch courier would be responsible for delivering dispatches into the divisional in-baskets and from the divisional out-baskets into the comm centre baskets. The sec sec is responsible for the distribution of dispatches from the divisional in-basket to staff members' baskets.

ORGANIZATION BOARD

Keep abreast of all post changes. As the Org Board is changed, the Comm Centre baskets are changed. Always know who is occupying what post so that when you deliver a dispatch you will always know whose basket it goes in. If you are not sure, check the Org Board.

RESPONDING TO COMMUNICATIONS

Handle your dispatches daily. Do not let them stack up on you. When someone sends you a dispatch let them hear from you. Do not get the reputation of 'I hesitate to send so and so a dispatch because I don't know when I'll hear from it, or if I'll ever hear from it.' **Do not let your dispatches dead-end.** When you let your dispatches (or letters) stack up on your desk, you are in actuality chopping the comm lines of the organization and in so doing chopping your own pay cheque.

ANSWERING LETTERS

Secretaries who type letters should always take care to staple the carbon copy on top of the incoming letter – do not use a paper clip. In answering letters, answer their questions. Give them the information they are seeking. Use the gradient scale method. **Do not fail to answer their questions.** If you don't know the answers, find out.

ORIGINATED DISPATCHES

The purpose of the secretarial unit is to type answers to letters. Most all intra-organizational dispatches can be handwritten: this saves time in putting them on tape (when you could be writing them yourself) and saves the transcriber's time for replying to letters. Stay in communication with other staff members and with our correspondents. If you don't handle your dispatches properly don't reply to the sender, as I said before, you are cutting your own pay cheque.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ml.rd

(Note: The two earlier issues of 8 Apr '58 and 13 Dec '62 were the same basic issue as the above Policy Letter, with a few changes reflecting the evolution of the Comm System and the Org Board.

13 Dec '62 was a straight reissue of 8 Apr '58 – as part of the Reissue Series (7) – with minor changes such as the inclusion of a salutation in the dispatch example, and in the first paragraph under Comm Centre *Baskets*,

addition of a phrase, "(except in some larger Orgs, where there is a Communicator for this purpose)" after the sentence saying each person is responsible for picking up and delivering his own dispatches.

4 Jan '66, *Issue III* (above) gave *two* dispatch examples instead of one as given in both earlier issues, showing the different routing for information or advice and for a request or an order; added the second half of the paragraph after the second letter example re including the attestation "it is okay" on a dispatch; updated the *Colour Flash System* in line with the 7 Division Org Board, which in the earlier two issues had been based on *type* of dispatch, report, letter, carbon copy, etc. as opposed to Divisional colour flash; and deleted a second half of the paragraph entitled *Written Requests*, which read, "We have a Comm Centre where dispatches are to be placed. Place your dispatches in the person's basket, not in his hands. **It is anxiety about communication only that causes people to jump the lines.** There may be, however, a few exceptions: emergencies, or if you have a large article that would not fit into a Comm Centre basket. The point is, do not run around all day handing people dispatches, nor put them down on someone's desk. This tends to interrupt their work and causes confusion on the lines." It also added the second paragraph under *Comm Centre Baskets* re Divisional Comm Centres; and under the paragraph *Answering Letters*, after the sentence, "Give them the information they are seeking," deleted " – but do not try to sell them a course and an intensive if all they want is some information concerning an ad we are running."]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 30 MARCH 1966

Revised Reissue of HCO PL 15 Nov 1958

Remimeo
All Staff Hats
Staff Status 2 Check Sheet

All Divisions

THE THREE BASKET SYSTEM

All personnel assigned a desk and a specific stationary working space are to have a stack of three baskets.

The top basket, labelled "**in**", should contain those items and despatches still to be looked at.

The middle basket, labelled "**pending**", is to contain those items which have been looked at, but which cannot be dealt with immediately.

The bottom basket, labelled "**out**", is to contain those items which have been dealt with and are now ready for distribution into the comm lines again, or to files, etc.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:lb-r.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 25 OCTOBER 1971
Issue I

Remimeo
Basic Staff Hat

COMM ROUTING
HOW TO TIE UP A WHOLE
ORG AND PRODUCE NOTHING

There are 3 types of Communication routing.

They are

1. Horizontal fast flow
2. Command Channels
3. Conference.

If these are not known one from another the whole org can get tied up. Despatches hide the desks *and* the executives. Independent policies cross up standard programs and chaos occurs.

HORIZONTAL FAST FLOW

The normal flow lines of an org are horizontal.

They do not go up, over and down on the org board. They pass from one unit to another sideways without going through seniors.

Almost all despatches should travel in this way.

It is fast flow, not inspected by seniors comm.

Examples:

Hatting Officer Dept 1 despatches Word Clearer Dept 13 directly and is answered back directly.

C/S Dept 12 despatches Supplies Dept 9 directly and is answered directly.

Tech page despatches E/O directly and is answered directly.

None of the comm ever goes to the originator's senior or to the receiver's senior.

Only when something goes wrong or there is a conflict do seniors get consulted or dive in on the line.

COMMAND CHANNEL

Command channels go up through seniors over to a senior and down to a junior. Or they go up through all seniors and back through all seniors.

It is used **upward** for unusual permission or authorizations or information or important actions or Compliances. Downward it is used for **orders**.

CONFERENCE

This is a line usually from an executive to the chairman of a governing body such as Advisory Committee or Executive Committee or Aides Council or Commanding Officer Conference etc.

It is used for program clearance or policy requests.

TABLE

Horizontal	=	Used for all normal flow.
Command Channel	=	Used for unusual permissions or authorizations and downward for orders.
Conference	=	Used for getting clearance for programs.

SCRAMBLE

Now if you scramble these, you get chaos.

More and more people produce less and less while working harder and harder.

You even get something that is a liability or a bureaucracy or a government.

Such a scramble leads to lots of motion but nothing done. Lots of "work" is visible but the org mysteriously gets insolvent.

Let us look at an example:

Magazine Layout sends a magazine dummy he wants okayed up to Magazine I/C to Director Promotion to Dissem Sec to HCO Exec Sec to Division 7 Sec to LRH Comm to Issue Authority who okays it and sends it back on same route.

This takes maybe 6 days.

It's idiotic. Why? Because an item that should be Horizontal is routed on Command Channels. **Five** needless terminals get involved. Promo is delayed.

The correct routing is Horizontal: Magazine Layout to Issue Authority. The correct time would be a few hours at most even on normal comm lines.

Example:

Suppose we sent the pc after session to the D of P, the C/S, the TEO, the Tech Sec, the Qual Sec, the Director of Certs and Awards and then the Examiner. And returned him on the same route every session!

Nothing, but nothing would get done in Tech or Qual if one had such routing! But people sure would be "busy".

WHY

Why does a scramble occur?

Executives get anxious. They want to know everything. So they get themselves onto all Comm Lines.

Comm Lines are a lousy source of data.

The Executive should be watching **products** if he wants to know.

The Org Board up to date, the day's statistic investigations and inspections are the real sources of information. Not despatches.

Thus, by demanding to be on routing lines the executive can jam all lines.

One has to have a certain amount of trust in handling people.

By direct inspection of the org and its staff an executive learns who is or isn't on post, who is or isn't working. By sitting at a desk handling despatches the executive remains ignorant.

REVERSED

Many an org gets reversed in using comm channels wrongly.

Executives and staff activate programs without consulting any conference and inspect and relay every despatch!

The program one wants to do is thus unknown to others and crosses up all *their* programs. Yet at the same time the org is frantically curious about despatches!

ADVICE

If the org has lots of staff and no income, these conditions will be present:

- A. The comm system is not in as above but is scrambled.
- B. No Exec is walking around inspecting and getting people to work on their posts.
- C. Programs, uncleared with others, are being activated that tie up staff but produce little.

My advice is straighten it out and obtain production.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.bh

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 10 APRIL 1963

CenOCon
SHSBC Students
Franchise
Field

Re-Issue Series (12)

WHAT AN EXECUTIVE WANTS ON HIS LINES

(Re-issue of HCO Policy Letter of May 26, 1959)

There are only four things which an executive wants on his incoming communication lines.

These are:

1. Information
2. Appointments and dismissals of personnel for his action or confirmation.
3. Financial matters.
4. Acknowledgements.

He does not want on his lines:

1. Demands for decisions.
2. Backflashes and can'ts.
3. Entheta.

Demands for decisions are always indicative of irresponsibility; people want the executive to create the mistakes; and an executive can make mistakes if he is asked to make decisions distant from his zone of action equipped with insufficient data to make the decision correctly.

Backflashes, by definition, are an unnecessary response to an order. This can get fairly wicked. They are not acknowledgements, they are comments or refutals. Example: "Sell the bricks" as an order, is replied to by "Bricks are hard to sell" or "We should have sold them yesterday". This is a disease peculiar to only a few staff members. They cannot receive an order directly and are seeking to be part of the comm, not the recipient. This goes so far as senseless "Wilco's" or "I'll take care of it" when the executive only wants to know Is it done? Despatches or orders, in most instances, are held until completed. We assume that they got through or rely on other means of saying they didn't. Only a few situations require an acknowledgement to an order over long lines and all of these occur when there is doubt that the recipient is there.

In the matter of can'ts, an executive seldom orders the impossible and generally consults with people before issuing an order. A persistent "Can't be done" means "I am unwill-

ing". I have learned this the long way. Person A on a job, saying "Can't" all the time, changed to Person B, receiving the same orders, discovered to me that the job could be done since B, on the same post, receiving the same orders, never said "Can't" and the job did get done.

Entheta means embroidered reports. Data is data. It is not opinion. Data, not entheta, brings about action. All entheta does is cut the lines.

To jam an executive's lines is a serious thing to do. The result is a cut line. A bottle-neck is created by staff when staff jams a line to an executive. Eating up an executive's time and patience destroys harmony, dissemination and income.

Depending on an executive for petty decisions, is sure to jam lines and cost units.

The role of an executive is to plan and execute actions and to co-ordinate activities. To do this he gets people to do their jobs and establishes the overall plan of action. Only an executive can string lines and co-ordinate actions and resolve the jams that impede things. For an executive to decide for people decisions applicable only to the sphere of one job is folly.

WHAT AN EXECUTIVE'S LINES SHOULD LOOK LIKE

Information:

When a member of an organization does something of importance, he should always inform the executive after the fact. It is perfectly all right to take actions within one's organizational purpose. It is not all right to keep it a secret.

1. Do it.
2. Tell the right people and the executive by adequate communication at the speed necessary to the case.

Similarly, an executive ought to tell people his goals and plans and, when he does something of any importance to others, he ought to say so. The captain who tells the ship how the action is going saves a lot of nerves and useless motion.

Appointments and Dismissals:

Minor hirings and firings in a department by authorized persons should always be subject to confirmation at least after the fact. Major appointments and dismissals of key personnel must be okayed by a senior executive before the fact and action taken only on the senior executive's authority.

For example, it is a board action to appoint, transfer or dismiss an association secretary or an organization secretary. It is an executive director action to appoint or dismiss department heads and then only on the advices of an association secretary or organization secretary. It is an association secretary or organization secretary action to appoint, transfer or dismiss deputies or section chiefs. It is a department head's action to appoint or dismiss other staff but always, in every case, with permission from the next superior and information all the way up.

Finance Matters:

Consistent finance information as in advisory committee minutes and authority for changes and capital expenditures are an executive matter. My own authority is needed only on major changes of policy or expenditures and on extreme financial emergencies. Ordinary financial planning and routine actions are better handled locally by the association secretary, organization secretary or the director of accounts. I do need financial information. But where I have done planning and promotion and it is agreed upon, further handling of finance is handled under a blanket authority from me except for extreme financial emergencies or major capital outlays which are local matters.

These are the things I want on my lines. I change personnel as the answer where information is chronically withheld, where appointments and dismissals are irregular, or when an organization starts getting insolvent. Where people are continuously demanding that. I make the decisions they should be making, I again recognize other ills and again change personnel.

If we all understand what's wanted, we can do it,

Well, let's look this over and do it and win.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:gl.rd

[*Note:* No significant change was made when reissued.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 27 DECEMBER 1963

Confidential to:
Cent Dirs
HCO Con Secs
Assn/Org Secs
HCO Areas

THE "MAGIC" OF GOOD MANAGEMENT

(Some tips of value which, while they do not form the rationale back of my own actions, will be found of practical use.)

(Hat Check: HCO Secs should Hat Check this Policy Letter on Assn/Org Secs and Assn/Org Secs should Hat Check it on HCO Secs up to Continental Level.)

The sole actual criteria by which skill in management is estimated in this society and by us in any one management person is financial volume and solvency.

This does not mean that Scientology is obsessed with making money. But money does buy a lot of things Orgs and staffs need and under poverty inspired propaganda, "making money" has come into bad repute. In actual fact the only real sin in our present system of economics is to be poor, even in Russia.

Financial volume and solvency are the final test of any manager of a Scientology Organization or area, large or small. If the Organization isn't making lots of money, if the staff isn't well paid, if there's no good cash surplus to hand, if book stocks are not well up and paid for, if the tape bills aren't paid up to date and the 10% is overdue and behind, then the natural conclusion at headquarters is that there isn't much good managing being done. The criticism is leveled solely at the person managing the Org or its HCO and no other factors or explanations are taken into account.

Finance, in this society, is still our best index, and so we use it to judge the competence of management. People who say we shouldn't have money merely want us to fail. The data is looked at this way: A good manager's organization is highly solvent; a bad manager's organization is broke. Staff, conditions of the area, local flaps, these are never taken into account.

There are no forgivenesses for insolvency from the society and there is no better index of the kind of job the manager is doing.

To have high financial volume and to be solvent, a manager need only (a) follow established patterns, (b) see that there are competent people on staff and that they are doing their work, (c) that service gets rendered on a highly personal basis, (d) that there isn't a lot of entheta and natter coming from disaffected staff members and hangers on, (e) that the spirit of

Scientology is recognizable in the Organization, (f) that people aren't over-restimulated by the "dangerous environment", (g) that there are lots of bodies moving through the shop, and (h) that the place is obviously for Ron and in agreement with his plans. Given just these things, success is certain. Given one or more of these poorly done or badly out and failure starts to creep in, given several out and there's no Org, much less no manager.

These points of success mean many other things but they also mean high volume solvency. And high volume solvency is the index of success in the present economic framework of society no matter how socialistic the society appears.

The route to volume and solvency is milestoned by following these few points:

A. ESTABLISHED PATTERNS

Follow established patterns of the Org. Don't keep breaking them up (or distracting personnel on post) with new projects and wild ideas. And don't follow them so Simple Simon that there's no initiative ever displayed in handling Org problems. The best promotion channels are already built into the Org pattern.

B. UPGRADE STAFF STATUS

See that people want to work for the Org and make it a pleasant and happy thing to work for the Org. Stamp ruthlessly on propaganda that interferes with Org personnel procurement in the field.

Continuously hold up the proper image that staffs are made up of the better Scientologists and make it true. Make it worthwhile to be on staff. Arrange it so that a staff member has more status than a field Scientologist. Discourage the idea that a staff member is there "just to help out" as a favour. Permanent staff membership should be a coveted status and an enduring career. After all, we'll be running things one of these days. And who will we count on? Staff members of tried and proven record, of course. Get competent people on staff, give them status and hold them on staff. Don't go in for transience and see that they do their own job, not a lot of others. And treat them with courtesy and respect.

C. SERVICE

Be sure service gets rendered. The person trained must be well and interestedly trained and his or her problems in training handled. The person there for processing must be processed at the case level to get a win and processed interestedly and personally to a win. Tear the place apart if non-trained students drift off or non-winning pcs emerge from the HGC. Don't ignore these ever. Give good service. Give the people what they came for. Schedule their time briskly and oversee their progress alertly. Look at the students and pcs every week and see how they look and act accordingly.

D. MALCONTENTS

See that the place stays clear of entheta and natter. Use O/W liberally. Spot the spinning malcontent and do something energetic. Don't get reasonable about natterers. If they're hypercritical they have overts. If they have a real complaint they'd talk to the management, not everybody else. These people are just nuts and they spread disaster. They drive off all the good staff members and prevent new ones, yet there they stay nattering madly about things they don't understand and haven't read. As they drive off good personnel, if you don't watch it you wind up with only nuts. So the natterer is no light problem. Don't hire them in the first place, but if you do by accident, deep six them during the probation period provided. Don't fill up an Org with disaffected persons just because you have to have bodies. This is a tough one because at least half the people about are incapable of understanding what's going on but capable of howling like mad about it. They prevent work. They're just chaos merchants. Natterers that hang around an Org, with "an apartment nearby where all the students go" should be processed or shot from guns.

E. THE ATMOSPHERE OF AN ORGANIZATION

The Spirit of Scientology is one of help, a flippancy for the Authorities Who Know Best, a hope of getting onward, the one possible escape from the condemnation of this place. It doesn't include doubt and "I've an open mind" or reasonableness about those who would stop us. It's an aura of new horizons, a better life, an invitation out of the muck of all the mispent yesterdays. It's an offer to be born again. When it is discounted, played down, put alongside of psychology, medicine or self betterment Carnegies, it's being betrayed. The door is being closed on the millions. Omit playing my tapes, omit remembering why we're here, go into agreement with the idea we're just another Org like Murrays and you've had it. The atmosphere of Scientology is a lot more important than new buildings and modern furniture.

F. THE DANGEROUS ENVIRONMENT

Keep down the danger in the environment by actually winning steadily against it. As per Scientology Zero, don't increase it. Only the Merchant of Chaos does that. The natterer is obsessively selling a dangerous environment, trying to frighten others, trying to decry their belief in Scientology because it gets in the road of their desire to alarm and frighten others. Don't increase the danger in the staff member's environment by sudden firings, wholesale staff reductions, etc. It's the manager's job to find work for his staff to do, not reduce the staff to fit the work. Use job security, reassurance and nice steady wins to reduce the danger of the environment. Some day every Scientology Org will be sanctuary for any person within it by civil law. Just now, handle this by keeping morale up and winning against the outside. Don't fire or let off permanent staff members. Increase the volume of work to do. And laugh at these attacks. That's all such puny attacks deserve anyway, no matter the noise they make. The staff uncertain of its jobs, uncertain of the staying power of Scientology and the Org, cowed by raging executives and threats is in an apathy of no-work. One sweeping firing can wreck a

place for a year. One threatening Staff meeting can reduce work for weeks. Raise staff tone with raised security, good temper, wins they know about, and steady even if small progress against our enemies. And publish the wins so they don't come only on a rumour line. And boot out the Chaos Merchant-whose sole task is selling "dangerous, hopeless environment".

G. BODIES IN THE SHOP

Make sure that lots of bodies move through the shop, no matter whether they're spending or not. Just work all the time to move lots of bodies through the place. Don't let letter registrars drive them off with high prices threatened. Don't let reception turn everybody away. Hold open evenings and Sunday teas and tape plays and Congresses and Co-Audits, Move bodies through the shop in volume. The instinct unfortunately is to keep the place quiet and stop traffic. Don't let it happen. Just keep people pouring in and out, no matter how or for what. And your standard promotion lines if in place will get their shares of course sales and intensives and books. The manager's first job is not to "run an organization" but to see that bodies move through the shop and build an Organization to care for them and then to keep bodies moving through the shop and increase the body volume. All else, if other points here are in place, will follow. You can forecast any slump coming by a body count. When that public body traffic drops, watch it. Within a few weeks, there goes the unit.

Mail in the Mailbox is an index of how many bodies are going to be in the shop. Get large volumes of letters out and large volumes of answers. Any letters out are better than no letters out. Too much emphasis on quality of letters is just another way of excusing low mail volume. And will result in few bodies in the shop. Do your best to hold quality up and keep goofs down-but get mail pouring into the mailbox.

Get books avalanching into the public (your first line of reach, actually) and you'll have more bodies in the shop.

An Org is home to Scientologists. If you've no place for them to sit and talk or leave the shopping bag, you'll have closed the door on a lot more bodies in the shop. So field auditors prowl and steal pcs. All right, hang up a sign "We are not responsible for any bad results from cut rate co-auditing or processing not supervised by us."

Open the door with books, mail events and interest and keep it open. And you'll soon have a volume of bodies in the shop. *Then* accommodate the flow. And still keep the channels open for *new* bodies, no matter how crowded you get.

No Organization was ever solvent without bodies in the shop and channels for new bodies to put in the shop. However you get them in or why, do it. Concentrate hard on new traffic flow.

H. A HUBBARD SCIENTOLOGY ORG

This final bit is added not out of any pride or conceit or bid for loyalty. It has been consistently observed by many observers that when a place seems to be critical of or in dis-

agreement with Ron or cool toward his plans, the public falls rapidly away. No squirrel has ever survived. Treat a bust or a personal office of mine with disrespect and the public falls away. Apologize for my policies and the public stays off in droves. There's nothing of superstition about this. The public wants Scientology Ron's brand and they don't buy other brands. In thirteen years, every squirrel or disaffected or critical office has miserably failed.

The "we agree in most things with Ron but _____" sees the coat tails of the public, not their faces. Only recently a large office nearly crashed on this one alone. I repeat that this is no self-interested observation. It is just fact. "This office doesn't fully agree with Ron" is a sure trademark of failure. I can name nearly a hundred (independent, nearly all of them) failed centres who for all their work and often creditable actions, new furniture and exteriors, failed and failed hard on just that point. Just fail to keep the name plate on the door of my personal office bright, just let some student's critical remark about a tape go by and you've promptly got less public. Of course the one who discounts this point of success the most is already failing the worst. It's bad taste for me to mention it but it is true and has to be brought up in any monograph on the success of a Scientology office. I know of two or three million dollars spent and lost on forming offices because this was not appreciated as a factor in success – and this at times when Anti-Ron newspaper stories were at their peak!

Success in our times is measured by quantities and material gains. By our society's operational system, spiritual gains are often unobtainable in the absence of material things. However much you may regret this, we do live in this society and operate within its financial framework.

The manager's record before the board's eyes, whether he or she be Central Org or HCO, is considered basically successful or unsuccessful by measure of balance sheets. It is just a measure. Good income means good quarters, a cheerful staff, successful service and everything listed above in place. It means Scientology is winning. I do not receive direct benefit from that balance sheet. But I receive direct information from it. And the basic point, not forgiven by any other point, is that good and well done organizational Scientology is high volume and solvent Scientology. And all new appointments and changes in Org top personnel are made by the board with that point in mind.

Of course, you can sell Scientology short, grab a lot of money for no service and have an apparent solvency. But I have found that this takes about six months to catch up with an Org, at which time it starts to go broke in earnest in a soured community. All solvency is measured by yearly averages, not sudden spurts. Consistent income means all above points in.

I just thought you'd like to know. We're not in it for money. But solvency is our best broad yardstick of consistent service and high activity and the quality of management of any Org is judged accordingly.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:dr.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 5 MARCH 1965

Issue II

Remimeo

POLICY: SOURCE OF

According to Webster's New World Dictionary:

Policy: Political wisdom or cunning; diplomacy; prudence; artfulness. Wise, expedient or crafty conduct or management. Any governing principle, plan or course of action.

The last definition is the one we use. According to the World Book Encyclopaedia Dictionary, the one we most use (published by Field Enterprises Educational Corporation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, 54, Illinois, USA):

Policy: A plan of action; way of management. Practical wisdom; prudence. Political skill or shrewdness. Obsolete – the conduct of public affairs; government.

The sense in which we use policy is the rules and administrative formulas by which we agree on action and conduct our affairs.

A "policy letter" is one which contains one or more policies and their explanation and application.

It is issued by the **Hubbard Communications Office**, is written by L. Ron Hubbard or written (more rarely) for him, has the agreement of the International Board and is basic organizational law in organizations.

A "policy letter" is not Scientology org policy unless written or authorized by L. Ron Hubbard and passed as a resolution or covered by blanket resolution of the International Board and issued or published by an HCO. It is not policy if any of those steps are missing.

The International Board is composed of three Board Members, L. Ron Hubbard, Chairman, Mary Sue Hubbard, Secretary, and Marilyn Routson, Treasurer. It is the controlling board of Scientology.

The Chairman, **Hubbard Communications Office** and HCO Secretaries and staffs compose Division 1 of the International Board and all orgs.

The Secretary and all Organization Secretaries (US and Saint Hill) or Association Secretaries (Commonwealth and South Africa) and their staffs compose Division 2 of the International Board and all orgs.

The Treasurer, Assistant Treasurers, all accounting executives, and assistants for Material and their staffs compose Division 3 of the International Board and all orgs.

Policy for all divisions and orgs is made as above.

There are no other boards or board members, individual board members, officers or secretaries with the power of issuing policy. Boards issue Resolutions. Individual board members or officers can issue directives, general orders, and orders. These expire if not re-issued as policy.

Other officers issue Administrative Directives in place of policy letters but these may only forward policy.

Secretarial Executive Director orders apply mainly to personnel or local conditions, expire in one year if not stated to expire earlier, may only last one year in any event.

Policy letters apply broadly to all orgs and Scientologists without exception.

Almost all policy has been developed by actual experience.

The only way policy can be changed is by writing up a policy letter in full and sending it to L. Ron Hubbard for approval or disapproval.

Policies cover hats, duties, lines, procedures, rules, laws and all other aspects of Scientology activity except technology.

Technology is covered in HCO Bulletins.

HCO Bulletins are written by or (more rarely) for L. Ron Hubbard and are issued by HCO and HCO Secretaries. They do not require sanction by the International Board.

No one else may issue or authorize an HCO Bulletin.

HCO Bulletins are recommended technical data. Certificates are awarded on the data contained in them and violation of it can therefore cause a suspension of the certificate. This is the main power of the HCO Bulletin.

An HCO Bulletin becomes policy only if mentioned in a policy letter.

A book may become policy if made so by a policy letter.

HCO Policy Letters are printed or (more commonly) mimeographed in green ink on white paper. This colour combination may not be used for any other releases in Scientology. Reprinted policy letters sometimes appear in magazines in black ink on white paper but they are not the original.

HCO Bulletins are printed or mimeographed in red ink on white paper. This colour combination may not be used for any other purpose in Scientology. Reprinted HCO Bulletins sometimes appear in magazines in black ink on white paper but they are not the original.

Committees of Evidence are called for in any violation of the publishing or counterfeiting of an HCO Policy Letter or an HCO Bulletin or their colour combinations or signatures.

The only other official paper from L. Ron Hubbard and HCO is the HCO Executive Letter, usually a direct executive order or a request for a report or data or news or merely in-

formation. It is not policy but should be answered if an answer is requested. It is blue ink on green paper.

Using the colour combination for any other purpose or counterfeiting one calls for a Committee of Evidence.

Sec EDs and HCO Executive Letters are basically LRH comm lines but are used by International Board Officers also if authorized.

The other Divisions (2 and 3) have other means of comm, with other colour flashes.

If it is not in an HCO Policy Letter it is not policy.

HCO Policy Letters do not expire until cancelled or changed by later HCO Policy Letters.

No officer or Scientology personnel may set aside policy even when requesting revision.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jw.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 13 MARCH 1965
ISSUE III

Gen Non-Remimeo
DIVISIONS 1,2,3

THE STRUCTURE OF ORGANIZATION

WHAT IS POLICY?

The only reason anyone fights good policy is they're too stupid or too inexperienced in an org to understand it. Unable to grasp it, they are too lazy to work at trying. They miss words, don't see reasons, imagine situations are otherwise and in general can't grasp it. So they try not to use it or dream up their own. People with bad study histories can't grasp policy. For policy also follows the rules of study.

Therefore never put a person with bad study history on a key executive post. They can't grasp policy as they can't study it either.

Only personnel with quick study histories, fast passages through courses, can be counted on to put in an org or department pattern and keep it wheeling. The others are too involved in their own troubles and too imperceptive to be of any use in making an org boom.

Such people do however sometimes have a use even when not straightened up. They do well in pioneer areas where they have to do it all off the cuff and where their very inability to accept anything causes them also to refuse defeats and discouragements. Their inability to grasp a situation is often of benefit when bravery is required. This does not however excuse efforts to make them more capable and as they grow older and more experienced, they will also become brave and quick and *will* follow policy.

Following policy is a matter of grasping situations and knowing policy well enough to apply the right policy to the right situation – where no policy covers, an experienced, quick person can easily extend the idea of general policy to cover it, knowing it isn't covered.

The dull person has never even grasped basic general policy and so confronted with usual or unusual situations alike, can't find any policy to cover anything and so acts in any old way.

On the other hand, policy, to fit and be of benefit, must be itself born out of great insight and familiarity with the facts. Government policy is usually written by clerks who have never heard a shot fired in anger. Therefore almost all current government policy is completely silly. Nobody can apply it as it fits nothing and just gets everyone in trouble. Therefore a quick person with good judgement in the field and in the real situation can get through only by following his own policies and insights. This is easily mistaken for a dull person acting against policy that is good.

But even dull policies provide wide agreement as a basis for work co-ordination and so something happens on a larger scale. Individual policy making on every post is the defini-

tion of chaos. Thus even bad policy is usually more workable than individual policy and can make stronger orgs.

Brilliant policy based on experience of course can cause orgs to zoom.

We conclude then that where we see a person constantly off policy in an area that has worked well when on policy, that we must act.

Where we have a *large* organizational scope we must have workable policy that is followed. For just lacking policy good or bad and lacking its being followed, we stay small by definition.

No policy existing makes small non-expanding departments or orgs.

Policy good or bad existing but not followed makes chaotic departments or orgs and causes shrinkage. Good policy based on actual situations experienced followed well makes an expanding department, org or civilization.

The smaller the org, unit or department the less policy is needed. Reversely, the less policy is used the smaller will become the org, unit or department.

One can always safely assume, when policy is available, that non expansion is the direct result of the policy remaining unknown or not followed. The steps to take are therefore:

Expansion formula:

- 1. Provide good policy.**
- 2. Make it easily knowable.**
- 3. Be strenuous in making sure it is followed.**

This is the most broad possible formula for expansion.

Profitable expansion of a unit, department, org, company, empire or civilization depends utterly on the above formula being applied.

If it is well applied, literally thousands of other impeding factors drop into unimportance.

This applies to anything, even a person, but the bigger the number of individuals involved the more rigorously it has to be followed.

The bigger the size of the activity concerned (the more people involved in it) the more damage can result from failures to follow policy.

Thus orgs or companies which halt expansion mysteriously only need to have more policy, or to make policy more easily available or to be more vigorous in requiring it to be followed.

Policy is a guiding thing. It is composed of ideas to make a game, procedures to be followed in eventualities and deterrents to departures.

The basic policy of an activity must be the defining and recommending of a successful and desirable Basic Purpose.

Take a Navy, to get a more distant comparison. If a Navy has the Basic Purpose of defending a nation and its citizens and expanding their scope, and if the policy is the guiding principle behind all other policies and if these in turn are developed from experience and made known and followed, then oddly enough even new inventions or new philosophies of state could not prevent that Navy from doing its job and expanding the nation. The US Navy might very well have won the war with Japan in its six weeks if those who headed it in Washington had not been mere political puppets subject to every Congressional and Presidential whim. The text books were very clear about what the Navy should do. But King, Nimitz and Short, the Admirals involved, had been chosen by whim, favoritism and capacity for liquor, not by raw statistics of "good Navy activity". They had been trained at an Academy where the basic principles of "Good Navy" and raw statistics on personnel had not been used to choose an Academy head or Instructors. So King, Nimitz and Short, as Admirals *listened to current political rumours or whims* (being only confirmed in political not naval policy) and so let Pearl Harbour happen. How? Their own naval text books said "During times of negotiation with an unfriendly state, the position of the fleet should be at sea, whereabouts unknown." That is line one of the Navy textbook on Tactics and Strategy. Where was it? In Pearl Harbour during many days of hostile negotiation between Roosevelt and the Japanese – the most dangerous naval rival. Where were King and Nimitz? At a cocktail party with the politicians. Where was Short? Giving his all ashore, having given his men full weekend liberty and having ordered all ammunition stowed below for a coming Admiral's inspection. So Pearl Harbour could happen. But did the humans learn? No. True, Short, acting on his Washington orders notwithstanding, was removed and eventually court-martialed. But King and Nimitz took over the whole Navy for more than four heartbreaking years of "promote by political whim" "what policy?" and defeat in battle after battle until aircraft turned the tide of war and the army and an atom bomb finally finished it. Now the Navy is really no more. A few subs. A few patrol ships. The rest in mothballs. People think the Navy is small now because of new weapons. No, it is small because it (a) didn't clearly express its Basic Purpose, (b) didn't educate its people well in the policy it did have, (c) let political opinion shift it about, (d) chose its officers by rumour, cabal and social presence and (e) forgot its texts when the emergency loomed. Result, long war, now no Navy with anything – officers palling with men, ships in the bone yard. Could the Navy have done its job in 1941? Yes. Had its original policies regarding officer training and selection been followed ruthlessly despite all politics over the years. King, Nimitz and Short would not have been in charge or would have acted by policy had they been. The fleet would have been at sea during negotiations and the strike on Pearl Harbour would have been a Jap bust. The fleet would have been there to knock out the Jap in his own home ports. The war might have ended with Japan in the first six weeks. The point is not whether it is good or bad to have a Navy. The point is that here is an actual organization and an actual occurrence.

Therefore one can learn that:

An individual, species, organism, organization, to succeed, survive and expand in influence must have a formulated **Basic Purpose**.

To keep beings from growing, the reactive bank is almost entirely made up of false and booby trapped purposes. Thus we can see that, by its having been impeded so thoroughly in past ages, the idea of having a personal or organizational or group Basic Purpose is an extremely valuable one.

Without one expressed or unexpressed, a being or an organization or group without one doesn't grow but shrinks and becomes weak – in this universe nothing can remain long in an unchanging state. Given a potentially successful Basic Purpose that is acceptable to the being, organization or group, one can then formulate **policy**.

Policy is a rule or procedure or a guidance which permits the **Basic Purpose** to succeed.

The Basic Purpose runs through time. When it is impeded, distracted from, not complied with, thwarted or stopped, a state of failure of the Basic Purpose occurs in greater or lesser degree. Sometimes challenges to it cause it to strengthen but only when the challenges are consistently overcome.

A being, organism, organization, group or species or race *learns* in forwarding its Basic Purpose or meeting challenges to its Basic Purpose certain *lessons*. Certain procedures or courses of action, rules or laws were conceived at times of stress and some of them were successful. Those that were not successful or helped the opposition were *bad*. Those that were successful forwarded of course the Basic Purpose and were *good*.

The successful ideas or procedures that assisted the Basic Purpose were then dignified by the status of proper ideas, acts, procedure or *policy*.

Those that were unsuccessful in assisting the Basic Purpose became *bad policy*.

Ideas or procedures that distracted from or balked the Basic Purpose were called *offenses*.

Things, groups, other determinisms that challenged or sought to stop or refused to comply with the Basic Purpose became *enemies* or opposition.

Therefore *Policy* is derived from successful experience in forwarding the Basic Purpose, overcoming opposition or enemies, ending distractions and letting the Basic Purpose flow and expand.

Policy laid down which is thought up independent of experience in similar situations is either the result of great foresight and is successful or it is simply stupidity, in that it seeks to handle situations which will never exist or if they do, won't be important.

Policy based solely on bad rumours, unverified, which may or may not reflect actual existing conditions or which is laid down at the insistence of some self-interested person or minority without taking the rest of the group into account is very destructive policy simply because it does not match the conditions which actually exist and so, in *itself*, may impede or distract from the Basic Purpose. An example of this is legislation by legislators who, other-

wise uninformed, act because of pressure groups, minority riots or simply sensational press that seeks not legislation but simply to feed the appetite of a disaster hungry public.

If bad policy or laws or actions based on rumour rather than raw facts become too frequent and general, then the Basic Purpose of a being, organization or group becomes itself distracted, smothered and forgotten and the result is shrinkage, loss of power, death and oblivion. Although it is often too late when bad policies or pressure group laws have been the order of the day to slash them all from the books and exhume the Basic Purpose, the action of sweeping away unreal, inapplicable and impeding laws and policies which were based originally on rumour and bad sources can have the effect of rejuvenation on a being, a group or an organization which has begun to die. Periodic sweep-outs of antiquated and didactic laws (rather than general concepts and Sub-Purposes) must be undertaken by a being, organization, group or race or species. However, such an action must be carefully done, selecting only those laws or rules which came into being because of pressure groups or infrequent enemies or which were derived from no experience. And before throwing any policy away one must carefully examine its history to see if it is still restraining an enemy or forwarding some Sub-Purpose. For throwing away a lot of lessons could also collapse the forward thrust of the Basic Purpose which has "gotten this far for *some* reason."

Sub-Purposes are the purposes of the various sections or parts of the being, organism, group, race or species which forward the Basic Purpose. They must amplify, qualify and/or describe the action or procedure of the part of the whole in a brief and crisp way so as to hold them in function in their support of the Basic Purpose. They could also be called, the **purpose of a part of the whole**, or as we use them, the purpose of a post, unit, department or an org with a special function. When one hears of the **purpose** of his hat or section, unit, department, org or Division, he is observing the **Sub-Purpose** of a part of the whole organism which is vital to the action of forwarding the **Basic Purpose** of the movement. Indeed he may never know what the **Basic Purpose** really is and only know the **Sub-Purpose** of his own hat, section, unit or department. However, by studying the various **Sub-Purposes** of several hats or sections he could probably figure out the **Sub-Purpose** of the Department and by studying the various **Sub-Purposes** of the departments of an org he could probably guess at the **Basic Purpose** of the whole being or organization or movement. If study of **Sub-Purposes** either fails to locate any or ends in being unable to relate them into any large **purpose**, one is of course studying a disorganized movement.

One can change a **Sub-Purpose** (cautiously indeed) or add parts with new **Sub-Purposes**, and leave a movement (a) unaffected, (b) increased in scope, or (c) decreased in size and influence. One can, up to a point, add Policies on and on, limited only by the ability to get them known and leave an organization or movement (a) unaffected, (b) increased in readiness to meet emergencies, or (c) crippled. The wisdom of the policy and whether or not it was a successful solution to some actually possible confusion or crisis determines whether or not it should be added or deleted. Foresight plays a large role in formulating a **Sub-Purpose** or a Policy. These two are never wholly the product of chance or experience; indeed they may be 80% wise foresight and 20% experience and still be good useable **Sub-Purposes** or Policies. Twentieth Century Science sought to discount wisdom entirely and beings and organiza-

tions were educated or developed with no **Sub-Purposes** whatever and all policies were developed either by clerks, teachers or legislators inexperienced in any part of life or were taken from past experience only with no refinement of any wisdom. The failures of governments and systems and races in the first half of the Twentieth Century were wholesale and the wars frequent and senseless.

Personal, state, or organizational or social chaos results from adding parts with no well defined **Sub-Purposes**, enforcing Policies based on rumour or taken from the data of mere theoreticians in their ivory towers, an irresponsible press or legislators in their self-interested heads and smoke-filled rooms. A study of how the pressure groups, clerks, theoreticians and irresponsible press and duly elected but completely unselected and uneducated legislators destroyed individualism, states, businesses, civilizations and races would be only a study of how not to organize and survive, how to ignore, abandon or discredit all Basic Purposes, Sub-Purposes and successful policies. The scene was one of indescribable chaos that filled one with protest and dismay. If there was a wrong way to do things it became the order of the day and youth went into a complete apathy, purposeless and drifting and the world began to die a little each day, the mental hospitals became flooded, life ceased to be any fun at all. Things are not always like this and indeed don't have to be.

Mismanagement or misgovernment of self, an organization, group or state would then consist of failing to forward the **Basic Purpose**, not grasping and specifying **Sub-Purposes**, and not experiencing and formulating policies to strengthen successful ideas or actions that forward the **basic** and **Sub-Purposes** and impede ideas or actions that retard them and not recognizing actual enemies or oppositions or planning and carrying out successful campaigns to handle them. Failing in any of these actions the individual, group, organization, state, civilization, race or species will falter, fail and die.

Recognizing the Basic Purpose, supplementing it with Sub-Purposes for the parts of the whole, and learning and enforcing the policies which bring success, spotting actual enemies or oppositions and planning and carrying out campaigns to overcome them, removing distractions, rewarding the forwarding of Basic Purpose and Sub-Purpose and penalizing actions which retard, an individual, group, organization, civilization, race or species survives, gets better, lives on higher and higher planes.

The game of life has the formula of having and forwarding a Basic Purpose and supplemental Sub-Purposes.

This is done by the Formula of Policy which consists of:

1. Conceiving, recognizing, testing and codifying successful ideas, actions and procedures that forward the Basic Purpose and retard its opposition;
2. Making these policies known and in greater or lesser degree understood; and
3. Getting these policies followed.

If in (3) policy is to be followed, there must be discipline, but even more important, there must be ways of choosing personnel other than by sloppy rumour or social presence.

Personnel can only be chosen on raw statistics supported by ample data containing figures. If the raw data is good, then one assumes that Basic Purpose is being forwarded as it is meeting with success. The raw data already has a curve in it as it is tabulated against the success of basic policy. So the person whose raw data is good must have been forwarding Basic Purpose, therefore must be either a screaming genius at originating ideas that forward the Basic Purpose or a wizard at knowing, applying and following policy. Either way he or she is worth all the diamonds of Kimberley.

Such a person will inevitably rise in the organization or group if raw data alone is observed in selecting and promoting personnel.

If the person is a screaming genius at originating policy and has not made enough errors to reduce his successful raw data, and has stayed on-policy otherwise so as not to reduce the effectiveness of those around him, he will eventually rise to a level which makes policy and the whole organization will benefit. Similarly a person who grasps and follows policy very well and forwards the Basic Purpose well and who is very capable will sooner or later rise to a position of trust that safeguards against sweeping changes that will retard or crash the group or organization and so is vital at higher levels.

Out of these two general types of being one gets the leadership levels of a movement. But they will never arrive at all if those in charge ever use anything but statistics in judging them since their very success will cause enough cabal to influence high levels against them if these high levels ever use fragmentary rumours or opinions in handling personnel.

Raw data means assembled but otherwise unevaluated data. It is "uncooked" and "unflavoured" and "untouched by human hands". It, in short, is uncontaminated or unchanged data. It is native and natural and unspoiled. And the only data that answers those qualifications is statistical data. "How many or how few and how much or how little in what time." That is the only data that a senior official in a group, organization or state ever dare use in selecting and promoting personnel.

The "state" of the person, the "result of his tests", "the examination figure" are all useless to a senior official deciding upon who to promote or pass over. His decision will be wrong in exact proportion that he permits opinion to enter and raw data to drop out.

Introducing opinion into personnel selection is a study of "how crazy can one get". How much liquor a man can hold, how acceptable socially is his wife, his breath, his taste in ties are all completely disrelated data. For how does anyone know at the top really what the environment is now like at the bottom? Maybe that lovely music room-board room requires a pink necktie, a purring wife and endless capacity for drink, but is that the organization's environment? It is not! Maybe the organization's environment demands an allergy to liquor, a complete tart for a wife, overwhelming breath and neon ties. And maybe tomorrow's board level will too! The world changes, it does not become softer. Only some people do.

The psychiatric or school test alike are written and administered by people in ivory towers who again have no contact with the organization's real environment. Statistical as they may try to be, such tests are utterly worthless. They are not on-the-job statistics. They are classroom or laboratory statistics. They are definitely cooked data. And when used for per-

sonnel and promotion they cook a lot of careers. And by putting eggheads on post, they cook a lot of parts of an org if not the whole thing. They have some small value in determining someone's quickness or slowness, but the conditions are too unreal and the necessity level of real environmental emergency is missing. It's like a plane crash synthesized in bed. No jolt. So, poor (but not the worst) of cooked data.

Maybe the working environment demands a dumb guy who is too slow to panic at awesome futures! Yet bright enough to see what policy applies. When men with small experience in it can qualify to run the world, they can only then administer tests to advise who should run it.

Only statistics that represent action and accomplishment are fair tests of ability and who deserves promotion or the gate.

Therefore the only organization that is a sound organization is one **whose every activity** can be tabulated by statistics.

If you wish to reorganize you must do so with an eye toward "Can this post (dept or Division) be statisticized?" Any body of people such as "the typing pool" or "the instructors" must be broken down to individuals one way or another. One has three things then that must be tabulatable: (a) the individual, (b) the part and (c) the whole. Each of these must be so organized as to be capable of being seen through accomplishment or lack of it. Only this is fair organization. All other types are unfair, will not select out leaders or good workers and subject these to the enturbulence of the lazy or those with other philosophies to fry.

If you have any other type, people are promoted or fired by rumour, back-biting or common brag and either type has only liability. In using them one destroys empires and every great civilization that is dead died because opinion and rumour were the key causes of personnel changes.

It is unfair to every decent staff member to have an org that cannot be tabulated by relative income, work or traffic.

The common way of the dead and dying past was to put some fellow in charge and then shoot him or reward him if things went wrong or well and neglect the rest. This works unless a society only protects the man at the bottom and routinely weakens the man at the top. When that happens, the system is useless. Only by chance do things go well. So chance is added to rumour as the means of promotion or the gate. No wonder the Asiatic, a member of our oldest civilizations, says "Fate!" and explains it all. He had too many rulers who ruled by rumour or chance or didn't rule at all. And so the power died. Only when you can find out who did which or why can you be just. And only when an organization can be fully viewed top to bottom through raw data of how much or how little an individual can be rewarded and individual nuisance be weeded out.

REALITY

Reality in policy, in orders, in advice depends upon either great insight or great experience. Combining both gives great success.

But no matter how great the insight may be, viewing the actual condition is a vital step to resolving it. Remote solutions not based on experience or close inspection are usually unreal.

Therefore no orders should ever be issued without data and experience and insight. Data comes from tabulation of actions and amounts in organizations. Experience comes from working in similar or parallel situations. Insight comes from the ability to observe coupled with the courage to see and the wit to realize without any thought of personal importance.

Therefore, the soundest leadership comes from the most extended experience and intimate knowledge of that or parallel circumstances. Leadership without this will lack judgment.

Remote leadership is best when it itself is involved close to its hand with the same problems. Therefore remote leadership must have under it similar organizational problems and traffic at home that exist at the remote point. Then understanding is quick and solutions are real.

For one organization to command another, they must be similar.

Management labour problems evolve from the communication formula "Cause-Distance-Effect with Intention at cause, Attention at effect, and Duplication". A board room is not a machine shop. The machinists seek to duplicate the board or refuse to. If they fail to they always refuse to. Thus only a working org of similar pattern can command a working org.

The commanded org will always seek to follow the pattern of the commanding org and duplicate what it thinks the commanding org consists of. A great tension exists at all points of non-duplication. This tension stems from the effort to duplicate. If foiled trouble or breakage will occur at that point. Where the subordinate org is unable to duplicate what it thinks exists at the senior org then it suffers an ARC break of greater or smaller magnitude. Patterns, officer authority, comm lines, all must be similar. Size is not important in this. Org pattern is. If the subordinate org has any hope of ever attaining the size, and if the purposes, pattern and policies are the same, that is enough. ARC will remain high, execution will be good and expansion is assured, providing of course that the Basic Purpose is good in the first place.

EXPANSION

All that is needed to expand an org or its business, given a good Basic Purpose and an area to expand into is the knowledge of the expansion formula:

Direct a channel toward attainment, put something on it, remove distractions, barriers, non-compliance and opposition.

The basic formula of Living (not Life) is:

Having and following a Basic Purpose.

Thus expansion is an increase in living. To increase living and raise tone and heighten activity one need only apply the expansion formula to living. Clean away the barriers, non-compliance and distractions from the Basic Purpose and reduce opposition and the individual or group or org will seem more alive and indeed will be more alive.

All an executive has to do to expand a part or the whole of an org is to divine the Basic Purpose, divine or issue the Sub-Purposes, point out an area to expand into and then remove the distractions from, barriers to and non-compliance with the Basic Purpose, and Sub-Purposes and put something on the channels that augments existing impulses and expansion will begin. It will be successful to the degree that the Basic Purpose is good, the Sub-Purposes real and the policies are taken from real experience and interpreted by persons facing similar current problems.

By the process, thereafter, of just removing barriers, distractions and non-compliance expansion can be accelerated to a point where it overwhelms all hostile efforts to contain it and the result is extremely gratifying in terms of expansion at velocity. It seems completely magical. For life instantly appears.

One must remember to channel a Basic Purpose. A channel has two boundaries, one on either side of it. These must exist in an org. They consist of discipline of those who would distract or stray or wander or who help the opposition or suppress the Basic Purpose or Sub-Purposes or who cannot seem to learn or comply with policies or orders. Discipline must only be aimed at the above and where it is random or doesn't serve to channel, then it itself is a distraction or a barrier and will breed non-compliance. But when entirely absent the force is let to wander and expansion does not occur. Discipline must be precise, known, uniformly applied and inevitable when the rules are broken. Those who do their job welcome it as it helps keep others from preventing them from working or acting or complying or getting their own jobs done.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jw.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 23 APRIL AD 15

Remimeo
All Staff Hats
Sthil Staff
Exec Hats

All Divisions

Use: Executives should keep a stack of these 23 Apr AD 15 Pol Ltrs near their desk and staple one to every despatch or report received which violates it. Circle para violated and return to staff member.

(Changes HCO Pol Ltr on CSW slightly in that conclusions or solutions are no longer acceptable from a junior to a senior, only data.)

PROBLEMS

The most senior organizational policies there are follow:

1. **Never** solve the problem any junior presents to you. **Never never never never never never.**
2. **Always** investigate for the true cause of the trouble. **Always always always always always always.**
3. **Solve** only the problem you find after very careful investigation of the whole matter and after you have examined all possible causes of the problem.
4. **Never** solve a problem that has already been solved in general policy.
5. **If** someone thinks the policy is wrong or is itself the source of the problem then (a) he or she must be made to fully read the policy (b) demonstrate what it is supposed to solve (c) look over the problem he or she thinks the policy is wrong on to find the actual causes of the problem he or she is trying to solve.

The primary aberration in situations that are being mishandled is:

6. The person is unable to recognize source.

Example: A person A sees another B drop a wall mirror and break it. A puts in a purchase order specifying thicker glass. B next day drops a chair down steps and A puts in a PO for new stair carpeting. B a week later runs a car into a wall and A proposes a different design

for the wall. If this kept on and B was never singled out by A or A's seniors, then dozens of unusual solutions are entered into the org, not just POs but policy changes as well! Why? A is "below source" and doesn't recognize the causes of his problems. Therefore his solutions are alter-is of existing situations and result in alter-is of tech, policy and orders. Soon the area around A is in a complete confusion. What about B? He probably generalizes with "they said" "everybody knows" etc on entheta and so remains "invisible" behind his generalities. B can be spotted best by damage reports whenever damage occurs. As they are filed as a statistic in B's file, it soon becomes a visible datum. The cause of confusion in A's area is not A. It is A's inability to perceive *causes*. Thus any system which isolates actual causes disentrubulates a group and makes unusual solutions unnecessary and only then can policy *go in*.

Therefore we get some other very senior org policies:

7. **Never** accept a conclusion from a junior. **Never**.
8. **Always** demand facts of a junior. **Always**.
9. **Never** take a generality from a junior.
10. **Always** challenge any conclusion a junior offers.
11. **Never** act on a junior's data until you have fully investigated the situation.
12. **Always** investigate until you find the basic policy violation that started the problem in the first place.

TECHNICAL

13. Making Scientology work on pcs and students is the **only** way you can salvage org situations.
14. If Scientology is not applied exactly per HCOBs and tapes technical will "go out" and within a few months the area will be spinning with unusual solutions.
15. The fastest way for a technical executive to become overworked is to violate the policies in this policy letter.
16. The fastest way for a technical executive to get into trouble and a mess is to accept an auditor's conclusions and propose a solution.

Example: An instructor says, "Process R00⁶ doesn't work on certain cases. When these cases come on course could I please order them to Review auditing?" Serious blunder by a senior, "Yes." Why? Because the instructor isn't capable of spotting an ARC Broken student – can't confront ARC Breaks. Therefore quite often the instructor lets R00 be run on an ARC Broken student. The correct technical executive action, and the **only** correct one on receiving

⁶ Note: R00 is the process on Grade 0, Grade Zero Quads 0-0

such a report, is to promptly personally investigate. Investigation even of the students' case folders would disclose that the instructor ignores ARC Breaks from comm cycle blunders by new student auditors, that the instructor won't give ARC Break assessments (who else could give one on a Zero Level course?) but sometimes runs R6 EW on the students under the guise of "an assist for a misunderstood word". I think that's enough trouble to get the instructor's senior into a hurricane of trouble if only from blown students and no new enrolments! (This is an actual example. The final result was a Comm Ev for the technical executive and the instructor, the first for proposing and alter-ising policy and technology, the second for forcing auditing [rather than doing assessments] on Zero Level students. The Comm Ev had to be ordered at the request of their tech senior because neither would accept orders to remedy the above conditions but just kept on fouling up students.)

NON-COMPLIANCE

18. If you think for one moment that a staff member who won't or can't follow clear, definite policy, will follow your orders either, you dream.
19. The first thing you know about an off-policy type personnel is that none of your instructions are being carried out either, usual or unusual.
20. Look, if they can't apply vividly clear policy, they sure can't apply a brief order.

SUMMARY

21. You can conclude that where you have a personnel who cannot perceive the causes of things you will have a continual spinning mess. None of the problems presented for solution are the actual problems that exist. In A and B above, the problem presented was "How to get more durable things." This could not be solved because it was the wrong problem and didn't exist. The right problem was "How to get B to stop breaking everything in sight." A senior, not seeing B at all (not being around B), accepting a problem and a conclusion from a junior (A) soon is involved in endless discussions over "How to get more durable things." This never solves. Because it wasn't the problem. Further, any order the senior gives A is also never put into effect without wild alter-is. Why? A, unable to see sources, can't see the senior as a source either and really takes his orders from anyone who comes along! Students, pcs, the garbage man.
22. The basic problem of management then is the problem of cause blindness. People in the org who cannot see cause cannot solve problems, for to solve a problem one must see what is causing it!
23. And the solution to all this lies in the policies in this policy letter.
24. And auditing people up to an ability to perceive and perceive the causes of things is the primary solution to all problems.
25. Until you get them there you use any mechanism necessary to follow orders. Only in that way will they ever make it.

26. When tech goes out, when HCOBs aren't followed or tapes known and used exactly, the Road Out is blocked.
27. Nobody has any right to a bank.
28. For when they are permitted such a right they block the road for the rest.
29. The only person you could completely trust is a Clear. And unless the clear is also trained in Scientology tech and admin also you could never accept his vote on org matters. That's the truth. And that's why we're going to make it all the way.
30. If we're determined we will make it, we will make it.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ml.rd

(Note: By Organizational Policy is meant that policy which makes the organization into an organization and keeps its flows fast and its design uncomplicated. In absence of these policies the design becomes altered and flows cease and the org dies.) [Note: The mimeo issue of this Policy Letter and the First Edition of Volume 0 skipped the number 6 in the numerical sequence. The text above and the earlier texts are identical; only the numbering has been altered to include the skipped 6.]

[Note: The mimeo issue of this Policy Letter and the First Edition of Volume 0 skipped the number 6 in the numerical sequence. The text above and the earlier texts are identical; only the numbering has been altered to include the skipped 6.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 16 MAY 1965

Issue II

Gen Non-Remimeo

HCO Div 1
Dept Insp & Rpts (Dept 3)
Ethics Section

INDICATORS OF ORGS

Just as pcs have indicators so do orgs.

There is a probable long list of Good Indicators. When these are present, Ethics is quiet and hangs onto an interrogation, etc only long enough to get policy and technology in.

There is a probable long list of **Bad** Indicators. When these are present Ethics becomes industrious in ratio to the number of bad indicators.

The first indicators, Good or Bad, are Statistics – the OIC graphs for units, sections, departments, divisions and the org. When these are rising, the rise is a **Good Indicator**.

When these are falling the fall is a **Bad Indicator**.

The second of these indicators, good or bad, is **Technical Gains**. When technology is in cases are gaining. This is a Good Indicator. When technology is out, cases are losing. This is a Bad Indicator.

Ethics only exists to hold the fort long enough and settle things down enough to get technology in. Ethics is never carried on for its own sake. It is pushed home only until technology is functioning and then technology resolves matters and Ethics prowls off looking for other targets.

We don't hang people because we started to hang them and so must do so. We start to hang people and keep right on tying the noose in a workmanlike fashion right up to the instant we can get tech in – which of course makes the noose unnecessary.

But if tech never does get in then we complete the hanging.

You will find if you label a Suppressive you will some day get him back and get tech in on him. If you don't ever label they wander off and get lost.

Labelling as a Suppressive is our hanging.

When things are bad (Bad Indicators heavily visible) putting a body on the gallows is very salutary. We call it "Putting a head on a pike". Too many **Bad** Indicators and too goofed

up a situation and we must put a head on a pike. Then things simmer down and we can begin to get tech in.

That's the whole purpose of Ethics – to Get Tech **in**. And we use enough to do so, to get correct standard tech in and being done.

When there are lots of bad indicators about – low and falling statistics, goofed cases, we get very handy with our Interrogatories and put the place very nearly under martial law – we call this a State of Emergency. Once Emergency is declared, you usually have to put a head or two on a pike to convince people that you mean it. After that necessity level rises and the place straightens up. If an Emergency is continued beyond a reasonable time, we resort to very heavy discipline and Comm Ev the executives who wouldn't get off it.

Ethics, then, is applied to the degree required to produce the result of getting tech in. Once tech is really in on a person (with a case gain) or a tech division, let us say, and auditors actually audit standard processes by the book, we know it will resolve and we ease off with Ethics.

Ethics, then, is the tool by which you get Good Indicators In by getting tech in. Ethics is the steam roller which smooths the highway.

Once the road is open we are quite likely to skip remaining investigation and let it all be.

But somebody promising to be good is never good enough. We want statistics. Bettered statistics.

SYMPTOMS OF ORGS

Orgs have various symptoms which tell us how things really are Ethic-wise.

One of these is Dilettantism.

DILETTANTE-ISM

Dilettante = One who interests himself in an art or science merely as a pastime and without serious study.

In an org, this manifests itself with "people should live a little." "One needs a rest from Scientology." "One should do something else too." All that kind of jazz.

It also manifests itself in non-consecutive scheduling, part-time students, "because things are different in this town and people can come only two nights". Ask what they do with other nights. Bowling. Horse-racing.

Boy, you better mark the case folders of staff. You have a Suppressive aboard. Maybe six.

Scientology, that saves lives, is a modern miracle, is being compared to bowling. Get it?

That org or portion just isn't serious. Scientology is an idle club to it, an old lady's sewing circle. And to somebody, selling training and auditing are just con games they put over on the public.

SUPPRESSIVES!

Root them out.

Wild Rumours – This Symptom is caused by Potential Trouble Sources. Find whose case roller-coasters (gets better, gets worse). Investigate. You'll find a Suppressive or two outside the org.

Put a head on a pike with an HCO Ethics Order and publish it widely.

ARC Broken Field – The Johannesburg Comm Ev Order of last week is a perfect method of handling the situation. Appoint a Comm Ev Chairman to inquire into matters and form a list of interested parties based on reports he will now receive.

Bad Tech – When results just don't happen in the Academy, HGC or Review one or another, look for the Potential Trouble Sources and Suppressives. Only they can keep tech out. Put a big head on a pike and then begin to interrogate every slip in the place. Suddenly Tech is in again.

There are many such symptoms.

At the root of every bad condition will be found a suppressive person.

Locate your Potential Trouble Sources by locating passers of rumours, etc. Then locate the Suppressive and shoot.

Calm reigns. Tech is in.

And that's all one means to accomplish.

Today **technology works on every case**. If the local org can't handle a case, Saint Hill can.

If you get tech in well enough in an org, tech handles all. Beautifully. But if it is out, only Ethics can bat down the reasons it can't be gotten in.

OPTIMUM STATE

The optimum state of an org is so high that there is no easy way to describe it. All cases getting cracked, releases and clears by the hundreds, command of the environment. Big. That's an optimum state for any org.

If it isn't rising toward optimum today, it is locally being held down.

The viewpoint of Ethics is there is no adequate reason why an org is stumbling except Ethics reasons. Let others take care of any other lacks. Ethics never gets reasonable about lack of expansion. If Ethics shoves hard enough others will get a high enough necessity level to act.

So when an org is low:

Find out where its statistics are down and who is a PTS or an SP and *act*.

That's the job of Ethics. Thus little by little we take off the brakes for a cleared Earth.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:wmc.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 13 OCTOBER 1965

Remimeo
All Executives

**DEV-T DATA –
EXECUTIVE RESPONSIBILITY**

Executives may not OK anything done or to be done below their level unless their immediate junior has also stated or attested with initial that it is OK.

Unless one can fix responsibility for actions there is no responsibility anywhere and the whole show goes to pot.

Never let a junior say, "Is this OK?"

Always require the junior to state or initial, "This is Okay" on all work, actions or projects.

An organization permitting a lot of "Is this OK?" will soon go to pieces. Things are or aren't OK. Make them say so. Hang them if it's a false attestation.

"Is this okay?" is Dev-T and should be chitted as such.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ml.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 28 FEBRUARY 1966

Remimeo
Exec Sec Hat
Sec Hats
LRH Comm Hat
Director Hats

DANGER CONDITION DATA
WHY ORGANIZATIONS STAY SMALL

The size of an organization depends upon this law:

A large organization is composed of groups. A small organization is composed of individuals.

If you really understand this principle and use it properly you will be able to have a large organization.

There are other factors such as (1) the desirability and quality of one's commodity, (2) the able promotion of it, (3) the ability of the heads of groups in the organization to catch dropped balls and (4) the close following and comprehension of the policies of the organization and its groups.

But the gross monitoring law is as above. When one does not know this and apply it one has a small, semi-bankrupt organization that overworks everyone and underpays.

This rule applies to a planet or a nation and is most readily seen in these gross terms. A planet with nations will be far more prosperous than a planet with one central government governing the individuals of a planet.

Socialism fails (and it always fails) because of two factors:

- (a) The government seeks to run the individual, and
- (b) Socialism unmocks *companies*.

At this writing the prosperity difference (and there is one, Russia currently starving) between the democracy of the US and England and the Super Socialism of Russia is that the "West" still has companies and the "East" (Russia and China) have abolished them. Russia seeks to run the individual. It has collective farms, etc., but they won't leave a manager alone – to manage – they govern his workers.

To the degree that England and the US tax the individual and seek to govern him they will dwindle in size.

England at this writing is undergoing one unmock of the whole empire solely because it is by-passing the manager and the governor and directly seeking to govern individuals through income tax, "benefits", etc.

The US is about to come to pieces. Like all big countries on the way out it never looks so good as when it is already about to fall apart. The US is by-passing the states and US companies and is therefore putting the governors, managers and the states and companies in Danger Condition. This, unrepaired, will unmock states and companies and collapse the sub-group on which the big group called the US depends for an organization is composed of groups. Non-Existence is the Condition just below Danger. A Danger Condition carried on too long drops down scale to non-existence. A large group made up of non-existences is of course non-existent itself. Thus by-pass by the heads of a big organization of the heads of its internal small organizations works toward non-existence. It is really quite simple. To make an organization get smaller all one has to do is by-pass the sub-groups and run the individuals only and the org will collapse or struggle along at near-collapse **no matter how bright its manager may be or how hard he or she works or how bright the staff is, or how good the product**, the violation of the law in the second paragraph will decay.

Fantastic, isn't it?

All one has to do to make an organization grow is apply the law that a large organization is composed of groups. It is **not** composed of individuals.

In absolute proof of this, in a tiny org it is always observed that everyone there wears each one all the hats. It is a madhouse of individual cross-endeavour. Show me an org that stays small and I will show you an org where every staff member is wearing all the hats in the place. They can't grow because they violate the law that a large organization is composed of groups.

Russia, just yesterday sweeping the world has begun to lose ground and her empire withdraws. Russia won't allow companies. She *never says* to the head of Georgia "Get your statistics up, bub" and leaves him to it. Instead she governs the Georgian individual with spies, secret police and even income tax and is more apt to shoot the head of Georgia if his statistics do rise as he is then looked on by a paranoid central government as capable enough to be a menace. Russia once governed via cells and did so as long as she was expanding. Now she has Income tax! Russia expanded despite bad management solely because she was composed of cells and collectives – but she went too far and erased the individual entirely, so, though growing she starves. Her groups were mainly dedicated to politics, not production, which is a frailty of governments anyway. But the basic group is composed of individuals. (For heaven's sakes don't tell Russia as we don't want her growing – tell her she must govern her individuals individually and she'll vanish. You can tell the US, if you like, but only because no president yet ever listened to anything except his popularity poll and with only a four year career, isn't likely to. In the US, the government itself vanishes regularly and only the companies, with plenty of interference, keep the civilization going.)

England's sad old empire was great as long as India was run by the East India Company, etc. etc. Its colonies and dominions did fine right up to the moment the government in Westminster and Whitehall started to run the natives as individuals, by-passing the company controlled colonies. Then the "Empire" started to go broke because it never was a political empire but a commercial one. As a political empire it uniformly failed until about 350 years ago it began to charter companies to rule and govern foreign lands. Then it got an "empire".

When it began to by-pass its company heads and set up crown controlled governors and then by-pass these it ceased to be an English Empire and it looks today that soon there won't even be an England. It could not control even one colony the moment it started to govern individual colonial citizens on a by-pass of the colonial companies.

You can use the same argument they use. That "concentrating only on groups is hell on the individual". Marx used that line. Well it isn't true. When you get too big a group the individual in it, suffering the whole pressure of the state suffers. The reverse is true – "by concentrating only on groups the individual is protected and prospers".

Now we get to the philosophic question in the law, how large is large, how small is small.

Oddly this is easily answered, unlike most philosophic conundrums. You have to have the answer to "how big should a group be in order for the individuals in it to be effectively managed without oppression in order to get the job done". That asks and answers it. A correct group size is one where the individuals in it are not made too small by the group being too large. This is a ratio question. The Government of England! and the individual Englishman are of incomparable magnitude. What the hell can Joe Cockney a citizen do against the Government of England! Nothing! So Joe Cockney goes to pieces. You can't have a comm line between a Billion horsepower motor and one grasshopper! Something is going to explode and it isn't the Billion h.p. motor. It's the grasshopper. Therefore when the management unit is too big the individual (despite all the protection laws in the world) becomes apathetic and can't work or doesn't see himself as important enough to bother about.

So what is a proper sized basic group?

A group is a proper size when the individuals in it can easily approach the manager of that group on a familiar friendly basis and be sure he knows what they're doing and why and if they're doing it.

The individual in that group is not oppressed. His charm counts. He feels up to arguing with that manager. The executive (with a deputy on his side) feels up to confronting the rest of the group. His own personality counts.

The only reason you have strikes and labour unions is that this group law has been violated. Too many individuals in the group for them to know intimately their manager on a friendly co-operative basis.

This is all Marx is about. Marx is really a protest against too big a group solved by creating a protective state (an overwhelmingly large group) that "rescues" the individual! So Communism is a mess. For by making a state group one overwhelmed the individual and sure enough the only criticism of Communism that a Communist will tolerate is that it has too big a "bureaucracy" by which he means too big a government for an individual to confront. Communism goes even further. It abolishes the individual utterly! It *forces* him to be a group. And that is very bad for individuals are the building block of the small group. So Marx neither knew nor solved the basic, problem of government. He didn't know the above 2 laws about organizations and groups so Communism, supposed to solve individual oppression, is the most individually oppressive form of Government on this planet.

How many individuals can effectively compose a group?

It depends on the ability of the manager to handle men on an individual basis. This varies. But such men or women as can handle a large number are very, very rare. So we take a *safe* answer.

A fairly safe answer is six – the manager of the group plus five individuals, one a deputy manager.

This is determined by the answer to this question:

How many subordinates are you willing to work with on the job? Five others is about all you'd care to stretch it. Two others would be too comfortable – even too dull. But you can stretch it up to five.

Thus we could stretch out an org composed of groups of six persons – a manager, a deputy and four – making 6 maximum in each group.

And you now have the size of the largest building blocks it takes to make a big org. Six persons in each.

If we pyramid this we have (each maximum):

- 5 staff members and their In-Charge as a unit;
- 5 units and the section executive in a section;
- 5 sections plus the department's director in a department;
- 3 departments and the secretary, a deputy and a communicator in a division;
- 4 divisions in a portion and the Org Exec Sec and a deputy and a personal sec;
- 3 divisions and the HCO Exec Sec plus her deputy and a personal sec in the HCO portion.

Or with a full Exec Division set up:

- 4 ES Comms in an Office for the Org Exec Sec and a personal sec;
- 3 ES Comms in an Office for the HCO Exec Sec and her personal sec.

But we build *downwards* by groups of six if we expand further, rarely exceeding 5 and an Executive.

You see then that the moment the HCO Exec Sec starts handling Address in Charge, the jump is too great as it puts Address in Charge up against the equivalent of the total executives of units and sections of HCO! It makes his group too big. It makes him too small (being such a small part). He gets rattled, feels oppressed, tends to snarl because he is overwhelmed – his group is too big so he is too small. Simple as that.

So long as an Executive only handles 2, 3, 4, 5 people he *can* handle his job because they know him. The people under him can handle *their sub-groups* so long as they contact only 2, 3, 4, 5 people and themselves.

For instance, so long as there are only 5 Continental Orgs, Exec Sec Communicators will feel comfortable, providing the Continental orgs have each 2, 3, 4, 5 orgs under them and have in their turn ES Communicators.

So proper organization for expansion builds in blocks of 6 maximum – 5 + an executive. That can be 5 groups plus an Executive as you go up or 5 staff members plus an executive as you go to the bottom.

Wherever this is violated the organization (whether a nation or a company or us) will dwindle. Where it is kept, the organization will grow.

I warn you that 5 plus an executive sized groups is hard work, even a strain at times, but it can be done. 6 or 7 + an executive is quite too much. And a Government vs Joe Doakes is a complete smash as Joe is only maybe 1/70,000,000th as big as the Government!

So never by-pass. Completely aside from the true mechanics of the Danger Formula where by-pass results in non-existence, it is hell on the Executive *and* every member of the organization to have continual violation of the maximum groups size.

If an executive feels overworked, even with all Dev-T cared for and policed, then that executive has below him violations of group size *and is* by-passing some point that should have an executive below him, with a group under that executive. The overworked executive is trying to handle more than five other people directly. (Five staff members or five group executives.)

It's like boxes in boxes in boxes. But in this case 6 boxes at the most fit comfortably.

If a department has 8 sections under its director, then we have to group the sections by giving the Director 2 who each control 4 sections. This is a very comfortable director for he has a group of 2 + the director. He can loaf. But his assistants will sweat. So add 1 assistant and divide the department's sections into 3 groups, 3, 3 and 2 and you will have a more efficient department.

That's the way you juggle it about to prevent overwork by Executives and overwhelm of individuals.

If you want to increase efficiency on a 5 + executive group, always make one of the 5 a deputy and slightly senior to the other 4. The four can then approach the deputy to see if they should approach the executive on matters they feel uneasy about. This adds a gradient.

There are various ways to juggle this about. An executive with 7 sections can take 3 himself and give a deputy 4, etc. Lots of ways to do it but just stay at or below 1 + 5 if you can.

The senior to the group exec is not counted as a member of the group.

Here and there we violate this. A Comm Ev is not as acceptable as a Hearing because one person faces more people. Jury trials are a horrible strain and a cruelty because one has to face about 14 people! (Judge, prosecutor, jury.) Too many!

So those are the laws which underlie organization.

But you can have it all on the org board and not practise it and collapse. If an Exec Sec is approaching 15 staff members past their executives, it can wreck the place as the staff members go into apathy, the secretaries go into non-existence and bang! no org.

So completely aside from Danger Condition, violations of *following* proper group organization will bring any organization, a planet, a state, an org, into a mess.

This is what underlies the decline and fall of civilizations: the state begins to govern the individual!

An organization is composed of groups not individuals. And that truth followed and practised in the flesh as well as on paper will bring about a happy civilization, a happy nation and a flourishing org.

SUMMARY

A large organization is composed of groups, a small one is composed of individuals.

The primary difference between the opulent West and the starving East is that the West still permits companies. This means to some extent the Western nations are composed of groups so they are still somewhat successful.

A group is a proper size when the individuals in it can easily approach the manager of that group on a friendly basis and be sure he knows what they are doing and why and if they are doing it.

More than 5 persons plus their executive tends to be too large a group.

The persons under an executive can of course be executives of groups. And the five persons below each of *those* executives can be executives of groups.

If things aren't organized this way the *individual* is crushed. The executive is crushed by overwork and the persons under him are overwhelmed.

By-pass of an executive, aside from putting him in danger, overwhelms the members of his group and makes them do less and makes them feel attacked and lessens their sense of their own power.

2 + an executive is also a group but the executive is not really working to capacity.

With all Dev-T cared for an executive will be overworked if he is over more than four subordinates.

The principal reason orgs stay small is no matter how fancy their org boards they do not actually practise what is on the board but by-pass or pay no real attention to command lines and so in actual practice are only one or two oversized groups – which results in them

staying small and being overworked and also underpaid as their system in actual practice is inefficient.

The moral is, practise proper grouping as provided by the org pattern, never by-pass and so expand and have a happy staff.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 6 NOVEMBER 1966
Issue I

Remimeo

ADMIN KNOW-HOW
STATISTIC INTERPRETATIVE

STATISTIC ANALYSIS

The subject of making up statistics is probably well known. How one draws one. But the subject of what they mean after they are drawn is another subject and one which executives should know well.

Things are not always what they seem in statistics.

BACKLOGS

A backlog caught up gives one a high soaring statistic which promptly slumps. To call the soar affluence and the slump emergency is an executive error.

When you see a leaping and diving pattern on something that can be backlogged you can be very sure it has been.

This activity is working in fits and starts, usually only occasionally manned.

For a long time, nothing is done or counted, then suddenly a month's worth is all counted in one week.

So when you see one of these draw a line halfway between peaks and depressions, more or less the same distance from each and you can then read the statistic as rising or falling.

CAUSATIVE STATISTICS

In any set of statistics of several kinds or activities, you can always find one or more that are not "by luck" but can be directly caused by the org or a part of it.

An example is the "Letters Out" and "Completions".

Gross Divisional Statistics. Whatever else is happening, the org itself can improve these as they depend only on the org, not on "fate".

So if you see the gross divisional statistics generally down or going down for the last couple or three weeks and yet see no beginning upsurge in the current week in "Letters Out"

and "Completions", you know that the org's management is probably inactive and asking to be removed. For if they saw all stats going down they should have piled in on "Letters Out" and "Completions" amongst other things as the least they could do. They *can* push those up.

So amongst any set of statistics are those which can be pushed up regardless of the rest and if these aren't, then you know the worst – no management.

ENROLLMENT vs COMPLETIONS

If you see a statistic going up in "Completions" and see a falling "Enrollment" statistic you know at once the body repeat sign-up line is *out*.

People who graduate are not being handed their Certs and Awards by a Registrar but are being given them by Certs and Awards or in mass meetings, or in some way repeat sign-up is not being procured.

Thus the 40% to 60% repeat sign-up business is being lost.

This also means, if continued over a long period of time, that bad technology is present as poor word-of-mouth advertising is going around.

Look in such a case at a third statistic, Qual Collections. If this is poor or very, very high, you can be sure that lack of enrollments is caused by bad tech.

A very high Qual Collections statistic and a low enrollment statistic is a terrible condemnation of the Tech Division. Gross income will soon after collapse as tech service just isn't good.

COMPARING STATISTICS

Thus you get the idea. Statistics are read against each other.

A statistic is a difference between two or more periods in time so is always comparative.

Also two different statistics are comparative such as in examples above.

PREDICTION

You can predict what is going to happen far in advance of the occurrence, using statistics.

High book sales mean *eventual* prosperity. Low book sales mean eventual emergency all along the line.

High gross income and low completions mean eventual trouble as the org isn't delivering but is "backlogging" students and pcs simply by not getting results. Carried on long enough this means eventual civic and legal trouble.

Low FSM commissions may only mean no FSM programme. But if there is an FSM programme, then it may mean bad tech. So a low Completion and low Qual will mean an eventual collapsed FSM statistic also as the FSM's own area is being muddled up by failed cases.

High book sales, high letters out, high Tech and high Qual statistics mean the gross income statistic will soon rise. If these are low then gross income will fall.

Bills owed and cash in hand are read by the distance between the two lines. If it is narrowing, things are improving; if widening, things are getting worse. If they are far apart and have not closed for a long while, with the cash graph below, the management is dangerous and not at all alert.

THE DANGEROUS GRAPH

All statistics on one set of graphs giving a sinking *trend* line is a dangerous situation.

One draws a trend line by choosing the mid-way point between highs and lows and drawing a line.

If all these lines or most of them are down, the management is inactive.

FALSE COMBINATIONS

When a Continental Org includes its own org on its combined graphs for area orgs it can have a very false picture.

Its own org's stats obscure those of the area orgs which may be dying.

Thus if you include a big function with a lot of small ones on a combined graph you can get a very false idea.

Thus, graph big functions as themselves and keep them out of small functions of the same kind.

The Continental Org should not be part of a Continental Exec Div's statistics. Similarly SH stats should not be part of WW's.

A combined statistic is of course where you take the same stats from several functions and add them up to one line. A very large function added into a combined graph can therefore obscure bad situations. It can also obscure a totally inactive senior management as the big function under its own management may be wholly alert and competent but the senior management is masked from view by this one going concern, whereas all its other points except the big one may be collapsing.

THE BIGGEST MISTAKE

The one big godawful mistake an executive can make in reading and managing by graph is being *reasonable* about graphs. This is called **Justifying A Statistic**. This is the single biggest error in graph interpretation by executives and the one thing that will clobber an org.

One sees a graph down and says "Oh well, of course, that's....." and at that moment you've had it.

I have seen a whole org tolerate a collapsed Completions graph for literally months because they all "knew the new type process wasn't working well." The Tech Sec had **justified** his graph. The org bought it. None thought to question it. When it was pointed out that with the same processes the preceding Tech Sec had a continual high graph and a suppressive was looked for it turned out to be the Tech Sec!

Never JUSTIFY why a graph continues to be down and never be reasonable about it. A down graph is simply a down graph and somebody is goofing. The only explanation that is valid at all is "What was changed just before it fell? Good. Unchange it fast!" If a graph is down it can and *must* go up. How it is going to go up is the only interest. "What did we do each time the last few times just before it went up? Good. Do it!"

Justifying a graph is saying, "Well, graphs are always down in December due to Christmas." That doesn't get it up or even really say why it's down!

And don't think you know why a graph is up or down without thorough investigation. If it doesn't stay up or continues down then one didn't know. It takes very close study on the ground where the work is done to find why a graph suddenly rose or why it fell.

This pretended knowledge can be very dangerous. "The graph stays high because we send out the XY Info Packet" as a snap judgment may result in changing the Dissem Sec who was the real reason with his questionnaires. And the graphs fall suddenly even though no Info Packet change occurred.

GROSS REASONS

Graphs don't fall or rise for tiny, obscure, hard to find reasons. As in auditing, the errors are always BIG.

Book sales fall. People design new flyers for books, appropriate display money, go mad trying to get it up. And then at long last one discovers the real reason. The book store is always shut.

A big reason graphs fall is there's nobody there. Either the executive is double hatted and is too busy on the *other* hat, or he just doesn't come to work.

STICKY GRAPHS

Bad graphs which resist all efforts to improve them are *made*. They don't just happen.

A sticky graph is one that won't rise no matter what one does.

Such a graph is made. It is not a matter of omission. It is a matter of action.

If one is putting heavy effort into pushing a graph up and it won't go up then there must be a hidden counter-effort to keep it down.

You can normally find this counter-effort by locating your biggest area of non-compliance with orders. That person is working *hard* to keep graphs down.

In this case it isn't laziness that's at fault. It's counter-action.

I have never seen an org or a division or a section that had a sticky graph that was not actively pushing the graph down.

Such areas are not idle. They are not doing their jobs. They are always doing something else. And that *something else* may suddenly hit you in the teeth.

So beware of a sticky graph. Find the area of non-compliance and reorganize the personnel or you, as an executive, will soon be in real hot water from that quarter.

Those things which suddenly reared up out of your In-basket, all claws, happened after a long period of sticky graphs in that area.

Today's grief was visible months ago on your stats.

SUMMARY

The simple ups and downs of graphs mean little when not watched over a period of time or compared to other graphs in the same activity.

One should know how to read stats and what they mean and why they behave that way so that one can take action in ample time.

Never get *reasonable* about a graph. The *only* reason it or its trend is down is that it is down. The thing to do is get it up.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jp.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 25 NOVEMBER 1970
(CORRECTED AND REISSUED 27 NOV 1970)

Remimeo

Org Series 16

POLICY AND ORDERS

Probably the greatest single confusion that can exist in the subject of organizing is the reversal of "policy" and "orders."

When definitions of these two things are not clearly understood they can be identified as the same thing or even reversed.

When they are not understood plainly then staff members set their own policy and demand orders from top management, totally reversing the roles.

Confusion thus generated can be so great as to make an organization unmanageable. It becomes impossible for staff to do its job and management cannot wear its hat.

People in an organization obsessively demand orders from policy source and then act on their own policy. This exactly reverses matters and can be a continual cause of disorganization.

As policy is the basis of group agreement, unknown policy or policy set by the wrong source leads to disagreement and discord.

Demanding or looking for orders from policy source and accepting policy from unauthorized sources of course turns the whole organization upside down. The bottom of the org board becomes the top of the org bd. And the top is forced to act at lower levels (order issue) which pulls it down the org bd.

But this is not strange as we are dealing here with principles rather new in the field of organization, principles which have not been crisply stated. **There is no exact english word** for either of these two functions.

Policy as a word has many definitions in current dictionaries amongst which only one is partially correct: "A definite course or method of action to guide and determine future decisions." It is also "prudence or wisdom" "a course of action" and a lot of other things according to the dictionary. It even is said to be laid down at the top.

Therefore the word has so many other meanings that the language itself has become confused.

Yet, regardless of dictionary fog, the word means an exact thing in the specialized field of management and organization.

Policy means the principle evolved and issued by top management for a specific activity to guide planning and programming and authorize the issuance of projects by

executives which in turn permit the issuance and enforcement of orders that direct the activity of personnel in achieving production and viability.

Policy is therefore a principle by which the conduct of affairs can be guided.

A policy exists, or should exist, for each broad field or activity in which an organization is involved.

Example: The company has a lunchroom for its employees. Top policy concerning it might be "To provide the employees cheaply with good food and clean fast service." From this the lunchroom manager could plan up and program how he was going to do this. With these approved they form the basis of the orders he issues.

Now let us say the manager of the lunchroom did not know organization and that he did not try to get a policy set or find if there was one and made up his own policy and planned and programmed and issued his orders on that. Only the policy *he* makes up is "To make dough for the company."

Now the wild melee begins.

Top management (the lunchroom manager's highest boss) sees stenos eating cold lunches brought from home at their desks. And begins to investigate. How come? Stenos then say, "We find it cheaper to eat our own lunches." Top management finds coffee in the lunchroom is terrible and costs several shillings. Dried out sandwiches cost a fortune. There is no place to sit . . . etc. So top management issues *orders* (not policy). "Feed that staff!" But nothing happens because the lunchroom manager can't and still "make dough for the company." Top management issues more *orders*. The lunchroom manager thinks they must be crazy at board level. How can you make dough and still feed the whole staff? And top management thinks the lunchroom manager is crazy or a crook.

Now you multiply this several times over in an organization and you get bad feeling, tension and chaos.

Let us say top management had issued policy: "Establish and run a lunchroom to provide the employees cheaply with good food and clean fast service." But the lunchroom manager hired knew nothing of organization, heard it, didn't realize what policy was and classified it as a "good idea." Idealistic, probably issued for PR with employees. "But as an experienced lunchroom man I know what they really want. So we'll make a lot of dough for the company!"

He thereafter bases all his orders on this principle. He buys lousy food cheap, reduces quality, increases prices, cuts down cost by no hiring and does make money. But the company gets its income from happy customers who are handled by happy staff members. So the lunchroom manager effectively reduces the real company income by failing to cater to staff morale as was intended.

UNPREDICTABLE

It is a complete fact that no top management can predict **what** policy will be set by its juniors.

The curse of this is that top management depends on "common sense" and grants greater knowledge of affairs to others at times than is justified. "Of course anybody would know that the paper knives we make are supposed to cut paper." But the plant manager operates on the policy that the plant is supposed to provide employment for the village. You can imagine the squabble when the paper knives which do **not** cut paper fail to sell and a threatened layoff occurs.

Nearly all labor-management hurricanes blow up over this fact of ignorance of policy. It is not actually a knowing conflict over different policies. It's a conflict occurring on the unknown basic of unknown or unset policy of top management and the setting of policy at an unauthorized level.

ORDERS

"Order" takes up two small print columns of the two ton dictionaries.

The simple definition is

An order is the direction or command issued by an authorized person to a person or group within the sphere of the authorized person's authority.

By implication an **order** goes from a senior to juniors.

Those persons who do not conceive of an organization larger than a few people tend to lump all seniors into order-issuers, tend to lump anything such a senior says into the category of order and tend to lump all juniors into order-receivers.

This is a simple way of life, one must say.

Actually it makes all seniors bosses or sergeants and all juniors into workers or privates. It is a very simple arrangement. It does not in any way stretch the imagination or sprain any mental muscles.

Unfortunately such an organized arrangement holds good for the metal section of the shop or a platoon or squad. It fails to take into account more sophisticated or more complex organizations. And it unfortunately requires a more complex organization to get anything done.

Where one has squad mentality in a plant or firm, one easily gets all manner of conflict.

Few shop foremen or sergeants or chief clerks ever waste any time in trying to tell the "rank and file" what the policy is. "Ours was not to reason why" was the death song of the Light Brigade. And also the open door to Communism.

Communism is unlikely to produce a good society because it is based on squad mentality. Capitalism has declined not because it was fought but because it could not cope with squad mentality. The policies of both are insufficiently embracive of the needs of the planet to achieve total acceptability.

An order can be issued solely and only because its issuer has in some fashion attained the right to issue the instruction and to expect compliance.

The officer, the chief clerk, the shop steward, the sergeant, each one has a license, a warrant, a "fiat" from a higher authority which entitles him to issue an *order* to those who are answerable to him.

So where does this authority to issue orders come from?

The head of state, the government, the board of directors, the town council, such bodies as one could consider top management in a state or firm, issues the authority to issue orders.

Yet such top persons usually do not issue authority to issue orders without designating what the sphere of orders will be and what they will be about.

This is the policy-making, appointment-making level at work.

All this is so poorly and grossly defined in the language itself that very odd meanings are conceived of "policy" and "orders."

Unless precise meanings are given, then organization becomes a very confused activity.

Understood in this way, the following sentence becomes very silly: "The board of directors issued orders to load the van and the driver was glad to see his policy of interstate commerce followed."

Yet a group will do this to its board of directors constantly. "You did not issue orders. . . ." "We were waiting for orders. . . ." "I know we should have opened the doors but we had no order from the council. . . ."

The same group members, waiting for orders to sit or stand by special board resolution, will yet set policy continually. "We are trying to let others do their jobs without interference." "I am now operating to make each member of my department happy." "I am running this division to prevent quarrels."

Ask officers, secretaries, in-charges, "What policy are you operating on?" and you will get a quick answer that usually is in total conflict or divergence from any board policy. And you will get a complaint often that nobody issues their division orders so they don't know what to do!

The fact is that **policy** gives the right to issues orders upon it to get it in, followed and the job done.

A group of officers, each one issuing policy madly while waiting for the head of the firm to give them orders is a scene of mix-up and catastrophe in the making.

Policy is a long, long-range guiding principle.

An order is a short-term direction given to implement a policy or the plans or programs which develop from policy.

"People should be seated in comfortable chairs in the waiting room" is a policy.

"Sit down" is an order.

If policy is understood to authorize people to issue orders, the picture becomes much clearer.

"Clearing post purpose" is another way of saying "Get the policy that establishes this post and its duties known and understood."

Unless an organization gets this quite straight, it will work in tension and in internal conflict.

When an organization gets these two things completely clear, it will be a pleasant and effective group.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.rd.gm

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 6 DECEMBER 1970

Remimeo
Dept 14 Hats

Personnel Series 13

Org Series 18

THIRD DYNAMIC DE-ABERRATION

The exact mechanism of 3rd Dynamic (group or organization) aberration is the conflict of **Counter Policy**.

Illegal policy set at unauthorized levels jams the actions of a group and **is** responsible for the inactivity, non-production or lack of team spirit.

Counter policy independently set jams the group together but inhibits its operation.

Out-Reality on org bds, hats, etc, is to a large degree caused by disagreements and conflicts which are caused by illegal policy.

If we had a game going in which each player set his own rules, there would be no game. There would only be argument and conflict.

VARIETIES OF COUNTER POLICY

At the start it must be assumed or effected that there is someone or somebody to set authorized policy for the group. Absence of this function is an invitation to random policy and group conflict and disintegration. If such a person or body exists, new proposed policy must be referred to this person or body and issued, not set randomly at lower levels or by unauthorized persons.

Policies so set by the policy authority must be informed enough and wise enough to forward the group purpose and to obtain agreement. Ignorant or bad policy even when authorized tends to persuade group members to set their own random policy.

When no policy at all exists random policy occurs. When policy exists but is not made known, random policy setting will occur. Ignorance of policy, the need or function of it, can cause random policies. Hidden not stated random policies can conflict.

Correct policy can be relayed on a cutative basis – a few words left off or a qualifying sentence dropped which makes policy incorrect or null. "Children may not go out" can be made out of "Children may not go out after midnight".

Altered policy can be limitless in error.

Attributing a self set policy to the authorized source can disgrace all policy as well as pervert the leadership purpose.

Policy can be excluded from a zone of a group that should be governed by it. "Pipe making policy does not apply to the *small* pipe shop."

Such masses of unnecessary policy can be issued that it cannot be assimilated.

Policy can exist in large amounts but not be subdivided into relevant subjects as is done in hat checksheets.

Disgrace of policy can occur in a subsequent catastrophe and render any policy disgraceful, encouraging self set policy by each group member.

CLEARING A GROUP

All authorized policy must be set or made available in master books and adequate complete policy files. This makes it possible to compile hats and checksheets and issue packs.

Group surveys of "What policy are you operating on?" can reveal random policy.

All bugged (halted) projects can be surveyed for illegal policy and cleaned up and gotten going again.

Other actions can be taken all of which add up to:

1. Get existing policy used.
2. Get areas without policy crisply given policy from the authorized source.
3. Debug all past projects of false policy.
4. De-aberrate group members as per the Organization Misunderstoods PL and other materials.
5. Educate the group members concerning policy technology.
6. Set up systems that detect, isolate and report out-policy and get it corrected and properly set, issued and known.
7. Monitor any new policy against statistics and include policy outnesses as part of all statistical evaluations.

ADMIN SCALE

I have developed a scale for use which gives a sequence (and relative seniority) of subjects relating to organization.

- **Goals**
- **Purposes**
- **Policy**
- **Plans**
- **Programs**

- **Projects**
- **Orders**
- **Ideal Scenes**
- **Stats**
- **Valuable Final Products**

This scale is worked up and worked down **until it is (each item) in full agreement with the remaining items.**

In short, for success all these items in the scale must agree with all other items in the scale on the same subject.

Let us take "Golf Balls" as a subject for the scale. Then all these scale items must be in agreement with one another on the subject of golf balls. It is an interesting exercise.

The scale also applies in a destructive subject. Like "Cockroaches".

When an item in the scale is *not* aligned with the other items, the project will be hindered if not fail.

The skill with which all these items in any activity are aligned and gotten into action is called **Management**.

Group members only become upset when one or more of these points are not aligned to the rest and at least some group agreement.

Groups appear slow, inefficient, unhappy, inactive or quarrelsome only when these items are not aligned, made known and coordinated.

Any activity can be improved by debugging or aligning this scale in relation to the group activity.

As out-Reality breeds out-Comm, and out-Affinity, it follows that unreal items on the scale (not aligned) produce ARC Breaks, upsets and disaffection.

It then follows that when these scale items are well aligned with each other and the group there will be high Reality, high Communication and high Affinity in the group.

Group mores aligned so and followed by the group gives one an ethical group and also establishes what will then be considered as overts and withholds in the group by group members.

This scale and its parts and ability to line them up are one of the most valuable tools of organization.

DEBUG

When orders are not complied with and projects do not come off, one should **Detect**, **Isolate** and **Report** and handle or see that it is handled, any of the scale items found random or counter.

If any item below **Policy** is in trouble – not moving, one can move upwards correcting these points, but certainly concentrating on a discovery of illegal or counter policy. Rarely it occurs some old but legal policy needs to be adjusted. Far more commonly policy is being set by someone verbally or in despatches, or hidden, that is bugging any item or items below the level of policy.

So the rule is that when things get messed up, jammed up, slowed or inactive or down-right destructive (including a product as an overt act) one sniffs about for random or counter policy illegally being set in one's own area or "out there".

Thus in the face of any outness one **detects-isolates-reports** and handles or gets handled the Out-Policy.

The *detection* is easy. Things aren't moving or going right.

The isolation is of course a **what policy** that must be found and **who** set it.

Reporting it would mean to HCO.

Handling it is also very easy and would be done in Qual.

This Admin tech gives us our first 3rd Dynamic de-aberrater that works easily and fast.

Why?

Well, look at the Admin Scale. *Policy* is just below *Purpose*.

Purpose is senior to policy.

The person who is setting random or counter illegal policy is off group purpose. He is other purposed to greater or lesser degree.

From 1960 to 1962 I developed a vast lot of technology about goals and purposes. If we define a goal as a whole track long long term matter and a purpose as the lesser goal applying to specific activities or subjects we see clearly that if we clean up a person's purposes relating to the various activities in which he is involved and on the eight dynamics we will handle the obsession to set random or counter policies!

So it is an auditing job and the tech for it is extensive. (The African ACC was devoted to this subject. Lots of data exists on it.)

It happens however that around 20% (probably more) of any group's members are actively if covertly anti-group and must be handled at a less profound level under Personal Aberration in the Org Misunderstood Policy Letter before you can begin to touch purpose.

Thus any group member, since this tech remedy helps them all, would be handled with:

1. General case de-aberration (called L10s on Flag).
2. Purpose handling for posts.
3. Org bd, hatting and training.

Those setting random or counter purpose later detected would get further no. 2 and no. 3.

As the universe is full of beings and one lives with them whether he likes it or not, it would be to anyone's interest to be able to have functioning groups.

The only way a group jams up and (a) becomes difficult to live in and (b) impossible to fully separate from is by random and counter purposes.

If one thinks he can go off and be alone anywhere in this universe he is dreaming.

The first impulse of a hostile being is "to leave" a decent group. What a weird one.

The only reason he gets in jams is his inability to tolerate or handle others. There's no road out for such a being except through.

Thus all we can do to survive even on the first dynamic is to know how to handle and be part of the third or fourth dynamic and clean it up.

Probably the reason this universe itself is considered by some as a trap is because their Admin Scale is out.

And the only reason this universe is sometimes a trial is because no one published its Admin Scale in the first place.

All this is very fundamental first dynamic tech and third dynamic tech.

It is the first true group technology that can fully de-aberrate and smooth out and free within the group every group member and the group itself.

Thus, combined with auditing tech, for the first time we can rely wholly on technology to improve and handle group members and the group itself toward desirable and achievable accomplishment with happiness and high morale.

Like any skill or technology it has to be known and done and continued in use to be effective.

The discovery, development and practical use of this data has made me very very cheerful and confident and is doing the same thing on the test group.

I hope it does the same for you.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd.ts

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 14 DECEMBER 1970

Remimeo

Personnel Series No. 14

Org Series No. 19

GROUP SANITY

The points of success and failure, the make and break items of an organization are

1. **Hiring**
2. **Training**
3. **Apprenticeships**
4. **Utilization**
5. **Production**
6. **Promotion**
7. **Sales**
8. **Delivery**
9. **Finance**
10. **Justice**
11. **Morale**

These eleven items **must agree with and be in line with the Admin Scale** (Org Series No. 18).

Where these subjects are not well handled and where one or more of these are very out of line, the organization will suffer a third dynamic aberration.

This then is a **Sanity Scale** for the third dynamic of a group.

The group will exhibit aberrated symptoms where one or more of these points are out.

The group will be sane to the degree that these points are in.

Internal stresses of magnitude begin to affect every member of the group in greater or lesser degree when one or more of these items are neglected or badly handled.

The society at large currently has the majority of these points out. These elements become aberrated in the following ways:

1. Hiring

The society is running a massive can't have on the subject of people. Automation and employment penalties demonstrate an effort to block out letting people in and giving them jobs. Confirming this is growing unemployment and fantastic sums for welfare – meaning relief. Fifty percent of America within the decade will be jobless due to the population explosion without a commensurate expansion in production. Yet production by US presidential decree is being cut back. War, birth control are two of many methods used to reduce population. **This third dynamic psychosis is a *refusal to employ people*. Exclusion of others is the basic cause of war and insanity.**

2. Training

Education has fallen under the control of one-worlders, is less and less real. Data taught is being taught less well. Less data is being taught. School and college unrest reflect this. Confirmation is the deteriorated basic education found in teenagers such as writing. Older technologies are being lost in modern rewrites. **This third dynamic psychosis is a *covert refusal to train*.**

3. Apprenticeships

The most successful industries, activities and professions of earlier centuries were attained by training the person as an apprentice permitting him to understudy the exact job he would hold for a long period before taking the post. Some European schools are seeking to revive this but on a general basis, not as an apprentice system. **A third dynamic psychosis is a *denial of adequate experience to succeed*.**

4. Utilization

In industries, governments and armed services as well as life itself, personnel are not utilized. A man trained for one thing is required to do something else. Or his training is not used. Or he is not used at all. **A third dynamic psychosis is *failure to utilize people*.**

5. Production

Modern think is to reward downstats. A person is paid for not working. Governments who produce nothing employ the most people. Income tax and other current practices penalize production. Countries which produce little are given huge handouts. War which destroys attains the largest appropriations. **A third dynamic psychosis is *to prevent production*.**

6. Promotion

Promotion activities are subverted to unworthy activities. True value is seldom promoted. What one is actually achieving gets small mention while other things are heavily promoted. Reality and PR are strangers. **A third dynamic psychosis is *unreal or non factual promotion*.**

7. Sales

Sales actions are unreal or out of balance. Clumsy or non-functioning sales activities penalize producers and consumers. In areas of high demand sales actions are negligible even when heavy advertising exists. This is proven by the inability to sell what is produced even in large countries so that production cut backs are continual threats to economies and workers. A population goes half fed in times of surplus goods. With curtailed car factories a nation drives old cars. With a cutback construction industry people live in bad houses. Sales taxes are almost universal. **A third dynamic psychosis is *the impeding of product distribution to potential consumers*.**

8. Delivery

Failure to deliver what is offered is standard procedure for groups in the humanities. Commercially it is well in hand.

9. Finance

One's own experience in finance is adequate to demonstrate the difficulties made with money. **A third dynamic psychosis is *the perversion of finance*.**

10. Justice

Under the name of justice, aberrated man accomplishes fantastic injustices. The upstat is hit, the downstat let go. Rumours are accepted as evidence. Police forces and power are used to **enforce** the injustices contained 1 to 9 above. Suppressive justice is used as an ineffectual but savage means of meeting situations actually caused by the earlier listed psychoses. When abuses on 1 to 9 make things go wrong, the social aberration then introduces suppressive injustices as an effort to cure. Revolt and war are magnified versions of injustices. Excess people – kill them off in a war. **A third dynamic psychosis is *the substitute of violence for reason*.**

11. Morale

A continuous assault on public morale occurs in the press and other media. Happiness or any satisfaction with life is under continuous attack. Beliefs, idealism, purpose, dreams are assaulted. **Insanity is a refusal to allow others to be, do or have.**

Any action which would lead to a higher morale has to be defended against the insane few. **A third dynamic psychosis is a detestation of high morale.**

The **common denominator** of all these insanities is the desire to **succumb**.

Insanities have as their end product self or group destruction.

These eleven types of aberration gone mad are the main points through which any group **succumbs**.

Therefore, these eleven points kept sane guarantee a group's **survival**.

EXAMPLES

Seeing all this in one example permits one to see that these third dynamic insanities combine to destroy.

- A. Believing it impossible to obtain money or make it, a firm cannot hire enough people to produce. So has little sell, which is badly promoted and is not sold so it has no money to hire people.
- B. Needing people for another job the firm robs them from a plant which then collapses and fails to make money so no new people can be hired. This reduces production so people have to be dismissed as they can't be paid.
- C. Persons are in the firm but are kept doing the wrong things so there is little production and no promotion or sales so there is no money to pay them so they are dismissed.
- D. A new product is put in. People to make it are taken from the area already making a valuable product which then collapses that area and there is not enough money to promote and selling fails so people are dismissed.

The examples are many. They are these same eleven group insanities in play upon a group, a firm, a society.

SANITY

If this is a description of group aberration, then it gives the keys to sanity in a group.

1. HIRING

Letting people **into** the group at large is the key to every great movement and bettered culture on this planet. This was the new idea that made Buddhism the strongest civilizing influence the world has seen in terms of numbers and terrain. They did not exclude. Race, color, creed were not made bars to membership in this great movement.

Politically the strongest country in the world was the United States, and it was weakened only by its efforts to exclude certain races or make them second class citizens. Its greatest internal war (1862-65) was fought to settle this point, and the weakness was not resolved even then.

The Catholic Church only began to fail when it began to exclude.

Thus *inclusion* is a major point in all great organizations.

The things which set a group or organization on a course of exclusion are (a) the destructive impulses of about 10 or 15% of the society (lunacy) and (b) opposition by interests which consider themselves threatened by the group or organization's potential resulting in infiltration (c) efforts to mimic the group's technology destructively and set up rival groups.

All these three things build up barriers that a group might thoughtlessly buy and act to remedy with no long range plans to handle.

These stresses make a group edgy and combative. The organization then seeks to solve these three points by exclusion, whereas its growth depends wholly upon *inclusion*.

No one has ever solved these points successfully in the past because of lack of technology to solve them.

It all hinges on three points: (1) the sanity of the individual, (2) the worthwhileness of the group in terms of general area, planetary or universal survival, and (3) the superiority of the group's organization tech and its use.

Just at this writing, the first point is solved conclusively in Scientology. Even hostile and destructive personalities wandering into the group can be solved and, due to the basic nature of Man, made better for the benefit of themselves and others.

The worthwhileness of the organization is determined by the assistance given to general survival by the group's products and the actual factual delivery of those valid products.

The superiority of a group's admin tech and its application is at this current writing well covered in current developments.

Thus *inclusion* is almost fully attainable. The only ridges that build up are the short term defense actions.

For instance, Scientology currently must fight back at the death camp organizations of psychiatry whose solution is a dead world, as proven by their actions in Germany before and during World War II. But we *must* keep in mind that we fully intend to reform and salvage even these opponents. We are seeking to *include* them in the general survival by forcing them to cease their non-survival practices and overcome their gruesome group past.

There are two major stages then of *including* people – one is as paid organization personnel and one as unpaid personnel. **Both** are in essence being "hired". The pay differs. The wider majority receive the pay of personal peace and effectiveness and a better world.

The org which *excludes* its own field members will fail.

The payment to the org of money or the money payment to the staff member is an internal economy. Pay, the real pay, is a better personal survival and a world that can live.

Plans of **inclusion** are successful. They sometimes contain defense until we *can* include.

Even resistance to an org can be interpreted as a future inclusion by the org. Resistance or opposition is a common waypoint in the cycle of inclusion. In an organization where everyone wins eventually anyway the senselessness of resistance becomes apparent even to the most obtuse. Only those who oppose their own survival resist a survival producing organization.

Even in commercial companies the best organization with the best product usually finds competitors merging with it.

2. TRAINING

Basic training, hats, checksheets and packs **must** exist for every member of a group.

Criminal or antisocial conduct occurs where there is no hat.

Any type of membership or role or post in the whole organization or its field requires individual and team training. Only where you have a group member who will not or cannot bring himself to have and wear a hat will you have any trouble.

This is so true that it is the scope of personal enhancement.

Ask yourself "Who isn't trained on his post and hatted?" and you can answer "Who is causing the trouble?"

Basic training, slight or great, is vital for *every* member of a group, paid or unpaid.

A field auditor must have a hat. A student needs a student hat, etc. etc.

This requires training.

Training begins in childhood. Often it has to be re-oriented.

Training as a group member must be done.

Training in exact technology or in the precise tech of admin is not the first stage of training. Basic training of group members, no matter how slight, must exist and be done.

Otherwise group members lack the basic points of agreement which make up the whole broad organization and its publics.

Training must be on real materials and must be rapid. The technology of how to train is expressed in speed of training.

The idea that it takes twelve years to make a mud pie maker is false. **Time** in training does not determine quality of training. Amount of data learned that can be applied and skills successfully drilled determine training.

That the society currently stresses *time* is an aberrated factor.

The ability to learn and apply the data is the end product of training. Not old age.

The rate of training establishes to a marked degree the expansion factor of a group and influences the smoothness of the group during expansion.

If training is defined as making a person or team into a part of the group then processing is an influencing factor. The facilities for processing and quantity available are then a determining factor in group expansion.

3. APPRENTICESHIP

Training on post is a second stage of any training – and processing – action. This is essentially a familiarization action.

To have a person leave a post and another take it over with no "apprenticeship" or groove-in can be quite fatal.

The deputy system is easily the best system. Every post is deputied for a greater or lesser period before the post is turned over and the appointment is made. When the deputy is totally familiar he becomes the person on the post.

Rapid expansion and economy on personnel tend to injure this step. Lack of it can be *very* destructive.

Optimumly there should be one or two deputies for every key post at all times. This is a continual apprenticeship system.

Economically it has limitations. One has to weigh the *losses* in not doing it against the cost in doing it. It will be found that the losses are *far* greater than the cost, even though it increases personnel by at least a third for a given organization.

When an organization has neglected it as a system (and has turned over too many posts without deputy or apprenticeship action) its economics may decay to where it can never be done. This is almost a death rattle for an organization.

In a two century old highly successful industry, *only* the apprentice system was and is used (Oporto wine industry). The quality of the product is all that keeps the product going on the world market. If the quality decayed the industry would collapse. Apprenticeship as a total system maintains it.

Certainly every executive in an organization and every technical expert should have a deputy in training. Only then could quality of organization be maintained and quality of product guaranteed.

The total working organization should be on this system actually. And whenever a person is moved up off a post, the deputy taking over, a new deputy should be appointed. The last step (appointment of a new deputy) is the one that gets forgotten.

Failure to recruit new people over a period will very surely find the whole organization declining soon solely because there is no apprentice system of deputies. The organization expands, singles up the posts, promotes some un-apprenticed people and begins to lose its economic advantage. Low pay ensues, people blow off, and then no one can be hired. It's a silly cycle, really, as it is prevented easily enough by hiring enough soon enough when the org is still doing well.

The rule is **deputy every post and newly deputy them when promotions occur.**

The most covert way to get around this is just to call each person's junior a deputy even though he has other duties. This makes it all look good on an org board. "Do you have each post deputied?" "Oh yes!" But the deputies are just juniors with posts of their own.

A deputy is *used* to run the same post as it is deputied for. This means a double posting pure and only.

You'd be amazed at how much production an executive post can achieve when it is also deputied and when the principal holder of the post will use the deputy and gen him in, not get him to cover an empty lower post.

4. UTILIZATION

People must be utilized.

Equipment must be utilized.

Space must be utilized.

Learning to **use** is a very hard lesson for some. Untrained people, bad organization, poor machinery, inadequate space all tend to send one off utilization.

The rule is, if you've got it use it; if you can't use it get rid of it.

This most specifically applies to people. If you've got a man, use him; if you can't use him get him over to someone who can use him. If he isn't useful, process and train.

Anyone who can't figure out how to use people, equipment and spaces to obtain valuable final products is not worthy of the name of executive.

Reversely we get what an executive or foreman is – an executive or foreman is one who can obtain, train and use people, equipment and spaces to economically achieve valuable final products.

Some are very skilled in preparing people, systems, equipment, property and spaces to be used. But if these then go to someone who does not **use** them you get a bad breakdown.

The welfare state and its inflation is a sad commentary on "executive ability".

An executive whose people are idle and whose materiel is decaying is a traitor to his people and the org, just that, for he will destroy them all.

Utilization requires a knowledge of what the valuable final products are and how to make them.

Action which doesn't result in a final product that adds up to valuable final products is destructive, no matter how innocent it seems.

Man has a planet as a valuable final product. Improper *use* of the countries and seas, air and masses which compose it will wind up with the destruction of Man, all life on it and the usefulness of the planet. So *proper* utilization of anything is a very real factor.

The 19th century industrialist like the mad kings who built great structures used up men; they didn't properly use men.

And not using them at all, the current fad, is the most deadly of all.

Utilization is a big subject. It applies to resources, capabilities and many other factors.

The question being asked in all cases is "How can we **use** this to economically obtain a valuable final product?"

Failing to answer that question gives one the "mysteries of life".

5. PRODUCTION

One may be prone to believe there is no sense in any production at all. Such a one would also be likely to say "There is no sense at all." Or "If they keep on producing it will become impossible to destroy it all."

Production of some final valuable product is the chain of all production sequences.

Even the artist is producing a *reaction*. The reaction's service in a wider sphere to enforce it is what gives art its sense. A feeling of well being or grandeur or light heartedness are legitimate valuable final products, for instance.

The production areas and activities of an org that produce the valuable final products are the most important areas and activities of the org.

6. PROMOTION

The acceptance of valuable final products and of their value depends in a large degree upon (a) a real value and (b) a desire for them.

Promotion creates desire for the valuable final product.

The old saw that the man who builds a better mousetrap will have the whole world coming to his door is a total falsity.

Unless the value is made known, and the desire created, the mousetraps are going to go unsold.

Promotion is so important that it can stand alone. It can have limited success even when there is no product! But in that case it will be of short duration.

Promotion must contain reality and the final product must exist and be deliverable and delivered for promotion to be fully successful.

Public Relations and advertising and all their skills cover this area of promotion.

7. SALES

It is hard to sell what isn't promoted and can't be delivered. Economics greatly affect selling.

Anything must be sold for a price comparable to its value in the eyes of the purchaser.

Costing is a precise art by which the total expenses of the organization administration and production must be adequately covered in the **Pricing** allowing for all losses and errors in delivery and adequate to produce a reserve.

Pricing (the amount being asked) cannot be done without some idea of the total cost of the final valuable product.

The sale price of one final valuable product may have to cover the cost of producing other products which are delivered without price.

Pricing however does not necessarily limit itself to only covering immediate cost of a product. A painting with a dollar's worth of paint and canvas may have a price of half a million dollars.

Also a painting used in promotion may cost two hundred dollars and be displayed at no cost at all to the beholder.

These relative factors also include the **Skill** of the salesman himself and there is much technology involved in the act of selling something to someone and the world abounds in books on the subject.

Therefore sales (once promotion is done) are bound up really in **Costing, Pricing and Selling**.

The value in the eye of the purchaser is monitored by the desire created in him for it. If this is also a real value and if delivery can occur then **Selling** is made very easy – but it is still a skilled action.

The production of a valuable final product is often totally determined by whether or not it can be sold. And if it can be sold at a price greater than the cost of delivering it.

That it *gets* sold depends on the salesman.

The skill of the salesman is devoted to enhancing the desire and value in the eyes of the buyer and obtaining adequate payment.

8. DELIVERY

The subject and action of **Delivery** is the most susceptible to breakdown in any organization. Any flaw on the sequence of actions resulting in a valuable final product may deteriorate it or bar off final delivery.

There are many preparatory or hidden from public view steps on a production line. When any of these break down, delivery is imperiled.

Given the raw materials and wherewithal to make some valuable final product, the valuable final product should occur.

When a valuable final product does not get produced and cannot be delivered repair the earlier steps of its production.

Example: An auditing result is not delivered. Don't just repair the pc. Repair training of auditors and C/Ses. Repair the assembly line *before* the valuable final product. The sub-products are less visible. Yet they add up to the valuable final product.

The law of the irreducible minimum occurs in all delivery problems. Someone is trying to produce only the visible end product of a post or production line and neglects the earlier contributory actions and products as these are not plainly visible.

When an organization or its posts operate only on an irreducible minimum, production goes bad and **Delivery** crashes.

Take a cook who has his post at an irreducible minimum. Food is appearing on the table. If he reduced just one bit more the food would no longer be edible at all. He neglects purchasing, menus and preparation. That these occur is invisible to the diners. That food appears on the table is visible to the diners. If the cook operates at any less level than he is, no edible food would be visible – hence, irreducible minimum. The food served will be bad. But it will be visible. Invisible-to-the-diners actions aren't being done.

To improve the food, get the less visible actions *done*. Get the sequence of actions all done. The result will be improved food.

Take training. The final valuable product is a trained auditor. The course supervisor who runs his post on an irreducible minimum is simply there, appearing to supervise.

His final product may be horribly unskilled. The teaching may take "forever".

To improve this one goes earlier on the assembly line – materials, packs, tapes, student tech services, recorder repair, scheduling – dozens of actions including getting the course supervisor trained.

The visibility is still a course supervisor and students being taught. But with the *whole* earlier line in, the final valuable product is excellent!

A being hopes lazily for instantaneous production. It doesn't happen this way in the MEST universe. Things are produced in a sequence of sub-products which result in a final valuable product. Hope all you want to. When you omit the sub-products you get no valuable final product.

When the people in an organization do not know the valuable final products of the org and when a person on a post does not know the final products of his post, a condition arises where no org **Delivery** will occur, or if it does occur it will be poor or costly. It is vital that a person knows what his post final products are and what his unit, section, department and division sub-products are and how his own and each of these contribute to the valuable final products of the organization for actual delivery to occur.

Delivering other than valuable final products or useless final products or final products that need constant correction also add up to non-delivery.

A whole civilization can break down around the point of **Delivery**. So can an organization.

Since money can be looked upon as too valuable a final product it can actually prevent **Delivery**.

Failure to deliver is the one point beings do not forgive. The whole cycle hangs upon **Delivery**.

Deliver what is promised when it is expected in sufficient volume and adequate quality is the first maxim even of a group in politics or the humanities.

9. FINANCE

Finance too often disregards the other factors in this scale or the other factors in this scale too often disregard finance for organizations to long remain viable.

Financing must be in agreement with all the other factors of this scale and all the other factors must be in agreement with finance for viability to occur.

Because money is interchangeable for commodities then people can confuse it with too many things.

If you regard money like so many beans, as a commodity in itself, you open the door to understanding it.

Money is so many beans in to get so many beans out.

When you can master this you can handle **Finance**.

The **Finance** persons of an org, a civilization, a planet should put so many beans in and expect more beans out than they put in. This is quite correct as a viewpoint for finance.

The difference of beans in and beans out for a planet is made up by adding beans enough to those already in existence to cover new commodity.

When finance people fail to do this beans cease to be in pace with production and inflation and deflation occur.

In an org or any of its parts, industriousness of the staff makes the difference between the beans in and beans out.

An org has to have income greater than outgo. That is the first rule of finance. Violating it brings bankruptcy.

Now if the **Finance** people of an org apply the same rule remorselessly to all *its* transactions (financial planning) with each person and part of an org, finance becomes real and manageable.

So many beans in to support the first division means so many beans out of the org back to finance because of the cooperative work of the first division.

A hectic effort to work only with production products will wind finance up in a knot.

One has to estimate (**cost**) the contribution of each part of an org to the valuable final product to know what to allow what part of an org.

Finance has to have a full reality on the valuable final products and the sub-products and post products of the whole org to intelligently allocate funds.

This person, that division, each contributes some part of the action that results in the money received for the valuable final products.

So finance can extend so much money for each and expect that and an additional amount back.

If this occurs, so will expansion.

Finance comes unstuck when it fails to "**cost**" an organization and fails to support valuable final product production.

Finance must not only practice "Income greater than Outgo" for the org, it must practice it for each part of the org as well.

Then solvency becomes real.

The greatest aberration of finance is that it seeks to *save* things into solvency. The real losses in an org are the sums never made. These are the most important losses for finance to concentrate upon.

An org that makes £500 a week that should make £5000 a week in potential is losing the finance people £4500 a week!

Finance can force production along certain lines by putting in funds and getting more back.

Finance becomes too easily the management of an org but it only does that when it ceases to deal in its own commodity – money.

An org which has executives unfamiliar with finance will fall at once into the control of the finance people in the org. And these finance people, if they don't really know money will fall at once under the control of outside finance people.

One has to know finance in any organization anywhere, even in a socialism. Sooner or later the books get balanced in any society.

10. JUSTICE

Without justice there can be no real organization.

Even a government owes its people an operating climate in which human transactions and business can occur.

Where insane and criminal individuals operate unchecked in the community justice is uncertain and harsh.

The society in which the insane rise to positions of power becomes a nightmare.

Justice is a difficult subject. Man handles it badly.

Justice cannot occur until insanity can be detected and cured.

The whole task of justice is to defend the honest man. Therefore the target of justice is the establishment of a sane society.

The inability to detect or cure the insane destroys civilizations.

Justice is an effort to bring equity and peace. When one cannot detect and cure insanity then sooner or later justice actions will become unjust and be used by the insane.

To us, justice is the action necessary to restrain the insane until they are cured. After that it would be only an action of seeing fair play is done.

11. MORALE

When all factors balance up in an org and give the group a common direction and mutual viability, morale can be expected to be good.

When the admin scale and the ten elements described are out of balance (without proper importance given to each) and when one or many of these (admin scale and the elements herein described) are not in agreement one with another, then morale will be poor.

Morale is not made of comfort and sloth. It is made of common purpose and obstacles overcome by the group.

When the admin scale and these elements are not held together by similar aims, then morale has to be held up artificially.

The most ghastly morale I have ever seen was amongst "the idle rich".

And the highest morale I've ever seen was amongst a furiously dedicated common purposed group working under fantastic stresses with very little against almost hopeless odds.

I used to observe that morale in a combat unit would never materialize before they had been through hell together.

All drama aside, morale is made up of high purpose and mutual confidence. This comes from the admin scale items and these elements of organization being well aligned, one with the next, and honest sane endeavor to achieve a final goal for all.

L RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ms.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 30 DECEMBER 1970

Remimeo
SO Member Hat
Staff Member Hat

Personnel Series 15

Org Series 20

ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL

The differences between a competent person and an incompetent person are demonstrated in his environment (surroundings).

A person is either the effect of his environment or is able to have an effect upon his environment.

The 19th Century psychologist preached that man had to "adjust to his environment". This false datum helped begin a racial degeneration.

The truth is that man is as successful as he adjusts the environment to him.

Being competent means the ability to control and operate the things in the environment and the environment itself.

When you see things broken down around the mechanic who is responsible for them, he is plainly exhibiting his incompetence-which means his inability to control those things in his environment and adjust the environment for which he is responsible – motors.

When you see the mate's boats broken up you know he does not have control of his environment.

Know-how, attention, and the desire to be effective are all part of the ability to control the environment.

One's "standards" (the degree of rightness one is trying to establish and maintain) are directly related to one's desire to have a controlled environment.

The attainment of one's *standards* is not done by criticism (a human system). It is done by exerting control of one's environment and moving things effectively toward a more ideal scene.

Control of the environment begins with oneself. A good case state, a body that one keeps clean and functioning. This extends to one's own gear, his clothing, tools, equipment. It

extends further to the things one is responsible for in the environment. Then it extends out into the whole environment, the people and the MEST.

One can get pretty dirty fixing things up. That's okay. But can one then also clean one-self up?

The ability to confront MEST is a high ability. After that comes the ability to handle and control it.

The ability to confront people is also a high ability. After that comes the ability to get along with them and to handle and control them.

There is the Supreme Test of a thetan-the ability to make things go right.

The reverse of this is the effort to make things go wrong.

Incompetence-lack of know-how, inability to control-makes things go wrong.

Given some know-how or picking it up by observation, sane people make things go right.

The insane remain ignorant intentionally or acquire know-how and make things go wrong.

Insane acts are *not* unintentional or done out of ignorance. They are intentional, they are not "unknowing dramatizations". So around insane people things go wrong.

One cannot tell the difference really between the sane and insane by behaviour. One can tell the difference only by the product. The product of the sane is survival. The product of the insane is an overt act. As this is often masked by clever explanations it is not given the attention it deserves. The pretended good product of the insane turns out to be an overt act.

A large percentage of this planet's population (undetermined at this time for the "general public" but in excess of 20%) are insane. Their behaviour looks passable. But their product is an overt act. The popularity of war confirms this. The products of existing governments are mainly destructive. The final product of the human race will be a destroyed planet (a contaminated air cover rendering the planet unable to sustain life, whether by radiation or fumes).

Thus, due to the inability to detect and handle the insane, the sane majority suffers.

The hidden actions of the insane can destroy faster than an environment can be created **unless** one has the know-how of the mind and life and the tech of Admin and the ability and know-how to handle MEST.

An area or activity hit by an influx of new recruits or new customers tends to unsettle. Its MEST gets abuse, things go out of control.

Gradually, working to put in order, the standards are again being attained. The minority insane get handled, the know-how of groups and orgs becomes more generally known, the tech of MEST gets used again.

As an organization expands it goes through cycles of lowered condition and raised condition. This is normal enough since by taking on more and more area one is letting in more and more insane even though they are in a small proportion to the sane.

Order is re-established and survival trends resumed to the degree that the sane begin to reach out and handle things around them and as the insane are made sane.

Thus one gets downtrends and uptrends. As soon as a group begins to feel cocky, it takes on more area. This includes more unhandled people, admin and MEST and a downtrend begins. Then the sane begin to handle and the insane begin to be sane and the uptrend starts.

This is probably even the basis of national economic booms and depressions.

This is only bad to the degree that the insane are put in charge. As soon as this happens the downtrend becomes permanent and cultural decay sets in.

A group expanding rapidly into a decadent culture is of course itself subjected to the uptrend-downtrend cycles and has to take very special measures to counteract the consequences of expansion in order to maintain any rate of growth.

The individual member of a group can measure his own progress by increased ability to handle himself, his post and environment and the degree of improvement of the group itself because of his own work within it.

A group that is messing up its gear and environment worse than it did a while ago and is not improving it of course has to be reorganized before it perishes.

No group can sit back and expect its high brass to be the only ones to carry the load. The group is composed of individual group members, not of high brass.

The survival of a group depends upon the ability of its individual members to control their environment and to insist that the other group members also control theirs.

This is the stuff of which survival is made.

A sane group, knowing and using their technologies of handling men and MEST, cannot help but control their environment.

But this depends upon the individual group member being sane, able to control his MEST and those around him and using the tech of life, the tech of Admin, the tech of specific types of activity.

Such a group inevitably inherits the culture and its guidance.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sb.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 25 MARCH 1971

Remimeo

Org Series 26

VALUABLE FINAL PRODUCTS

By definition, a valuable final product is something that can be exchanged with other activities in return for support. The support usually adds up to food, clothing, shelter, money, tolerance and cooperation (good will).

On an individual basis this is easy to grasp. The individual produces a product or products which, flowed into the dept, div, org, company, community, state, nation or planet, then returns to him his pay and good will or at least sufficient good will to prevent his abandonment or destruction.

Long-range survival of the individual is attained in this fashion.

A valuable final product (VFP) is valuable because it is potentially or factually exchangeable.

The key word in this sense is **exchangeable**. And exchangeability means outside, with something outside the person or activity.

A valuable final product could as easily be named a **valuable exchangeable product**.

Sanity and insanity are matters of motive, not rationality or competence. The sane are constructive, the insane are destructive.

Thus insanity on the part of the potential receiver of a VFP can prevent an exchange of a final product the receiver should be able to use and for which he should be willing to give active support and good will to the producer. Example: Man starving; you try to sell him good food at reasonable price for which he has money to pay. He tries to shoot you and destroy the food. This is insanity since he is trying to destroy the product he needs and can afford.

Crime is the action of the insane or the action of attempting seizure of product without support. Example: Robbers who do not support a community seek to rob from it supporting funds.

Fraud is the attempt to obtain support without furnishing a product.

Sanity and honesty then consist of producing a valuable final product for which one is then recompensed by support and good will, or in reverse flow, supporting and giving good will to the producer of the product.

Ethical basics, morale, social subjects, law, all are based on this principle of the valuable final product. Previously it has been "instinctive" or "common sense." It has not before been stated.

Civilizations which facilitate production and interchange and inhibit crime and fraud are then successful. Those that do not, perish.

Persons who wish to destroy civilizations promote departures from these basic rules of the game. Methods of corrupting fair interchange are numerous.

The **Factors** are the first appearance of these principles.

The theory of the valuable final product is an extension of the **Factors**.

Parts of organizations or organizations, towns, states and countries all follow the principles which apply to the individual.

The survival or value of any section, department, division or org is whether or not it follows these principles of interchange.

The survival or value of any town, state or country follows these principles of interchange.

You can predict the survival of any activity by confirming its interchange regularities or can predict its downfall by irregularities in this interchange.

Therefore it is vital that a person or a section, department, division or part of an org or an org figure out exactly what it is interchanging. It is producing something that is valuable to the activity or activities with which it is in communication and for that it is obtaining support.

If it is actually producing valuable final products then it is entitled to support.

If on the other hand it is only organizing or hoping or PRing and is not producing an interchangeable commodity or commodities in **volume** or **quality** for which support can be elicited and even demanded, it will not be **viable**.

It doesn't matter how many orders are issued or how well org boards are drawn or beautiful the plans to produce are made. The hard fact of production remains the dominant fact.

How well organized things are *increases* production volume and *improves* quality and thus can bring about viability.

But it is the valuable final product there and being interchanged that determines basic survival.

Lack of viability can always be traced to the volume and quality of an actual valuable final product.

Hope of a product has a short-term value that permits an activity to be built. But when the hope does not materialize, then any hoped for viability also collapses.

One then must organize *back* from the actually produced product.

For instance, a technical subject is capable of producing an exact result.

If persons are trained to actually produce the result **and the result is produced** then one can exchange the technicians with the community for support.

If the result is produced (by training the technicians well) then the result can be interchanged with an individual for support and good will.

Where any of these factors suffer in volume or quality then an interchange is difficult and viability becomes uncertain.

As individuals, communities and states are not necessarily sane, upsets can occur in the interchange even when production is occurring.

Therefore the producer has a stake in maintaining the sanity of the scene in which he is operating, and one of his valuable final products is a scene in which production and interchange can occur.

The basics of valuable final products are true for any industrial or political, or economic system.

Many systems attempt to avoid these basics and the end result would be disaster.

The individual, section, department, division, org or country that is not producing something valuable enough to interchange will not be supported for long. It is as simple as that.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:mes.rd.gm

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 3 DECEMBER 1971

Remimeo

Executive Series 4

EXCHANGE

So many tricks have been entered into economic systems, and so many political fixations exist that a manager is often very hard-pressed trying to bring about solvency for his activity.

Money can be manipulated in a thousand different ways.

There are "speculators" who seek to buy something (like land) cheaply and sell it dear. Or sell it dear, depress the market and buy it back cheaply. In either case they make a profit.

It is less well understood that "speculators" also operate on the subject of money itself. By manipulating the value of one currency against another they seek to obtain a profit. This is the "international banker" at his daily work. He buys a hundred billion French francs for X dollars. Then he causes a panic about dollars. The franc gets very valuable. He sells his hundred billion French francs for 2X dollars. Then he says dollars are great. He has "made" a huge new lot of dollars for himself.

Or he finds a crummy politician like Hitler, builds him a war machine, gets paid back out of the plunder of Europe before Hitler collapses.

The banker loans George Manager 100,000 to modernize his plant. George wanted 200,000. But he takes the 100,000. The banker holds the whole plant as security. George doesn't make it as it really took 200,000 to do it. He goes broke. The banker grabs the 5,000,000 plant. This includes the 100,000 now spent on new machines. The banker sells it to a pal for 2,500,000 and makes that sum on his "loan."

The shareholders of Bide-a-wee Biscuit are told Bide-a-wee is busted. The stock falls. A group buys the stock up for peanuts, emerges as the owners of Bide-a-wee which turns out not to be busted.

All these and a thousand thousand other systems for making money, indulged in too often, spoil **confidence** and destroy money.

Eventually a whole religion like communism will grow up dedicated only to the destruction of capitalism.

What has been dropped out is the idea of **exchange**.

Money has to *represent* something because it is not anything in itself but an idea backed by confidence.

It can represent gold or beans or hours of work or most anything as long as the thing it represents is real.

Whatever it represents, the item must be exchangeable.

If money represents gold, then gold must be exchangeable. To prove this, the moment gold couldn't be individually owned, the dollar, based on it, became much less valuable.

There has to be enough of the thing that money represents. By making the thing scarce, money can be manipulated and prices sent soaring.

Economics by reason of various manipulations can be made into the most effective trap of the modern slave master.

Periodically through history, not just in current times, monied classes or those believed to control money have been torn to bits, shot, stoned, burned and smashed. The ancient pharaohs of Egypt periodically lost their country through tax abuses.

Money, in short, is a passionate subject.

Modernly, the lid is coming off the economic pot which is at a high boil.

Too many speculators, too many dishonest men generating too much hate, too many tax abuses, too many propagandists shouting down money, too many fools, all add up to an explosive economic atmosphere.

A group has to be very clever to survive such a period. Their economic arrangements and policies must be fantastically wise, well established and followed.

As it exists at this writing, the only real crime in the West is for a group to be without money. That finishes it. But with enough money it can defend itself and expand.

Yet if you borrow money you become the property of bankers. If you make money you become the target of tax collectors.

But if you don't have it, the group dies under the hammer of bankruptcy and worse.

So we always make it the first condition of a group to make its own way and be prosperous on its own efforts.

The key to such prosperity is *exchange*.

One exchanges something valuable for something valuable.

Processing and training are valuable. Done well, they are priceless.

In many ways an exchange can occur. Currently it is done with money.

In our case processing and training are the substances we exchange for the materials of survival.

To exchange something, one must find or create a *demand*.

He must then supply the demand in **exchange** for the things the group needs.

If that is understood, then at once it is seen that (a) a group can't just process or train its own members; and (b) a group cannot give its services away for nothing; and (c) the ser-

vices must be valuable to those receiving them; (d) that the demand must be established by surveys and created on the basis of what is found; and (e) that continual public contact must be maintained.

Thus, by bringing the problems of viability down to the rock-bottom basics of *exchange*, one can cut through all the fog about economics and money and be practical and effective.

If one is living in a money economy, then bills are solved by having far more than "enough money" and not spending it foolishly. One gets far more than "enough money" by understanding the principles of **exchange** and applying them.

In another type of economy such as a socialist state, the principles still work.

The principles of exchange work continuously. It does not go high and collapse as in speculation or demanding money but failing to deliver. Or delivering and not demanding money.

We see around us examples that seem to violate these principles. But they are nervous and temporary.

What people or governments regard as a valuable service is sometimes incredible and what they will overlook as valuable is also incredible. This is why one has to use surveys to find out what people want that you can deliver. Unless this is established, then you find yourself in an exchange blockage. You can guess, but until you actually find out, you can do very little about it.

Once you discover what people want that you can deliver, you can go about increasing the demand or widening it or making it more valuable, using standard public relations, advertising and merchandizing techniques.

The fundamental is to realize that **exchange** is the basic problem.

Then and only then can one go about solving it.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.gm

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 16 APRIL AD 15
Issue III

Gen Non-Remimeo

All Divisions

HANDLING THE PUBLIC INDIVIDUAL

We have learned the hard way that an individual from the public must never be asked to **decide** or **choose**.

Examining experiences we have had, I finally saw there was a hidden datum we had not been aware of in our orgs and particularly in handling the public. I finally dug it up and here it is:

To decide one has to understand.

Examining our big org chart you can see quite plainly that Understanding is higher than the point of public entrance into processing.

Example: Mr. J is offered Particle A. He can accept it just because it is offered. He does not have to even perceive it or talk about it or recognize any condition. He needs to see only two things:

- (a) That it is being offered by somebody or something (source), and
- (b) that Particle A *exists*.

All you have to do is show him where to obtain it and that it exists. This is acceptance without decision. Therefore he can have it.

Example: Mr. J is offered Particle A *or* Particle B. Now we have an entirely different situation. Mr. J must *compare* Particle A and Particle B in order to see which is best. Therefore he must see where each comes from (source), that each *exists*, establish the *condition* of each particle, *communicate* with and about them, *perceive* them, relate them to each other (become *oriented*), *understand* them, be *enlightened* and finally decide (establish own *purpose*). If he can do this Mr. J can choose which he should have, A or B. If Mr. J can't do all these things, Mr. J is overwhelmed, gets confused and takes neither. One has asked Mr. J to jump up a lot of levels. Actually the ordinary Mr. J, when raw meat and even not so raw, would have to have a Grade IX Certificate to obtain a Grade I Certificate. And that of course is impossible.

The door, then, is *barred* utterly for the majority of people into *any* department or function or org, let alone the promotion and accounts functions. The moral is very plain. Never ask anyone in the public or field to Decide or Choose.

Erase from our org patter "Which do you want, Mr. J?" Don't ask which course, or what pin or what book or which auditor or what door or what time he or she wants to start anything or which door or which road or which membership.

Cultivate totally on a staff a didactic but pleasant approach. "Your intensive starts_____. " "This is your next book_____. " "Your next course should be taken on_____. " "Go to the third door." "I see you're a pc. You go up to the second floor_____."

Erase even the banal "What do you wish?" or "What can I do for you?" as even that throws confusion into it.

Example: Miss N has heard of processing. She wants some. She never did decide to want some. She just wants some. Now to ask her to decide anything about it blunts that purpose. It is a thin purpose. It quivers. Don't ask her does she want a book or want training or want a pin or want anything else. Say only "Ah. You want processing. That is a good thing to want. Be here on Monday and bring funds." That's all. For heaven's sakes don't sell her processing or books or alternate schedules or ask her if she can pay or anything. That want is frail at best. Don't crush it! *If* she says timidly, "I only have_____ funds," say, "Good. Bring them, you can owe the rest. Be here on Monday."

In short **make** Miss N **right** for **wanting**, thus intensifying the want. Make her **right** when she talks about money. Then, being right, she *can* come in Monday. Simple. Chances are, even if she works, she'll still come in.

When she comes in she says, "I'm Miss N. I'm here for my processing." Reception **must** say, "Ah. You're Miss N. Good. There's the Accounts window. Sign up there." The Accounts says, "Here's the slip. Sign here. Take the slip to Room _____." Reception says, "This way Miss N." Estimations says, "Let me have your Accounts receipt. Good. That's fine. Have you been processed before? No? Well, you soon will be. This way please. Your auditor is waiting." The Auditor says, "Over here, please." Adjusts the pc's chair, etc, and sits down and says, "Start of Session." At its end he says, "Be in this room at _____" for Miss N's next. And so on. When she gets her Grade Certificate she's told, "That means you're a Grade I preclear. Get the book _____ down in reception. It will tell you all about Grade II." Miss N throughout is never anything but 8c'd. The general promotion told her what to want by saying she could have it. She expresses the want. The org people say, "That's a good thing to want. You can *have* it." And give it to her.

That's all.

Just as you'd never ask a pc which command he wanted, you never ask the public individual to decide.

You can teach them anything, particularly the truth. But never ask them to decide.

By processing up through the grades this person will soon begin to see and be there and understand and decide. And she'll surely decide she's a Scientologist as it's true all the way!

This is new Admin tech.

You will see us knocking out now all requests to choose in all promotion and in all routing of the public in an org. If we do so we will succeed beautifully.

THE FUNDAMENTAL

There is an even deeper fundamental at work here. It is quite startling.

You cannot get a flow without agreement. Examine your ARC triangle and you'll see why.

This is why an org won't flow traffic when Policy is out or not formed.

That's why any policy, agreed upon, is better than points of individual decision on flow lines.

It's not that people can't decide in orgs. They can. But when a staff member makes an individual decision not laid out by policy, the flow *stops*. Thus all flow and traffic lines including people and money and despatches will flow smoothly and rapidly only so long as the decisions that can be made are also part of policy and are simple decisions.

The rapidity of particle flow alone determines power.

Thus an org's strength and its sphere of influence and domain are all regulated by the *speed* of flow, both inside and outside an org!

And an org particle inside or outside an org (promotion, books, people, money) flows as fast as it's free of independent, unagreed-upon decision points.

Example: A flow line can go to A or B. Unless policy says "If it's above 80 it goes to A. If it's below 80 it goes to B," then that particle becomes the subject of a decision that is not covered by policy and *the flow stops*.

You can have a lot of choices on a Comm line or traffic line but none may be random choices made by an individual at that moment. The flow will stop, not because the decision is wrong but because the next point on the flow doesn't know what it really is and so can't handle it except slowly or by stopping it at least to think it over.

An org full of individual *decision points* not covered by group understanding is no org at all and will fail. It is a bunch of individuals working at cross purposes – each person okay, but the combined strength of the "org" is only that of one person in a state of confusion!

When the public is *also* being asked to decide about coming into an org full of individual decision points you get a total collapse.

The new Org Board overcomes all this. It has the choices laid out by policy and org form and formula. So it can grow, will be easy to work in and will remain a happy place unless somebody puts in some new decision points not on the chart. The result will be stopped flows, no traffic, no money, no org.

Never put in an "Individual random decision point" on a chart! That's the moral.

Then all staff can look over and see easily on what's decided where.

A multiple decision point can work providing only that all the decisions to be made are already known to all. Take a Communicator. She has to make many "decisions" that are known in advance. Which basket does what dispatch go into? That's an easy multiple "decision" providing the Org Board is easy to read and staff understands it and is doing the jobs for which they are posted. The line stops when the posts cross or aren't being handled, or at an "individual decision point" not then easily knowable to the staff.

This was the main problem in working out the 1965 Org Board. For the first time even my own post was being clarified by the need for knowable decision. Every post on the Board is like that. And it was all worked out. It could not have been worked out at all unless I had found some of the most fundamental formulas of this Universe. The type of pattern used kept one org going for 80 trillion years, believe it or not. And to that were added some very basic laws that had been overlooked by that outfit and which caused its eventual decay. It couldn't correct itself!

We aren't actually radically changed by the Org Board as all our own customs are functional on it also.

But it will flow and prosper as long as the decisions to be made are known already.

Example: A bill disputed decision = deposit sum in Reserved Payment Account and get the bill straight then pay right amount.

Example: Policy says Blue Students. They seem to be aquamarine coloured not blue. Report it to the Inspection and Reports Dept with all data. Inspection and Reports inspects and reports to the Office of LRH and policy is adjusted everywhere. Now we can handle aquamarine coloured students – or see that the Office of Estimations is forbidden to wear sunglasses while estimating! And while the policy is under adjustment we stick by known policy until adjusted.

Frankly, the 1965 Org Board pattern, as posted, gives all the routing hats and therefore the "decisions" are already visible. If a flow stacks up or a basket fills, or trouble occurs, we have an overload or an absence or an injected "individual decision point".

Far from robbing anyone of self determinism, the 1965 board is welcomed by sighs of relief. Even I was glad to get my own work onto it. The whole room went bright when I cog-nited "Gee, this is what everyone is trying to do to me; make me an individual decision point!"

One puts one's *baskets* and one's "*hands*" into the lines and *acts* on the lines. One doesn't put his decisions on the lines as the lines then hit him! A postulate or a decision is too close to a thetan's identity! It confuses him and makes him feel *hit* personally by the Communications when he has to newly decide on each one. If the decision is already there, A or B, he can *then* route with his "hands", not with himself. If he is always newly and randomly deciding he gets carried eventually on down the comm line himself and goes off post! A thetan can handle a vast volume of action so long as he doesn't have to make a strange or fresh decision in each act. We can tell in orgs who is making fresh individual decisions as that person has to bring each of his own dispatches in personally. (We call it, "bringing a body".) He routes himself too! Only a Communication runner who is involved only with who and where can do this safely as her decisions are known beforehand. Thus she can move on lines with impunity. Note that she only stops when she has to figure out who has now gone where and why she was not informed! Otherwise a Communications runner could go through fire and war with impunity without a pause so long as the who and where are known. Thus an investigation's personnel cannot also be a communications personnel without going half mad! But an investigation's personnel with her set of "who to look for and where" can move swiftly too! They (the communications personnel and the investigations personnel) have entirely different previously *known* decisions to make. Both are who, wheres. But the comm who, where is the comm station of a known person. And the investigation who, where is composed of types of whos and reported wheres. The purposes are different. The comm personnel sees to whom and where and delivers. The investigation personnel sees what and finds out whom and where and reports. Other staff must know what decisions these two will make. Other staff sees a jam of traffic and will feel comfortable if a Communicator predictably sends an expediter to help clear the jam. Also, seeing a confused area, other staff will feel all right about it if an investigator pops up and finds out what and whom and reports it accurately for a predictable decision. Thus a staff trained in the pattern of decisions that will be taken by the various departments only complains when somebody green puts somebody else's traffic on their lines or leaps in investigating the maintenance men when it's a bulldog a pc brought to session that's howling. Things get *predictable*. One sees a pile of traffic growing, one knows an expediter will show up. One sees a student blowing, one knows an investigator will show up. One can live in a predictable environment. One gets nervy only in the presence of unpredictable decisions. Want to know why wog courts make people nervy? Who can predict a wog court decision? Who can even predict the sentence man to man for the same crime? It's not knowing that makes men stupid. Part of knowing is:

"In a given situation what should be decided?"

Only a new knowledge of universal laws has made it possible to make, such an org pattern, for its decisions are then basic in every person and the universe in which we live. We need only avoid bank dramatizations to own the lot.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jw.rd

[Note: The above Policy Letter was reissued on 13 October 1970 without change. A revision was issued on 15 December 1972 deleting the first page and a half. This revision should be studied in conjunction with Policy Letters on sales closing techniques which appear in the 1972 and 1973 Year Books.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 21 NOVEMBER 1968

Remimeo

SENIOR POLICY

We always deliver what we promise.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ei.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 9 FEBRUARY 1971

Remimeo

EXECUTIVE MISBEHAVIOUR

In the past executives in three instances have seen fit to associate themselves with persons of the opposite sex who were antipathetic to Scientology and have continued with them a 2D relationship.

The idiocy of such conduct becomes obvious when it is realized that organizations antipathetic to Scientology spend money by the millions and hire people to infiltrate or disrupt organizations.

"Incautious" would be the light word for such behaviour. In each case the org and staff have suffered. In each case the actual condition of the executive could not have been higher than doubt.

Therefore the following policy is laid down:

Executive Misbehaviour Policy No. 1: No Executive who begins or persists in a sexual relationship with a person hostile to or "open minded about" Dianetics and Scientology may be retained on post or in the organization.

Executive Misbehaviour Policy No. 2: Any Executive who engages in activities for which he could be blackmailed may not hold any Executive post.

Executive Misbehaviour Policy No. 3: Any person who places personal interests and situations above the interest of the group may not hold an Executive post.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:mes:sb

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 24 AUGUST 1965
Issue II

Remimeo

CLEANLINESS OF QUARTERS AND STAFF
IMPROVE OUR IMAGE

There is no quicker way to depress income and public goodwill than to have dirty quarters and slovenly staff.

While we know it takes income to make a place look smart and to have elegant quarters, this is not the point of this policy letter.

Clean floors, walls, woodwork and service rooms require very little. Clean washrooms and proper paper towels and tissue are an ordinary requirement.

As the world goes more beatnik it is hard to keep up a standard of cleanliness and good order.

But it can be done.

And for the sake of income and goodwill it must be done.

The world has been educated by business to a tradition of clean quarters and smart service. We must at least equal that.

Staff should be uniformed in orgs that can afford it. A clean well dressed staff inspires confidence and begets the payment of bills and more service.

The private Scientology practitioner fails mainly on his personal lack of professional address to his clients and his personal dress is sometimes pretty grim. This is what costs him his income.

An org, to get anywhere at all, has to look like a real org and its staff must look like professionals. Until they can be uniformed, they can be clean.

Similarly, until you can have really swanky quarters you can at least have clean quarters, walls, WCs and things picked up.

A *clean* set of quarters and a neat, professional looking staff can increase your income by about 500%.

Improve our image.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ml.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 4 SEPTEMBER 1959
(Re-issued as HCO Policy Letter of 21 November 1962)

CenOCon
Franchise
Field

**COMPLETED STAFF WORK (C.S.W.) –
HOW TO GET APPROVAL OF ACTIONS AND PROJECTS**

THE MOST IMPORTANT PIECE OF YOUR HAT

There is an old term called "Completed Staff Work" which we will now employ in order to reduce Dev T and increase speed of action.

The term "Completed Staff Work" means – an assembled package of information on any given situation, plan or emergency forwarded to me sufficiently complete to require from me only an "Approved" or "Disapproved".

Here is what slows down approval and action and develops traffic: Somebody sends me a skimpy piece of information and demands a solution. As more information is required than is presented, I must then take over the person's Hat and assemble the missing data using my own time and lines. I must then dream up a solution and then order an action to be taken. This causes a slow-down on any action, causes my lines, already loaded, to be used for information assembly and brings about a feeling of emergency. My pending basket overloads and confusion results. This would be called "Incomplete Staff Work". It is incomplete because I have to complete it by:

1. Assembling the data necessary for a solution;
2. Dreaming up the solution based on written data only;
3. Issuing orders rather than approving orders.

If you are mad at your boss you can always ruin him with "Incomplete Staff Work". You forward him a fragment of alarming data without collecting the whole picture. This makes him do a full job of information collection. You give him no recommended solution. This makes him have to achieve a solution by remote examination of data; such solutions are often wrong as they are made without full data. Then you make him issue arbitrary and forceful orders that may ARC break some area and hurt his reputation. That's how to get even with a boss. And even if there's no intention of harming him, sending "Incomplete Staff Work" to your boss does harm him by making him send for information – getting despatches on already

crowded lines, by making him guess at the situation, by making him cook up solutions which may be unreal, and by thrusting him into the role of an arbitrary tyrant.

Now that we've seen the negative side, let us examine the positive side.

"Completed Staff Work" is an assembled despatch or packet which:

1. States the situation
2. Gives all the data necessary to its solution
3. Advises a solution; and
4. Contains a line for approval or disapproval by myself with my signature.

If documents or letters are to be signed as part of my action, they should be part of the package, all ready to sign, and each place they have to be signed is indicated with a pencil mark with a note in the recommendations saying signatures are needed.

Wrong example: A despatch from Canada saying "Central Organization here is spending large amounts". Look what I now have to do. I have to find out what is meant by "large amounts", who is doing it, if it is dangerous, figure out a way to curtail it and issue orders about it. None of this is my Hat. I am being forced to wear the Hat of the informing person.

Right example: I receive a packet (cable is no good and delays the situation's being handled as many more cables will be needed). This packet is covered with a despatch which says:

"145CA⁷. Central Organization here fast approaching insolvency. Data enclosed. I recommend: Director of Materiel be transferred to the post of Ext. Course Director that is now empty and that Jules Bentley be hired on the Dir. Mat. post at 25 units; that the Assn. Sec. be reprimanded for bad financial management and be ordered to budget his outgo; that a purchase order system be enforced; that a staff member ordering anything without permission have the item deducted from his pay; that the Dir of PrR⁸ be given lessons in letter writing.

Approved _____

Disapproved _____

Signed: Jane

HCO Sec. Canada."

Attached are copies of Ad Comm reports showing insolvency, a summary of amounts spent in last two months, a summary of income for last two months, a list of trivial items bought lately at high cost.

⁷ A numeration system that has been used to track the numbers of telexes. In the given example the telex 145 send from HCO Canada is mentioned.

⁸ Abr.: Director of Promotion and Registration

What I do then is check the approval line and sign. A cable is sent by my Communicator: "145CA2 OK best = Ron". The whole packet is airmailed back. But you must ask in your despatch to have a cable reply if you consider it that urgent.

On receipt of the cable the HCO Sec Canada issues the local Sec EDs and takes the other needed actions.

Action could occur because the data, solutions and orders were all assembled as "Completed Staff Work".

If you want to hold down your post or project don't insist on my collecting the data you should collect, dream up the solution you, more familiar with the scene, should achieve, and don't put me in a position of issuing unreal orders you can't then carry out.

We are a big team and a good one. I know any error on this in the past has occurred because you didn't know exactly what I wanted.

"Completed Staff Work" is what I want. Then you have your Hat, you can do more to help, and our lines can stay freer and faster.

There have been good examples of this in the past. Let's make the circumstances more general.

If you get the letters CSWP on an item it means "Complete the Staff Work, Please".

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:gl. rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 17 NOVEMBER AD 14

Remimeo
Sthil Staff

OFF-LINE AND OFF-POLICY
YOUR FULL IN-BASKET

(HCO Sec. Hat Check on all Executives and send me a despatch personally each time you have done so – 1 despatch per checkout.)

These two data are paramount in handling Scientology Communication Lines and your own In-Basket.

1. The first duty of an executive is routing properly and seeing that others route properly. If an executive does not do this, then the lines in his or her area will stack up and become so tangled that nobody can follow them or get through them. This reduces income and dissemination – producing traffic volume – and general effectiveness. By "routing properly" is meant to see that everyone around them routes properly. Forwarding something already improperly routed creates Dev-T and fails to handle misrouting where it is occurring.
2. Know and make known policy. The first thought of an executive in handling a despatch requiring a decision must be: "Is this already covered by planning or policy?" If the executive knows existing policy he or she will find that 99% of despatches "requiring decisions or solutions" are already cared for by policy and, the policy being unknown or non-existent, only *then* require "special handling". In short, if the matter is (a) covered already by policy, (b) if the sender should know that policy, or (c) if the first executive receiving the despatch knows policy, then the despatch should stop right there. This leaves flowing only traffic where policy does not exist or despatches about specialized matters.

The answer to put on a despatch demanding something already covered by policy is *not* some unusual solution. The answer on the despatch should be of two kinds – (a) to a person outside who would have no clue of policy, or (b) to somebody in an org who should know policy. In the case where (a) originates a query, the proper answer is "Policy on this is _____." In the case of (b) originating a query already covered by policy the answer is "Look up old (recent) policy on this."

To outside people, policy is largely unknown. Thus one has to look up the policy or recall it to handle. But such seldom have questions needing subtle points and field policy is

very well known in orgs such as "Give them what we promised if it was promised." "Keep entheta to a minimum" etc, etc. A simple "Sorry, it's against policy," is the simplest (and usually best) solution to outside wild queries or ideas. Why explain? You're not training a staff member.

Where a staff member is involved, it is expected he or she will know policy or can look it up.

If an executive gives the despatch querying for policy an "unusual solution" where policy already exists, then a problem will occur as this solution will clash with the *other* existing policy and the staff member goes spinning off to no-policy no-org. And the organization eventually becomes paralyzed. Any org that has an executive who doesn't keep up with policy and general planning and who is always replying to queries with unusual solutions of his own will soon find its income dropping out the bottom as it's being stuck on the track with counter-solutions. Soon, nobody will know what policy is, so in disagreement the org disintegrates. It is no longer an org – only a bunch of individuals working at cross purposes.

MISROUTING

Routing consists of forwarding a *proper* communication to its proper destination or, more pertinent to an executive, indicating how types of despatches are routed to staff members who route org despatches.

Misrouting would be misrouting indeed if one forwarded an improper despatch to anyone else and failed to shoot it back to its originator.

An improper despatch is one which hasn't any business on the lines. This is the soul of Dev-T (Developed Traffic) – the forwarding of improper despatches. One can forward all the proper despatches in the world without causing Dev-T. The moment one forwards an improper despatch *to anyone but the originator*, one has involved other terminals and blocked their lines too.

When you forward a despatch which should never have been written you become a party to the original Dev-T. Because the despatch *is* improper it will do nothing but snarl up In-baskets all the way along the line. The **only** correct action is to send it to the originator as improper.

IMPROPER

By improper we don't mean insulting or obscene. We mean:

- a) Has nothing to do with the person to whom it is sent or forwarded, or
- b) Is already covered by policy which should be known to the originator or the forwarding person.

Under a) we get nonsense despatches, despatches to the wrong people, obvious lies, "everybody says" despatches, despatches calculated only to make trouble, useless entheta and so on.

Under b) we have (A-HA! discovered!) the staff member who is ignorant of what's going on or what policies cover his or her post. We reasonably expect that, let us say, a Registrar has read those policies, old and new, that cover registration. From a general staff member we expect general planning to be at least known as general policy letters all go into his or her basket and so have been available.

OFF-LINE

A despatch is off-line when it is sent to the wrong person.

OFF-POLICY

A despatch is off-policy when originated by or forwarded by someone who should know that the matter is already covered by policy.

DEV-T

Traffic is developed (developed traffic, Dev-T) by originating *or forwarding an off-line or off-policy despatch to anyone but the sender*. This may seem obscure when we say a person *originating* an off-policy despatch should not send it to anyone but the sender – i.e. himself. He has the policy letters and general planning just as available to himself as they are to anyone in Scientology orgs. So querying by despatch about a policy that can be looked up is just being too lazy to look it up, isn't it? And putting the load on one's seniors to do one's own work.

When you forward an off-policy despatch to anyone but the sender, you, if you're an executive:

- a) Involve other lines and
- b) Fail to take the opportunity to spot a staff member weak on policy.

Your *duty* as an executive is to send the despatch to its source with orders to look up policy on this. Your duty is *not* to quote policy. He or she (the originator) is the one in mystery. Let the originator do the work. Nay, worse, prowl about that person a bit and see how bad it is and order if needed a full check out of the person on policy letters applying to his or her post. *That's* one's job as a senior executive. Not being a computer for the org that turns out answers.

Those staff members who habitually forward queries or something adequately covered in write-ups of their own duties to others are **dynamite** in an organization. The policy on

them has always been **they learn their job and do their job or they go**. We can't afford them. They *can cost us the whole organization*, and in two or three cases almost have.

They're too expensive when they don't learn their hats and general policy or push their duties off on others. *One* of them in an org costs at least *two* additional staff members to take care of their Dev-T and duties. Actual fact. Even where the Dev-T doesn't blow up an org. I could not possibly exaggerate their dangerousness to an org, fellow staff members and Scientology.

People who won't or can't learn policy or who continually alter it have not progressed case-wise to Level I. They cannot receive a comm so can't answer or respond properly and they do awfully wild things. They never dig what we're at, so they create a mess.

DUTIES OF AN EXECUTIVE

An executive keeps the organization on the road by getting people to get the job done. He may also have his own work and does that too and probably works very hard at it. But his *organization* duties are concerned mainly with enforcing proper routing and making people learn and adhere to policy. If an executive won't do that his post area or org is in a continual mess.

FLOODED IN-BASKETS

All you have to do is look at an Executive's In-Basket to know whether he or she is performing his or her *executive* duties. Although he or she may empty it daily, if there's much org traffic flowing through it you *know at once* that the person does not properly handle off-line or off-policy despatches.

This executive may be working day and night on the In-Basket. It's the *volume* of org despatches that says the executive is not handling off-line and off-policy despatches or who has not provided proper routing in his post area. Such an executive works himself or herself half to death and is still unable to get his people out of the red.

If the In-Basket is merely stacked up, and isn't being handled at all, it tells us that this person simply doesn't do any job at all but is kidding people. In actual experience when we find a stacked up, unmoving In-Basket we also find (a) pretended busyness or (b) just plain no action on post or (c) outright lies. But these conditions cause an area of upset in the org because *somebody else above or below* that person on the org board is unable to get his job done because of that "camouflaged hole" (means post not filled but only appears to be, thus leaving a hole in the line up). Such people *always* cause overwork by persons above or below them and are pretty dangerous to have around.

POLICY ON DEV-T

Our *policy* on finding an habitually full In Basket which never gets handled is to (a) attempt to get the person's hat on and if that fails (b) transfer them to a post they really can do and if they don't work there (c) dismiss. We don't ever add "processing" into our policy of handling such people as they are well below Zero and take too much work on them to make them useful.

Policy now regarding the executives who work hard but have fantastic staff despatch volume is (a) have them read this policy letter and if their volume doesn't reduce (b) hat check them on this policy letter and if their volume still doesn't fall to very little traffic (c) have them do the org board in clay, do Scientology orgs over the world in clay, do their post in clay and review all policy letters relating to their post and the org and planning in general.

The complaint is not that this executive isn't working. The complaint is that this executive is not putting his post area together and helping, through discipline of off-line, off-policy despatches to put an organization there and put Scientology across over the world.

Such an executive, freed of the burden of handling off-line and off-policy despatches will begin to do his own work industriously, will come out of protest and begin to handle and disseminate Scientology and will cease to flood Scientology lines by forwarding off-line and off-policy despatches.

Further, the executive will also supply routing directions for his general traffic that brings about a smooth flow in his unit or department or org or continent.

SUMMARY

You *never* send further an off-line or off-policy despatch. You *always* route it back to the source, the staff member who sent it.

On an off-line despatch you see to it that the source routes it properly whether it comes from above or below and that the originator of an off-line despatch from below studies the org board. On this last you must also be sure the org board reflects the actuality of the real organization and is functioning. When you skip doing that you can't of course get off-line routing cured as there isn't a visible line. Nobody has put the org board there to be known. Hence, lots of off-line despatches.

On off-policy despatches, you yourself must be familiar with policy in order to tell if something is covered *by* policy. In order to get somebody to follow policy you must of course be sure that the policy is available and that you have done everything you could to help get policy easily found and known. Time spent on the study of policy is very well spent. And when I ask for clarification of or existing policies in your area you should give that *top* priority *as you won't be able to do your job* unless you help on policy when needed. And the way to help on policy is to write up all the policies for your hat or area and send them to me if I ask for them so I can review and publish them. A group cannot function *at all* without agreed upon policy and of course *it can never grow*. Its In-Baskets get too full. There's no way to get

a post filled and working. There's no real comm, only Dev-T. The resulting confusion stops any expansion. So the org stays tiny and works madly and stays poor. No policy. All Dev-T. Each person present wears all the hats and also wears them all differently. That's not an org. It's a bunch of auditors pooling their confusions.

We are suckers for origination acceptance. Being trained auditors we are conditioned to letting people originate. But that's *in session*. You're not auditing when you're an executive. An improper despatch is actually not an origin at all. It's a confession that one isn't on staff or should be trained to come on staff. Such a "staff member" is still a field auditor knocking around in the org if he doesn't know policy. Critical, blundering, creating Dev-T, fouling up lines. Pretty grim. An executive's job is first to put an org there by providing comm lines amongst the group and from the org to public and public to org. That's the first, the very first responsibility of an executive whether Assn Sec or PE Director or D of T or any executive.

ROUTING

When routing arrangements are made *inside* the org – from staff member to staff member – we call it **organizing**.

When routing arrangements are made or communication invited from org to public and public to org we call it **promotion**.

The executive duties of an executive are primarily concerned then, with **organizing** and **promotion** and seeing that the arranged actions are executed.

Having put the lines there, the executive must see that they truly exist and go on existing. We call this "getting people's hats on" and "keeping people's hats on" inside the org, and public to org and org to public we call "making sure promotion is executed."

The bulk of any executive's job is seeing that things are *executed*. Seeing that lines are followed, policy followed, promotion carried out. Even the D of T, making sure students are taught only straight technology, is executing policy. The D of P, seeing that pcs get gains, is really only following policy and *making sure it is followed*.

For a very senior executive to actually forward further on a query he has received from a staff member the answer to which is already covered by policy is a *very* serious thing. Why? Because the action says this senior executive doesn't know policy, or at the very least isn't putting on the hats of his staff members and juniors and so hasn't got a functioning org.

For a very senior executive to forward an already misrouted despatch is a confession of the most gross ignorance of his or her own org board.

HARD WORK

It is not saintly then for an executive to merely work hard. In fact, where that work is mainly invested in handling the In-Basket, that hard work is just causing hard work in other places too. It is quite stupid to get tied down to an In-Basket full of staff despatches. The *only*

way this can happen (countless staff queries or infos) is by failing to spot off-line and off-policy despatches and return them to source, saying "Misrouted. See Org Board," for off-line. Or saying for off-policy, "Policy already exists on this. Look it up, please," or saying "This is contrary to general planning. Please look up recent policy letters."

MAKE THEM WORK

The surest cure for such floods of despatches is *always* to make the source work harder because he or she goofed by sending an off-line or off-policy despatch.

Some off-line off-policy despatches are originated out of pure laziness. "Takes too long to look it up, I'll ask the HCO Sec" is the usual line of thought. The poor HCO Sec, already too overworked to look up policy, gives in desperation an unusual solution. This really messes it up. The solution given can only be as good as the data offered and if that data is wrong, the solution is very wrong, and as the query originated in laziness it is probably wrong in data and so *any* effort to answer it at all will only louse things up.

Hence, it is contrary to the best interests of the org to give the source the proper routing for off-line despatches. If you do, you don't handle the real trouble – the staff member doesn't know it's an org yet and so will not be able to do his or her job. You *must* get that staff member familiar with the org board or you'll have betrayed the org. You see, *other* staff members also suffer with the off-line originations from this person. And as an executive you aren't protecting your own people from off-line origins if you don't handle the person doing it when spotted. Cure it and you help not just your In-Basket – you'll take a very heavy load off other staff members too. You see, yours isn't the only In-Basket in the org, and if you are an executive you're the one who *must* handle the routing for only you have the immediate authority to do so. Expansion depends chiefly on your taking that action.

On *off-policy despatches*, by which we mean the staff member doesn't know his policy and so does things contrary to it or wants to know if it is policy, why should *you* study up your policy letters? You are probably fairly well up on them. The person who isn't is the source of that despatch. So you *must* make sure that that person gets industrious on the subject of policy and burns some midnight oil on old and new policies and general planning.

So again, by your looking it all up for the offender, you cripple your organization by leaving uncared for an area in it that will goof. And that staff member's goof can destroy the whole org! That's no exaggeration.

Why are you working so hard as an executive to put the org there and make it grow if there aren't elements around that are destroying it? If there were no such elements your org would just grow and all your work would be promotional or service. That you are always continuously creating your department, unit or org or defending it somehow, means there must be something knocking it down. The symptom of that something is the off-line or off-policy despatch.

For you to be totally effective you yourself must know routing (the org board) and know policy and the general planning in progress.

And for an org board to be known it must exist and be real and must say what departments, units and staff members do.

And for policy to be known it must exist and be findable.

To make minor changes on an org board and double assign (2 or more hats to one person) is quite usual in an org. To make major changes such as Adcomm in Charge of HCO or training done by the Accounts Unit would be a gross violation of policy. And so your org board must to that degree be a standard org board. But you still have to do routing on it and provide routing for it.

To invent policies or supplement policies without sending them through channels as *completed staff work* (which means routed to the board, with all related policy letters clipped to the requested change and the new policy letter all written ready for issue) will break down the Scientology lines in that area.

You don't believe it? Australia got into its whole enquiry mess because the senior executives either did not know or follow the long standing policy concerning the prompt return of money to a dissatisfied pc. That cost the org thousands and thousands, a year of grief, and risked getting Scientology banned in Australia. A policy not known or altered is *death*. Not from me but from the community in which the org operates.

Still don't believe it? Washington D.C. either did not know or did not follow the explicit policy concerning receiving favours from preclears but only half-heartedly reported them to an uninformed HCO which didn't know or didn't follow the full intent and spirit of the policy and never told me as was implied in the original policy letter. The wife of that person giving the favours brought on the *whole* FDA mess that cost us tens of thousands and *two years* of grief and almost knocked out Scientology in the U.S.

Policy is survival for a group.

Only practical policy agreed upon and followed provides the ARC that is the life itself of any group. It's the mores, the policies, whatever you want to call them that makes a group or an organization alive and breathing.

Bad policy, bad mores, and you have a dying group, a dying organization. Governments whose policies are unreal are perishing. They act like criminals. There's where anyone gets his distaste for "policy" – he has looked at the policies of dying groups and is imitating how they are regarded.

But as in control there is good control and "bad control" so in policy there is good policy and bad policy. It has a bad name with some people. It bores them. They also kill groups. So if your organization is going to live it must have real, living policy and respect it and use it.

All right, so we're serious now. Org boards and policies must exist and be followed and the person who makes sure of that is a Scientology executive.

The clue to violations is the continuously full In-Basket, whether moving or not. If an executive's In-Basket is always full, then he or she either isn't (a) working at all or (b) is

working like mad but is not handling off-line or off-policy despatches by getting the lines in and the policy known.

You can't escape it, there it is.

There is nothing wrong with working hard as an executive. I do. There is nothing wrong with having lots of traffic through an In-Basket. A busy org does. There is everything wrong with an executive having a lot of staff traffic because 99% of it is off-line and off-policy and if you don't act to correct it you not only don't have time to breathe, you also will wind up with no income and no org.

Fact.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jw.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 31 JANUARY 1965

Remimeo
Sthil Staff

DEV-T

(Adds to HCO Pol Ltr Nov. 17, 1964)

The commonest cause of **off-line** despatches is:

A staff member writes a despatch to himself but routes it to somebody else.

Example: Registrar writes a despatch to the Org Sec asking how to meet a quota of interviews. This is Dev-T because it is off-line. Why is it off-line? The staff member responsible for increasing interviews is the Registrar, not the Org Sec. Therefore the despatch should be routed to the Registrar and routing it to anyone else is misrouting. *Informing* the Org Sec, "I am doing so and so to increase the number of interviews" is quite in order, but it's a despatch containing a report, requiring no answer. The correct routing of a query about increasing interviews would be to the Registrar. Thus, the above example's routing would be the Registrar to the Registrar.

When a staff member generates a lot of despatches about his post, these are usually misrouted if they go to anyone else but himself. Since who else should wear that hat? Not the Org Sec or Assn Sec. Not the HCO Sec. Only the staff member himself or herself.

In orgs a goodly number of people think staff members senior to them also wear their hats. This is definitely not true. The Assn Sec or Org Sec does not wear every other hat in the org. If he does, he is a pretty poor organizer. And if he lets staff force him to, then he isn't much of a leader.

You can detect people who fear responsibility or consequences of their most ordinary actions by the number of despatches they send others which should only have gone to the staff member himself or herself.

It's the figures on the weekly report sheet, the volume of work accomplished, the resume of results that inform others about a hat and the activities and effectiveness of the person wearing it. An Org/Assn Sec only needs to look at these reports, not his in-basket, to know if posts are being held. It may make one feel grand and responsible when others *must* come to one for help on their jobs but it sure doesn't make a strong org to have "what-do-I-dos" flying up to the head of the org day and night. People exist who do their jobs without a lot of Dev-T about how to do them, what to decide, how to think. And people exist who do their jobs without getting everyone else in trouble.

OTHER PEOPLE'S HATS

There is another type of Dev-T which one encounters. And that is the origination of comm that should have been originated by someone else.

This has several guises. You see it in a usual form in Academies where some student is always asking questions "so that the others will understand". The student himself or herself understood the instructor but asks a question so "the others will understand also". This is, of course, a student trying to wear the instructor's hat or another student's student hat. I can usually detect this one and break it right there with "Are you asking because you don't get it or because you think the others haven't?" Such a student can lengthen study hours horribly without helping anyone a bit.

A staff member occasionally tries to originate for another hat than his or her own. It is easily detected. The despatch has to do with the Academy but is from the HGC, etc.

Such a despatch is usually misrouted also. It is sent to a department head or the HCO Sec or somewhere. Trying to handle it gets pretty deadly as it's a double snarl.

The originator shouldn't have originated it and also should have sent it elsewhere if he or she did originate it. If the HGC thinks it has to wear the Academy hat then the despatch should go to the Academy and nowhere else. At least send it to the hat it most concerns.

This gets even more snarled when it jumps an org – to wit, an HGC staff member originates a despatch *for* the Academy and sends it *to*, let us say, the National Central Org. In the other org, unfamiliarity with the org board of the originating org can cause action to be taken. It isn't noticed that the HGC is talking for the Academy.

When action is taken other than returning the *off-origin despatch* to its sender, a great many evils can result. The least of them is that it gets the sender in trouble when acted upon.

Example: A staff auditor proposes to the Assn Sec that students be trained better in 8c because of a recent HGC flub. The Assn Sec jumps on the DofT. The DofT privately pounds the staff auditor into the ground.

Ill feeling in orgs usually stems from these *off-origin* despatches.

In the above example, the staff auditor should have taken it up emphatically on the basis of a flub in the HGC with the DofP who then would take it up with the DofT still on the basis of an HGC flub. Then it has a chance of straightening out. You see, lacking data, the person originating an *off-origin* despatch usually assigns wrong cause. In the above example it may have been certification at fault, not the Academy at all. One can drown in a sea of errors on these off-origin despatches. Basically what ails governments is their dependence on spy reports, police reports, etc. The reporting person does not wear the hat which should have originated.

When a staff member does not himself originate when he or she should, it will show up in the OIC reports and in emergencies. It is handled by putting on the person's hat, auditing or personnel transfers, not by off-origin despatches.

Did you know you can let an entheta despatch drop right there and create less entheta by doing so? Try it sometime.

Not all off-origin despatches are entheta, of course.

Part of this type of despatch is of course off-zone. Perth originating for Sydney. Or Los Angeles originating for New York. Or Assoc Sec London (as once happened years ago) doing business *only* in Australia. Or LA getting pcs only from Nevada. Here one sees somebody operating for the wrong zone or for only part of their whole zone. On a smaller look, a staff member doing only part of his job produces a similar result. And somebody doing another staff member's job is another version of it.

Off-origin despatches or work can make an awful lot of Dev-T – not always pleasant.

ORG BOARD DEV-T

An out of date Org Board can cause Dev-T.

A staff that doesn't have a well done Org Board cannot help but make Dev-T.

An Org Board is what we use instead of Appointment lists inside orgs. If it isn't posted on the Org Board, it hasn't been appointed. Why? Because an appointment is effective only if its work will be routed to it. If nobody knows about an appointment, then how can anything but Dev-T occur?

Thus prime preventers of Dev-T are:

1. A well done Org Board.
2. A complete Org Board containing all appointments.
3. A staff checked out on the Org Board.
4. All new staff checked out on the Org Board.
5. No appointments existing that don't appear on the Org Board.

A *lot* of Dev-T occurs because some people are insufficiently aware of the existence of an org. They think "we're all here together working". They don't realize everybody in the org does a different job than the rest.

There is no one so eager to reorganize everything as a new staff member who has yet to discover the org board and its purposes.

And there is a flood of Dev-T from anyone who:

1. Doesn't know the org board well and who
2. Hasn't got his own hat on.

Obviously, to reduce Dev-T and keep one's In-Basket within reason, one must:

1. Have a complete and well-done Org Board up to date and known, and
2. Get individual hats on.

Otherwise people will misroute continuously – sending their own bits to others and flooding wrong others with despatches.

HATS

Given a good Org Board with the purpose of each post stated and the whole thing well known to staff, lengthy and complex hats become less important.

Hats, complete ones, *are* important and of value.

But did you know that a staff member will do best if he has to *evolve* his own hat before he reads up on it or afterwards?

The way to do this is on a Clay Table.

Take a very fundamental statement of the staff member's job – a complete, simple statement. Then, have the staff member:

- (a) Work out the org in relation to the field and public in clay;
- (b) Work out his job in clay in relation to the rest of the org;
- (c) Work out his job in clay in relation to his job and himself.

After a staff member has done that (labelling every bit of everything he makes), and then done (a), (b) and (c) again, most of those misapprehensions and not-knows that cause Dev-T will be gone.

And it pays off in the time spent by increased effective volume and decreased Dev-T.

Very little Dev-T is caused by viciousness or mean intent. It's just the accumulations of (1) Not-knowns and (2) Afraid to dos.

Cure them.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jw.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 8 FEBRUARY 1965

Remimeo
Sthil Staff

DEV-T ANALYSIS

(Continues HCO Pol Ltrs of 17 Nov '64 and 31 Jan'65)

Probably the basic reason for the expansion of bureaucracies is Dev-T.

When Admin staff in one of our orgs begins to exceed Tech staff then it is obvious that a lot of Dev-T is on the lines. Proof of this is the continual finding that an increase in Admin staff does not lead to an increase in income but on the contrary often heralds an era of decreased gross income.

Within reason, you must not increase Admin staff numbers until you have thoroughly hunted down all Dev-T and taken adequate remedies for it.

When a government sees a lot of despatches it thinks it needs a lot of people. These, making more Dev-T, then seem to need many more people, etc. The cure for a lot of despatches without a lot of new income showing up is a brisk analysis of the org's comm lines.

This is simply done.

1. Look around for constantly full and not emptied In-Baskets. When you find one in which the traffic does not move, look the post over carefully and decide which one of the following to do on the basis of what you find on that post (a) educate or (b) replace. If, when (a) is done, the basket again remains as before, do (b).
2. Look into people's baskets for despatch and letter dates. If you find a basket where these are quite old, find out why and make up your mind what to do about it on the basis of what you find.
3. Look into drawers for cached despatches, letters, etc. If you find a drawer full, realize somebody is staying clean on the boards by hiding what should be visible. Find out why this violation is occurring and act accordingly.
4. Look over the traffic flow of the principals of the Org (Assn/Org Sec, HCO Sec) and analyze their traffic on the basis of the number of off-line, off-policy, off-origin despatches. Note what staff members are doing these and act accordingly.
5. Make the principals of the org keep logs of off-line, off-policy, off-origin despatches and also bodies brought with despatches. After one week, take these logs and, as they spot the Dev-T artists in the org, act accordingly.

The main thing to know is never get reasonable about Dev-T. If it doesn't cure by education or other means, then you have no choice but to act. The sooner you act, the better for everyone.

NO WORK

The Anglo-Saxon race has a crazy spot on the subject of work. The whole ambition is to *not* work.

This is quite at variance with several other races and normal thetan behaviour.

Easily the greatest source of Dev-T is non-compliance or no-comm.

You can say all you want about despatches and analyze them thoroughly and with benefit to all.

But the most deadly conditions, the things most likely to produce the greatest floods of traffic in the long run are non-compliance and no-comm.

One or the other of these is the basis of any emergency.

So in analyzing traffic to increase income and efficiency, be very alert to the points of non-compliance and no-comm.

In our ordinary despatch system these are not easily spotted as we seldom keep copies of our despatches.

The way to locate these spots is by questioning the principals of the org and getting a list of:

1. Emergencies of the past 3 months and what departments and personnel were most closely connected to them.
2. Present time problems of the principals with the org and the names of the staff members most closely connected with these.

Compare lists 1 and 2. You will find that there are names common to both these lists.

Query what despatches remain unanswered by these persons or what orders have not been complied with. This selects out one or two people.

You now have the basic sources of Dev-T in the org which cause more visible Dev-T to build up.

Act accordingly. And don't get "reasonable".

Principals seldom realize that their softness on bad Dev-T offenders works great hardship on other staff members. The real overt is against other staff members by not acting effectively to locate and reduce Dev-T.

As an example, I know of an instance where two staff members' non-compliance and neglect of orders cost an org £20,000 *cash* in one year alone and brought the org to a point where only heroic action saved it. Only two out of 50 were responsible. The other 48 were

working their heads off trying to make a go of things. These two, by non-compliance with despatches, with no-comm, sabotaged all promotion and the entire PO system and nobody could tell how it was happening. When they departed, not only the losses vanished but org income *doubled*.

So don't ever get soft where you see non-compliance or unanswered despatches. You're looking at trouble and future emergencies that may wipe out the org.

DEV-T ANALYSIS

You can pretty well size up a whole org just by watching its despatch lines and baskets.

If you were very skilled at this, you really wouldn't need to move out of the communicator's chair to spot every bad and good point in the org.

Without analysis by Dev-T, an org is carried on the backs of a few desperate staff members.

Why do it the hard way? Watch and handle Dev-T sources and you'll be able to breathe again.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jw.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 27 JANUARY 1969

Remimeo

DEV-T SUMMARY LIST

(Add to Dev-T Policies)

The following list is a summary of items which Develop (Increase) Traffic. It is based on years of experience with the subject of Dev-T.

1. FALSE REPORTS

A report that is false can cause greatly increased useless action including at times Bs of I, despatches verifying it, etc.

2. NON-COMPLIANCES

Failure to comply with an order can set an emergency flap going which crowds the lines with despatches. One consequence of non-compliance when repeated over a long period is to move a large number of Targets into PT in a sort of frantic jam. Catastrophes can occur because of non-compliance.

3. ALTERED COMPLIANCE

Something was introduced or changed in the orders which made them non-optimum. This sometimes wastes and repeats all earlier traffic.

4. NO REPORTS

The scramble to find out if something has been done increases traffic. This includes lack of data forwarded as it should have been. It causes as well anxiety and uncertainty.

5. COMM FORMULA UNUSED

All orders out answers in are on the Comm Formula. Failing to answer the question asked can triple traffic.

6. INFO FAILURE

Those in charge fail to brief their juniors. These then have no idea of what's going on and develop other traffic in conflict. Reversely, juniors fail to inform seniors of data they have.

7. LACK OF CSW

Failure to forward an assembled package of information on any given situation, plan or emergency or failure to forward complete information on any despatch, sufficiently complete to require only an approved or not approved, slows down approval and action and develops traffic. It often requires returning for completed staff work, or the senior concerned must take over the person's hat and assemble the missing data using his own time and lines. And thus traffic develops.

8. SUPPRESSION ON LINES

Lines get closed by arbitraries so that vital info does not get through or vital action is not ordered.

9. CROSS ORDERS

Juniors issue so many orders unknown to a senior and *across* his lines that a senior's orders are obscured or lost. Things get very confused, very active but non-productive.

10. PRESENT TIME ORDERS ONLY

Basic Programmes or standing orders or policy go out by not being enforced. PT orders only are being forwarded or handled. This eventually balls up in a big wad and an organization vanishes. Primary Targets go out.

11. NON-EXISTENT TARGETING

Targets are not set, major targets are unknown. Actions are then unproductive.

12. UNREAL TARGETS

Targets are set and worked on which are not derived from any useful major target.

13. CROSS TARGETS

The senior's target system is neglected due to conflicting targets being set on lower levels.

14. BUGGED TARGETS

A target develops bugs in its forwarding which are not seen or reported. The target stalls. A furious traffic burst may eventually occur to redo it and catch it up.

15. HOBBY HORSES

A staff member can "ride his favourite hobby horse", ordering and complying only in his favourite area, neglecting areas of greater importance. His orders often cross-order and distract from important targets and create Dev-T, vital actions being neglected.

16. STALEDATED ORDERS AND DISPATCHES

Staledating delays action, often important, and creates anxiety and emergencies. New (developed) traffic results in an attempt to get an answer or compliance.

17. FORMULA EVASION

Areas or persons fail to follow the conditions formulas assigned or actually indicated and pursue the wrong or no formula.

18. INCORRECT CONDITIONS

Incorrect conditions are assigned or assumed with consequent ball up of lines.

19. HAT DUMPING

This is referring everything to someone else. It greatly increases traffic without producing.

20. CHANNEL SKIPS

Something is not forwarded in channels but skips vital points and if acted on confuses the area of the points skipped.

21. VIOLATED PURPOSE

A Division, Dept or staff member or materiel used for things it was not organized to do. It disrupts its normal lines.

22. BACKLOGGING

If traffic or bodies begin to be backlogged one can stall completely just handling the queries about the backlog without getting anything really done.

23. OFF-ORIGIN

(Statements and Despatches)

A terminal originates something not its hat.

24.OFF-LINE

Despatches or orders are passed in a manner to deny info on record.

25. INCORRECT ORGANIZATION

The Comm System or procedures are not organized so as to be easily used. They are either not organized at all or are made too complex to be useful.

26. ORG BOARD DEV-T

An out-of-date Org Board can cause Dev-T. A staff that doesn't have a well done Org Board cannot help but make Dev-T. A staff that doesn't know the Org Board will make Dev-T.

27. UNTRAINED STAFF

Staff not grooved in on the lines mainly deal in Dev-T and although they even look busy seldom accomplish much.

28. UNPRODUCTIVE PERSONNEL

Keeping a personnel on a post who is a flagrant Dev-T source.

29. PEOPLE WHO PRESENT PROBLEMS

Problems presented by juniors when solved by a senior cause Dev-T because the source of the problem usually won't use the presented solution either.

30. HAVING TO HAVE BEFORE THEY CAN DO

Projects stall "because of FP" or "because it would be nice to have a _____".

31. PERMITTING DEV-T

The biggest single goof anyone can make is failing to recognize something as Dev-T and going on to handle it anyway. One's basket soon overflows. The reason for "overwork" and "heavy traffic" is usually traceable to permitting Dev-T to exist without understanding it or attempting to put the Dev-T right.

32. LACK OF EXECUTIVE RESPONSIBILITY

Is this OK?

Executives may not OK anything done or to be done below their level unless their immediate junior has also stated or attested with an initial that it is OK.

Unless one can fix responsibility for actions there is no responsibility anywhere and the whole show goes to pot.

Never let a junior say "Is this OK?" Always make him state or initial "This is OK" on all work, actions or projects.

"Is this OK?" is Dev-T and should be chitted as such.

33. EXECUTIVE ENTURBULENCE

An executive is seldom hit unless he has had non-compliance on his lines. He is almost never hit if he polices Dev-T. When an executive is hit by a catastrophe, he should handle it and **at once check up on dev-t and handle it**. I keep a daily log of Dev-T and who and what every time I find my lines heavy or there is a threatened catastrophe. Then I handle the majority offenders.

34. USING DEV-T AS AN EXCUSE TO CUT LINES

An executive must really know what Dev-T is and really say what the exact Dev-T was in order to reject or handle Dev-T.

35. CATASTROPHES

A catastrophe occurs by lack of prediction of a possible circumstance. Those things planned for do not become catastrophes. Catastrophes **usually follow a period of excessive Dev-t.**

The above make a great many motions necessary where only the one correct one was needed.

Thus a crew or Org can look *very* busy when it is only handling Dev-T. It will get nowhere. Real Targets are not done. Tempers go bad. Staff and crew are overworked.

Also when I get Dev-T on my lines I know that it is despite various screenings. If *I* get it, then it must be 100 times that for the fellow who has no such admin defenses.

I routinely run a Dev-T check on my lines and advise all officers and executives to do the same.

The way to handle this is **Review** and **classify** all targets into their types as per three recent Policy Letters.

Find and note all instances of Dev-T as above with the person who did them.

Turn in **knowledge reports** or ethics chits concerning them.

Concentrate on **completing** proper targets set as per the recent Policy Letters.

Only report completions.

Work to get **completions**. Then we'll get the job done.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ldm.ei.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 30 JANUARY 1969
Issue II

Remimeo

DEV-T SUMMARY LIST ADDITIONS

Adds to HCO P/L 27 Jan '69 (add to Dev-T Policies)

An actual example of Dev-T (*Developed* Traffic) follows:

A warm wind came up and the heating system on the "MV APOLLO" was no longer required to be on. A message was sent to the Engine Room to "turn off the heat".

The order was not complied with.

The order was repeated some time later to a steward to send a messenger to the Engine Room and tell them to "turn the heat off the fans". The messenger was not sent by the steward, but the steward instead told the I & R (Inspections and Reports) of the Engine Room who was making his inspection rounds, to turn *down* the heat.

Again the order had to be repeated, this time to a messenger who went to the Engine Room and gave the order to "turn the heat off the fans" to the Engineer of the Watch.

He replied, "We turned it *down* a short while ago!"

The messenger accepted this *almost* and reported back to the senior executive, who again had to send the messenger to repeat the order to "turn off the heat". This time the messenger returned with the compliance that the heat had been turned off.

Four times the message had to be repeated before compliance was reported.

Developed Traffic.

From the above some new forms of Dev-T can be isolated.

36. ACCEPTING AN ALMOST

The messenger accepted the **almost** of turning *down* the heat. The order was to turn it *off*.

An executive or communicator or messenger who accepts and forwards an "almost" is permitting Dev-T.

Orders given are to be executed and reported **done**, not to be nearly done or almost done.

A *communicator* can often be tripped up by this form of Dev-T. It is most easily spotted by insisting that the original order or orders be returned with the compliance so that any terminal on the line can tell at a glance *what was ordered*, and *what was done*.

37. FAILURE TO GET AN ORDER CLARIFIED

Upon questioning it was found that the messenger had not fully understood what was required and passed this uncertainty on to the Engineer of the Watch.

38. IRRELEVANT INFORMATION

The Engineer of the Watch, when told to "Turn the heat off the fans", gave the messenger the irrelevant information, "We turned it down a short while ago".

A later check revealed that he did indeed comply and turn the heat off but failed to inform the messenger of this, giving her only the irrelevant information that they had earlier turned it down.

This form of Dev-T can also take the form of forwarding to a senior large quantities of irrelevant information, jamming his lines, and reducing his productiveness. The opposite of this, of course, is failure to inform one's seniors of relevant data (see P/L 27 Jan '69, Dev-T Summary point 6).

39. REASONABLENESS

A staff member or executive can be "reasonable" and accept reasons why something cannot be done, accept incomplete cycles as complete, and fail to follow through and get completions.

All of which results in further traffic. This form of Dev-T is best handled by knowing and applying HCOB 19 August '67, "The Supreme Test" [Volume 7, page 362].

The supreme test of a thetan is his ability to make things go right.

40. FAILURE TO TERMINATEDLY HANDLE, REFERRAL

The only tremendous error an organization makes, next to inspection before the fact, is failing to terminatedly handle situations rapidly. The fault of an organization's wobble, wobble, wobble, Joe won't take responsibility for it, it's got to go someplace else, and all that sort of thing, is that it continues a situation.

What you should specialize in is terminating the end of a situation, not refer it to someone else. Complete the action now.

41. FAILURE TO COMPLETE A CYCLE OF ACTION AND REFERRAL

One of your most fruitful sources of Dev-T is your own double work.

You pick up a despatch or a piece of work, look it over and then put it aside to do later, then later you pick it up and read it again and only then do you do it.

This of course doubles your traffic just like that.

If you do every piece of work that comes your way **when** it comes your way and not after a while, if you always take the initiative and take action, not refer it, you never get any traffic back unless you've got a psycho on the other end.

You can keep a comm line in endless ferment by pretending that the easiest way not to work is to not handle things or to refer things. Everything you don't handle comes back and bites. Everything you refer has to be done when it comes back to you.

Complete the action, do it now.

42. FAILURE TO RECORD AN ORDER

Failing to make an adequate record of an order given, losing or misplacing the order can result in endless Dev-T.

The original orders being lost or not recorded at all, wrong items are purchased, incorrect actions are taken, cross orders are given, and a tremendous waste of executive time and money occurs straightening the matter out.

This is one of the most serious sources of Dev-T.

43. UNCLEAR ORDERS

An executive giving an unclear order puts uncertainty and confusion on the line right at the very beginning of the cycle of command.

The safe way on an important programme or action is to Target it.

44. MISUNDERSTOOD ORDERS

Orders misunderstood by the recipient will not be properly complied with as the order was misunderstood. The incorrect or no action following will require further traffic to correct.

As an executive, originate clear precise instructions and orders.

As a junior, duplicate the order, and never fail to clarify if you have misunderstood.

45. RELAYING AN ORDER IN A CONFUSING MANNER

Communicators and messengers can create Dev-T and foul up actions by poor relay of information.

46. CLEANING CLEANS

Doing something that is already done or ordering something to be done already done.

47. REPEATED TRAFFIC

The same traffic repeated to the same executive is Dev-T. Often takes the form of information or compliance reported by telex and then the *same* information being sent by despatch. There are times when a telex is followed by a more lengthy despatch or report, but this should only occur when *extra* information is really needed.

48. FAILURE TO WEAR YOUR HAT

A person on one post not doing that post but doing every other post creates endless Dev-T, all despatches and origins being off-origin and he covering the hole of his own post.

The person himself is the Dev-T.

49. UNUSUAL SOLUTIONS

Requests for authority to depart from the usual are dangerous when okayed as they then set up areas of difference and cause policy to wander and misfit at the joints.

Juniors who propose unusual solutions generally don't know the policy or orders anyway.

The proper thing to do is order a checkout on the appropriate policy.

50. REMOVING PARTICLES OFF THE LINE

Apart from being a serious offense, taking comm particles off another's desk or out of their In-Basket or off the comm lines causes Dev-T, and lost time in searching for the missing particles and can sabotage projects or actions, vital data being missing.

51. SLOW COMM LINES

Despatches held up on lines cause other despatches to be originated about the same subject, causing Dev-T to both sender and recipient.

The power of an organization is directly proportional to its speed of particle flow (letters, despatches, telexes, bodies).

Ken Delderfield
LRH Comm Aide CS-7
for
L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:KD:ldm.ei.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 27 OCTOBER 1969
Issue I

Remimeo

Admin Know-How No. 23

DEV-T

The entire, complete and only major source of Dev-T is ignorance or failure to grasp **Confusion and the Stable Datum** as covered fully in "Problems of Work" (and LRH Tapes of 1956).

Unless an executive or staff member fully grasps the basic principles of Confusion and a Stable Datum then the org board is completely over his head, the reason for posts is not understood and Dev-T becomes routine.

A post on the org board is the **Stable Point**. If it is not held by someone it will generate confusion. If the person that is holding it isn't really holding it, the confusion inherent in that area on the org board zooms all over the place near and far.

Any executive getting Dev-T knows at once what posts are not held because Dev-T is the confusion that should have been handled in that area by someone on post. With that stable terminal not stable, Dev-T shoots about.

Excessive transfers in an org promote fantastic Dev-T as the posts do not really get held as people are on them too briefly. "Musical chairs" (excessive transfers) can destroy an org or area.

The remedy is to get people trained up (OEC) to handle their posts, to get people on post who do handle their posts.

An essential part of such training is a *study* of "Problems of Work" and a full grasp of how a stable terminal handles and prevents Confusion. If the person cannot fully grasp this principle, he is below the ability to conceive of terminals and barely able to perceive lines. He cannot communicate since there are no terminals to him.

REMOTE AREAS

If an area remote from an executive does not contain a stable point to which he can send his comm and get it handled, then his comm only enters Dev-T into the area and he gets back floods of despatches and problems but no real handling. The area is not organized and does not have people in it who have grasped "Problems of Work" or how it applies to an Org Board or even why there is an Org Board.

Communicating into a disorganized area without first organizing it to have at least one stable terminal is foolishness.

An Org Board is that arrangement of persons, lines and actions which classifies types of confusions and gives a stable terminal to each type. It is as effective as its people can conceive of terminals and understand the basic principle of Confusions and Stable Data.

A good executive arranges personnel and organization to handle types of actions and confusions. He does not broadly Comm into disorganized areas except to organize them.

Any area which gives an executive excessively Developed Traffic (Dev-T) is an area where the persons supposed to be the stable terminals in that area are *not* holding their posts and do **not** understand what they are or why and do not know what an Org Board is and have never understood the Scientology fundamental known as Confusion and the Stable Datum. They are **not** doing their post or organizing their areas.

An executive's evidence of this is the receipt from there of Dev-T.

The executive's action is to get somebody **there**, get him to understand Confusion and the Stable Datum and how it applies to posts as Stable Terminals, get him trained up and use that now stable point to handle further confusions.

If an executive goes on handling Dev-T of people who are not stable terminals that handle their areas, **he will be forced to work harder than if the post were empty**. At least if it were empty, he would get only the confusion of that area. As it is if the post is improperly held and wobbly he gets not only the area confusion but also the enturbulation of the wobbly incumbent.

Volumes could be written about this subject. But there is no reason whatever not to be able to grasp the fundamentals concerning confusion and stable data, confusion and stable terminals, apply it to Org Boards, to areas and to expansion.

Chaos is the basic situation in this universe. To handle it you put in order.

Order goes in by being and making stable terminals arranged to handle types of action and confusion.

In organizing units, sections, divs, depts, orgs or areas of orgs you build by stable terminals.

You solve areas by reinforcing stable terminals.

Executives who do not grasp this live lives of total harassment and confusion.

The whole secret of organization, the whole problem of Dev-T, the basic ingredient of all expansion is contained in this.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:rs.ldm.ei.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 29 FEBRUARY 1972

Remimeo

Executive Series 10

CORRECT COMM

Dev-T (Developed or wrong traffic) destroys any real production in an org while making the Org Seem frantically busy.

The downfall of HCO was **the failure to police dev-t.**

The **cause** of dev-t is **unhattedness.**

People who do not know what they are supposed to do or produce take on traffic that does not belong to them, originate traffic they have no business with *and* send it to wrong terminals who don't handle.

Not knowing their hats or posts they *refer* things *they* should handle to others who don't handle them either. The org loads up with not dones and half dones and backlogs.

People who should refer what they know don't originate at all and sit on hot emergencies and leave them unhandled. And if they *do* send them on, not knowing the org board, they send them to the wrong terminals. And if they send it to the right terminal it goes in a way it can't be handled for lack of comm expertise.

This goes for any type of particle –despatches, letters, bodies, money, customers, materials, supplies, any particle.

Problems are brought to seniors instead of Completed Staff Work (requiring a recommendation).

Dev-t means an **unhatted untrained off policy staff.**

It means loads of overwork and little production or income.

And dev-t and unhattedness mean that the person at the top of a department, division or the org has to single-hand.

It isn't an org, it's a mob.

Unhatted staff "go criminal" so Ethics will be very heavy.

DISCIPLINE

A first action for an executive or any terminal is to demand **correct comm.**

In its basic elements this means:

1. The staff member originates things that apply or are the business of **his own post**. (*On Origin.*)
2. The origin is sent to the right terminal that handles that. (*On Line.*)
3. If a post is supposed to originate it does so. (*Communicates.*)
4. If a problem is encountered it is forwarded **only** with a full recommendation for handling. (*Completed Staff Work or CSW.*)
5. One does **not** accept a Comm that is not the post business of the originator. (*Enforces On Origin.*)
6. One does **not** accept a Comm that does not belong to him. (*Enforces On Line.*)
7. One insists that a post should originate or do the duties or furnish the product or service of that post. (*Enforces correct action.*)
8. One never accepts a problem unless it has with it a sound recommendation by the originator accompanying it. (*Enforced CSW.*)
9. One demands specific names and instances not generalities. (*Non Suppressive Comm.*)
10. One demands full particulars not half reports or vague generalities. (*Non Suppressive Comm.*)
11. One demands Comm be in proper form. (*Correct despatch or completed.*)
12. One has a place to receive the Comm. (*In basket or place in Org.*)
13. One has to have a place to put the Comm for delivery. (*Out basket or Comm Center.*)
14. One has to have standard lines and routes for particles to follow. (*Comm System or Lines.*)
15. One demands use of the system I warning, I Admin Cramming, I Retread as an Expeditor or in Estates to redo basics for frequent offenders.
16. One demands **hattedness** and people performing the duties of their posts!
17. One demands an up-to-date Org Board and Staff drilled on it.
18. One **never staledates**. He handles when he is expected to.
19. One does **not** go soft in the head or get reasonable or find exceptions. **There is no substitute for correct comm and correct lines.**

MADHOUSE

An org that has no Comm discipline is a madhouse. It will be expensive. It will produce very little. It will try to deliver overt products.

And it will drive its execs up the chimney.

The immediate result will be a conclusion on the part of the execs "These blankety blank blanks are doing us in!" "The place is full of suppressive people." "These guys are no-good bums!" And "Start shooting."

Heavy ethics and offloads occur. These are almost always the result of a whole org gone around the bend from Dev-T.

Accidents happen. People get ill.

And the place falls apart.

CURE

The only known cure is **training** and **hatting**.

For years we underestimated the number of persons needed to train and hat a staff. The whole civilization has troubles because it hasn't even known about hatting, much less that it took someone to do it.

Any failure of HCO was caused by its drowning in Dev-T, even at last generating it because it never had enough people devoted to training and hatting, getting in org lines and Comm lines.

HCO can do its job relieved of the whole burden of hatting.

The Solution is **the Establishment Officer**.

This person operates in a division, not under its secretary but under a Senior Establishment Officer.

He performs the duties of the departments of HCO for that division.

In a small org it requires a trained Establishment Officer for Divisions 7, 1 and 2 and another for Divisions 3, 4, 5 and 6.

In a larger org there is one in charge of all establishment officers and an establishment officer in each division.

As the org grows, the larger divisions get assistant establishment officers to the divisional one.

They do not establish and run away. They establish and maintain the division staff, personnel hats, posts, lines, materiel and supplies.

Their first job is to get staff working at their posts producing something and their next task is **to drive dev-t out of existence in that org**.

SUMMARY

The booms and depressions of orgs, their successes and fall-aparts are signaled by

Correct Comm – Success

Dev-T – Failing.

The underlying cause is unhattedness.

So we are dealing in Dev-T with a symptom. Like any disease it soon catches up with the body of the org and its health.

Dev-T is an expression of untrained unhatted staff. It shows they do not do the functions of their posts regardless of how busy or exhausted they are.

And most important for an executive to know: There is seldom any malice in it. It is just confusion. Even new people or new execs coming in to such an area all full of enthusiasm and bushy-tailed will cave in from the fantastic do-less motions of such an org.

Morale will be bad because **production is the basis of morale** and who can produce in the midst of all that noise????

The place will go into apathy and tiredness as one is hit all day with **off –line, off –origin comm.**

The Executive's solution is to **hat hat hat** and get help hatting hatting hatting, get the org board up and **drill, drill drilled**. Demand demand demand the products of the post the person holds and only those products. And police his lines and get the Dev-T in his own area handled handled handled and never never never pull Dev-T blunders himself and **always always always do and insist upon correct comm.**

The solution is do what you can and all you can to hat and reduce Dev-T and scream for an Establishment Officer to save the org.

Correct comm is the symptom of a healthy producing org and a valuable executive and staff member.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:mes.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 17 MARCH 1965
Issue III

Gen Non-Remimeo

HCO (DIVISION 1)
JUSTICE HAT

ADMINISTERING JUSTICE

There are some things to firmly keep in mind when you have to use HCO's Justice function:

1. Only the criminally inclined desire a society in which the criminal is free to do as he pleases.
2. Only the criminally inclined are frightened enough of Justice to protest and complain that it exists.
3. Without order nothing can grow or expand.
4. Justice is one of the guards that keeps the channel of progress a channel and not a stopped flow.
5. All reactive minds can exert pain and discomfort on a being. They demand the suppression of the good and the production of the bad. Therefore, in administering Justice, restrain just a trifle more than a bank can compel a bad action. The external threat need be just enough to make the internal pressure to do wrong the lesser of two discomforts. Judgment lies in how much external restraint to apply.
6. Decent people are in favor of Justice. Don't confuse the opinion of the majority who wish it with the snarls of the few who fear it.
7. A person who is dramatizing his criminal intent can become very angry if he is not prevented from hurting others.
8. A thetan is good. He invented a bank to keep others good. That mechanism went wrong. And that's why we're here.
9. In a session you would keep a burglar from bursting in the room and disturbing the preclear. In Scientology you keep offenders out so we can get on with our session with society.
10. Look up the person who rails against Justice most and you will have the one you have been looking for.
11. The only overt in handling Justice is not to work for the greatest good of the greatest number.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml.bp.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 MARCH 1965
Issue III

Gen Non-Remimeo
Post Org Public Boards

HCO (Division 1)

Justice

OFFENSES & PENALTIES

These are the penalties we have always more or less used, and these are the offenses which have been usually considered offenses in Scientology.

Formerly they were never written down or routinely enforced, there was no recourse, and these lacks made staff members uncertain of their fate. They knew something happened but not why. They knew certain things were frowned on but not how much or little. The penalties were suddenly administered without warning as to what they would be or for what offense.

This then is a Code of Discipline which we have almost always more or less used, made plain for everyone to see, with limits against over-punishment and recourse for those who are wronged.

Accordingly this Code of Offenses and their penalties becomes firm and expressed policy.

Lack of specified offenses, penalties and recourse brings everyone to uncertainty and risk at the whim of those in command.

There are four general classes of crimes and offenses in Scientology. These are **errors, misdemeanors, crimes and high crimes**.

1. Errors.

Errors are minor unintentional omissions or mistakes. These are

- auditing "goofs";
- minor alter-is of tech or policy;
- small instructional mistakes;
- minor errors or omissions in performing duties and admin errors not resulting in financial loss or loss of status or repute for a senior.

Errors are dealt with by corrections of the person, reprimand or warnings by seniors.

Certificates, Classifications and Awards may not be cancelled or suspended or reduced for an Error. The offender may not be transferred or demoted or fined or suspended for Committing an Error. No Committee of Evidence may be convened because of an Error.

Repeated corrections, warnings or reprimands by a senior can, however, bring the repeated error offenses into the category of Misdemeanor.

2. Misdemeanors.

These are

- non-compliance;
- discourtesy and insubordination;
- mistakes resulting in financial or traffic loss;
- commissions or omissions resulting in loss of status or the punishment of a senior;
- neglect or gross errors resulting in the need to apply the Emergency Formula to their person, section, unit, department, organization, zone or Division;
- knowing and repeated departures from standard technology, instructional procedures or policy;
- continued association with squirrels;
- abuse or loss or damage of org materiel;
- waste of org materiel;
- waste of funds;
- alteration of senior policy or continued ignorance of it;
- consistent and repeated failures to wear their hat regarding Dev-T;
- refusing an E-Meter check;
- refusing auditing when ordered by a higher authority;
- disturbing a course or class;
- disrupting a meeting;
- the discovery of their having an undisclosed criminal background in this lifetime;

- the discovery of an undisclosed tenure in a mental hospital;
- processing a known Trouble Source or the family or adherents of a Suppressive Person or Group;
- omissions resulting in disrepute or financial loss;
- inadequate or declining income or traffic in a section, unit, department, org, zone or Division;
- assisting the inadequacy or decline of income or traffic in a section, unit, department, org, zone or Division;
- failure to acknowledge, relay or comply with a direct and legal order from an executive staff member;
- Auditor's Code breaks resulting in a disturbance of the preclear;
- failure to follow the Instructor's Code resulting in disturbed students;
- contributing to a crime;
- failure to appear before a Committee of Evidence as a witness or interested party when personally given summons or receiving summons by registered post;
- refusing to testify before a Committee of Evidence;
- showing contempt or disrespect to a Committee of Evidence when before it;
- destroying documents required by a Committee of Evidence or refusing to produce them;
- withholding evidence;
- false swearing on a signed statement or form;
- impeding Justice;
- refusing to serve on a Committee of Evidence;
- refusing to vote while a member of a Committee of Evidence;
- misconduct;
- issuing data or information to wrong grades or unauthorized persons or groups or issuing data or information broadly without authority.

Such offenses are subject to direct punishment by order and for a staff member the punishment is the assignment of a personal condition of emergency for up to three weeks and

for an executive staff member the assignment of up to a three months personal condition of emergency.

Personal conditions of emergency reduce pay or units one third for the period assigned.

Recourse may be had by requesting a Committee of Evidence for return of pay but not damages.

The same offenses may be used for a Committee of Evidence but not both a Committee and punishment by direct order – one or the other.

However if any of these offenses become the subject of a Committee of Evidence the penalty for a misdemeanor may be increased to include suspension of a single certificate and/or classification (but no more) or a minor demotion or transfer, but not dismissal. None of these offenses may be made the subject of dismissal by direct order or Committee of Evidence.

Persons may not be dismissed for misdemeanors. Nor may any certificates, classifications or awards be cancelled.

Non staff or field or franchise Scientologists committing those of the above (except org) offenses applicable may have a Committee of Evidence convened on them.

Where serious, repeated or of magnitude harmful to many, the same offenses can be re-classed as Crimes by a Convening Authority.

3. Crimes.

These cover offenses normally considered criminal. Offenses which are treated in Scientology as crimes are

- theft;
- mayhem;
- harmful flagrant and continued Code Breaks resulting in important upsets;
- non-compliance with urgent and vital orders resulting in public disrepute;
- placing Scientology or Scientologists at risk;
- omissions or non-compliance requiring heavy intervention by seniors consuming time and money, with Dev-T;
- failure or refusal to acknowledge, relay or execute a direct legal order from an International Board Member, or an assistant board member;
- being or becoming a Potential Trouble Source without reporting it or taking action;

- receiving auditing while a Potential Trouble Source;
- withholding from local Scientology executives that he or she is a Potential Trouble Source;
- failing to report a Potential Trouble Source to local HCO;
- organizing or allowing a gathering or meeting of staff members or field auditors or the public to protest the orders of a senior;
- being a knowing accessory to a Suppressive Act;
- using a local Scientology title to set aside the orders or policies from the International Board;
- following illegal orders or illegal local policies or alter-is, knowing them to be different or contradictory to those issued by the International Board;
- not directly reporting flagrant departures from International Board policy in a section, unit, department, org, zone or Division;
- being long absent from post while a senior executive without advising the board member of his or her division;
- permitting a section, unit, department, org, zone or Division to collapse;
- not taking over as a deputy in a crisis not otherwise being handled;
- passing org students or pcs to outside auditors for private commission;
- using an org position to build up a private practice;
- taking private fees while on staff to audit outside pcs, run private courses, coach or audit students or org pcs;
- embezzlement;
- taking commissions from merchants;
- reselling org materiel for private gain;
- using an org position to procure personal or non-Scientology funds or unusual favours from the public, a firm, student or pc;
- impersonating a Scientologist or staff member when not authorized;
- inciting to insubordination;
- instigating a local power push against a senior;

- spreading destructive rumours about senior Scientologists;
- pretending to express a multiple opinion (use of "everybody") in vital reports, which could influence assistant board or board decisions;
- not reporting the discovery of a Crime or High Crime to Saint Hill while in authority or as a member of a Committee of Evidence or as a witness before a Committee of Evidence;
- refusal to accept penalties assigned in a recourse action;
- refusal to uphold discipline;
- getting another staff member disciplined by giving false reports about him or her;
- overworking an executive by ignoring one's duties;
- falsifying a communication from higher authority;
- falsifying a telex message or cable;
- causing a staff member to lose prestige or be disciplined by giving false reports;
- seeking to shift the blame to an innocent staff member for the consequences of one's own offenses;
- protecting a staff member guilty of a Crime or High Crime listed in this code;
- stealing or seducing another's wife or husband;
- committing offenses or omissions that bring one's senior staff member, unit, department, org or zone official to personal risk and/or a Committee of Evidence, civil or criminal court;
- wilful loss or destruction of Scientology property;
- making out or submitting or accepting false purchase orders;
- juggling accounts;
- illegally taking or possessing org property;
- causing severe and disreputable disturbances resulting in disrepute;
- obtaining loans or money under false pretenses;
- condoning circumstances or offenses capable of bringing a course, section, unit, department, org, zone or Division to a state of collapse;
- holding Scientology materials or policies up to ridicule, contempt or scorn;

- heckling a Scientology Instructor or lecturer;
- falsely degrading an auditor's technical reputation;
- impersonating an executive staff member;
- pretending Scientology certificates, classifications or awards not actually held to obtain money or credit;
- selling auditing hours or training courses for advance which are not then delivered as to hours and time in training (but not results or subject matter);
- using Scientology harmfully;
- not bringing a preclear up through the grades but overwhelming the preclear with high levels;
- processing or giving aid or comfort to a Suppressive Person or Group;
- knowingly using Scientology to obtain sexual relations or restimulation;
- seducing a minor;
- neglect or omission in safeguarding the copyrights, registered marks, trademarks, registered names of Scientology;
- issuing the data or information or instructional or admin procedures without credit or falsely assigning credit for them to another;
- issuing any Scientology data under another name;
- condoning the suppression of the word "Scientology" in its use or practice;
- allying Scientology to a disrelated practice;
- neglect of responsibilities resulting in a catastrophe even when another manages to avert the final consequences.

Crimes are punished by convening Committees of Evidence and may not be handled by direct discipline.

Crimes may result in suspension of certificates, classifications or awards, reduction of post, or even dismissal or arrest when the crime clearly warrants it. But such penalties may not be assigned by direct discipline. Certificates, Classifications or Awards may not be cancelled for a crime.

4. High Crimes.

These are covered in HCO Policy Letters March 7, 1965, Issues I and II and consist of publicly departing Scientology or committing Suppressive Acts.

Cancellation of Certificates, Classifications and Awards and becoming fair game are amongst the penalties which can be leveled for this type of offense as well as those recommended by Committees of Evidence.

A reward system for merit and good performance also exists.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:jw.cden

CANCELLATION OF FAIR GAME: The practice of declaring people FAIR GAME will cease. FAIR GAME may not appear on any Ethics Order. It causes bad public relations. This P/L does not cancel any policy on the treatment or handling of an SP. (From HCO P/L 21 October 1968.)

COMMITTEE OF EVIDENCE (COMM EV): A fact finding body composed of impartial persons properly convened by a Convening Authority which hears evidence from persons it calls before it, arrives at a finding and makes a full report and recommendation to its Convening Authority for his or her action. (From HCO P/L 7 September 1963, COMMITTEES OF EVIDENCE.)

[The above Policy Letter has been added to by HCO P/L 12 July 1971 Issue III, OFFENSES AND PENALTIES-ADDITION, and HCO P/L 29 July 1971 Issue III, PENALTIES FOR THE HIRING OR RECRUITING OF INSTITUTIONAL OR INSANE PERSONS, the latter being modified by HCO P/L 21 July 1972 Issue IV, STAFF QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR HIRING CANCELLED. – Note of Max Hauri: HCO PL 21 Jul 72 IV is currently not available. Probably the BPL 1 Feb 75 I STAFF QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS ENFORCED is the replacement of it.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 23 SEPTEMBER 1967

Remimeo
Page 1 of every Hat

NEW POST FORMULA - THE CONDITIONS FORMULAS

Every new appointee to a post begins in non-existence. Whether obtained by new appointment, promotion or demotion.

He is normally under the delusion that now he is "*The*" (new title). He tries to start off in power condition as he is usually very aware of his new status or even a former status. But in actual fact *he* is the only one aware of it. All others except perhaps the personnel officer are utterly unaware of him as having his new status.

Therefore he begins in a state of non-existence. And if he does not begin with the non-existence formula as his guide he will be using the wrong condition and will have all kinds of trouble.

The Non-Existence Formula is

1. Find a comm line
2. Make yourself known
3. Discover what is needed or wanted
4. Do, produce and/or present it.

A new appointee taking over a going concern often thinks he had better make himself known by changing everything whereas he (a) is not well enough known to do so and (b) has-n't any idea of what is needed or wanted yet. And so he makes havoc.

Sometimes he assumes he knows what is needed or wanted when it is only a fixed idea with him and is only his idea and not true at all and so he fails at his job.

Sometimes he doesn't bother to find out what is really needed or wanted and simply assumes it or thinks he knows when he doesn't. He soon becomes "unsuccessful".

Now and then a new appointee is so "status happy" or so insecure or so shy that even when his boss or his staff comes to him and tells him what is needed or wanted he can't or doesn't even acknowledge and really does go into non-existence for keeps.

Sometimes he finds that what he is *told* is needed or wanted needs reappraisal or further investigation. So it is always safest for him to make his own survey of it and operate on it when he gets his own firm reality on what is needed or wanted.

If the formula is applied intelligently the person can expect to get into a zone of by-pass where people are still doing his job to fill the hole his predecessor may have left. This is a Danger Condition – but it is the next one higher than non-existence on the scale. If he defends his job and does his job and applies the Danger Formula he will come through it.

He can then expect to find himself in Emergency Condition. In this he must follow the Emergency Formula with his post and he will come through *it*.

He can now expect to be in Normal Operation and if he follows the formula of that, he will come to Affluence. And if he follows *that* formula he will arrive at Power. And if he applies the Power Formula he will stay there.

So it is a long way from Power that one starts his new appointment and if he doesn't go UP the scale from where he really is at the start, he will of course fail.

This applies to groups, to organizations, to countries as well as individuals.

It also applies when a person fails at his job. He has to start again at non-existence and he will build up the same way condition by condition.

Most failures on post are occasioned by failures to follow the Conditions and recognize them and apply the formula of the condition one is in when one is in it and cease to apply it when one is out of it and in another.

This is the secret of holding a post and being successful on a job or in life.

Here are the formulas of conditions given in order of advance upward:

NON-EXISTENCE

1. Find a comm line
2. Make yourself known
3. Discover what is needed or wanted
4. Do, produce and/or present it.

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.

EMERGENCY

1. Promote, that applies to an organization. To an individual you had better say produce. That's the first action regardless of any other action, regardless of anything else, why that is the first thing you have to put their attention on. The first broad big action which you take is promote. Exactly what is promotion? Well, look it up in the dictionary. It is making things known; it is getting things out; it is getting one's self known, getting one's products out.
2. Change your operating basis. If for instance you went into a condition of emergency and then you didn't change after you had promoted, you didn't make any changes in your operation, well you just head for another condition of emergency.

So that has to be part of it, you had better change your operating basis, you had better do something to change the operating basis, because that operating basis lead you into an emergency so you sure better change it.

3. Economize.
4. Then prepare to deliver.
5. Part of the Condition of Emergency contains this little line – you have got to stiffen discipline or you have got to stiffen Ethics. Organizationally when a state of emergency is assigned supposing the activity doesn't come out of that emergency, regardless of what caused the emergency, supposing the activity just doesn't come out of the emergency, in spite of the fact they have been labelled a state of emergency, they have been directed to follow the formula, they have been told to snap and pop and get that thing straightened out, and they are still found to be goofing, the statistic is going down and continues to go down, what do you do? There is only one thing left to do and that is discipline because life itself is going to discipline the individual.

So the rule of the game is that if a state of emergency is ignored and the steps are not taken successfully then you get an announcement after a while that the condition has been continued and if the condition is continued beyond a specified time, why that's it, it has to walk forward into an Ethics matter.

NORMAL OPERATION

1. The way you maintain an increase is when you are in a state of Normal Operation you don't change anything.

2. Ethics are very mild, the justice factor is quite mild, there are no savage actions taken particularly.
3. A statistic betters then look it over carefully and find out what bettered it and then do that without abandoning what you were doing before.
4. Every time a statistic worsens slightly, quickly find out why and remedy it.

And you just jockey those two factors, the statistic bettering, the statistic worsening, repair the statistic worsening, and you will find out inevitably some change has been made in that area where a statistic worsens. Some change has been made, you had better get that change off the lines in a hurry.

AFFLUENCE

1. Economize. Now the first thing you must do in Affluence is economize and then make very very sure that you don't buy anything that has any future commitment to it, don't buy anything with any future commitments, don't hire anybody with any future commitments – nothing. That is all part of that economy, clamp it down.
2. Pay every bill. Get every bill that you can possibly scrape up from any place, every penny you owe anywhere under the sun, moon and stars and pay them.
3. Invest the remainder in service facilities, make it more possible to deliver.
4. Discover what caused the Condition of Affluence and strengthen it.

POWER

1. The first law of a Condition of Power is don't disconnect. You can't just deny your connections, what you have got to do is take ownership and responsibility for your connections.
2. The first thing you have got to do is make a record of all of its lines. And that is the only way you will ever be able to disconnect. So on a Condition of Power the first thing you have to do is write up your whole post. You have made it possible for the next fellow in to assume the state of Power Change.

If you don't write up your whole post you are going to be stuck with a piece of that post since time immemorial and a year or so later somebody will still be coming to you asking you about that post which you occupied.

3. The responsibility is write the thing up and get it into the hands of the guy who is going to take care of it.
4. Do all you can to make the post occupiable.

POWER CHANGE

There are only two circumstances which require replacement, the very successful one or the very unsuccessful one.

What a song it is to inherit a successful pair of boots, there is nothing to it, just step in the boots and don't bother to walk. If it was in a normal state of operation, which it normally would have been in for anybody to have been promoted out of it, you just don't change anything.

So anybody wants anything signed that your predecessor didn't sign, don't sign it. Keep your eyes open, learn the ropes and, depending on how big the organization is, after a certain time, why see how it is running and run it as normal operating condition if it's not in anything but a normal operating condition.

Go through the exact same routine of every day that your predecessor went through, sign nothing that he wouldn't sign, don't change a single order, look through the papers that had been issued at that period of time – these are the orders that are extant and get as busy as the devil just enforcing those orders and your operation will increase and increase.

Now the fellow who walks into the boots of somebody who has left in disgrace had better apply the state of emergency formula to it, which is immediately promote.

Wishing you success.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jp.rd

The Five Conditions

A lecture by L. Ron Hubbard

given on 25 May 1965

Thank you.

What's the date?

Audience: twenty-five.

Twenty-five May AD 15, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. A meter with a gray face. Isn't that interesting looking meter.

All right, I have a little bulletin – bulletin to give you, a couple of bulletins. And one of those bulletins is that Mary Sue is late today. [laughter]

Now, there's a rumor going about that if you're being processed in the HGC as a student, you can't come to lectures or something like that. That's false.

Let me give you a clue – this is the little bulletin you have. I'll give you a clue on the way we have to operate in Scientology: If it isn't written, it isn't true. And you just put that down and you'll get along fine in organizations and everywhere else. If it isn't written, it isn't true.

Somebody says this, that and the other thing; you say, "Well, have you got it in writing?"

And they say, "Well, no, as a matter of fact, (something)." Well, then it isn't true and that's that.

This, by the way, had to come into being. The first place I know of it was when we were down at 2600 Hoover in Los Angeles in 1950, and people used to walk in off the street and say, "Ron said to give me fifty hours of processing," or something like that, and by George, they would. [laughter]

There's very often some misunderstood statement or a rumor line or something like this is passed on verbally. And frankly it – even if it was uttered verbally it should have been in writing. So once more, if it isn't written, it isn't true.

You find out that when things are moving very fast, a whole bunch of verbal orders will get mixed up in the thing that other people aren't aware of and suddenly, why, nobody in the organization can agree with anybody else because the verbal orders are standing in the road of everything, and it just all breaks down. So you have to have that rule, and you have to make it stick.

Now, the other one is that Saint Hill had to be declared in a condition. Now, a declaration of a condition is something new, and you will soon find it applying to the course. And the bulletins are all practically written – the policy letters are all practically written on this, but I haven't had a chance to finish them up or sign them or something of the sort. But we've been using this, nevertheless, for some little time and that is, strictly, a condition is an operating state. Organizationally, it's an operating state.

And oddly enough in the MEST universe there are several formulas connected with these operating states. And if for instance, England, the British government, knew these or the United States government knew these, they wouldn't get into very much trouble. But as it is, they don't know them and they get into a great deal of trouble.

There are apparently certain formulas which have to be followed in this universe or you go appetite over tin cup.

I'll give you an idea of the Emergency Formula – the Emergency Formula... Of course, we're more accustomed to being in a state of Emergency on this planet than we are in any other state. And nevertheless, there is a certain way that you handle an emergency. And an Emergency status is declared simply and only by a down statistic; that is to say, the statistics went down. And it doesn't matter what statistics; if they were supposed to go up and they went down, why, that's an Emergency.

Now, the reverse can take place. The reverse can take place. Let's take the number of students in a unit. Let's say it keeps going up and it kept going up and it doesn't go down. Do you see? Then, obviously, the students aren't being graduated from the unit at the same rate they're being put into the unit, so there must be a slowdown in that unit of some kind or another. So that will create a State of Emergency, too.

So it's the desirable statistic has not been attained. And the statistic which should go down goes up or the statistic which should goes up goes down.

Now, let's take the gross income of an organization at large. That has to do with a, let us say, a drop. And it's a consistent drop: One week, we don't pay any attention to it; two weeks, we start paying an attention to; three weeks, why, and then we jolly well pay an attention to it. Don't you see? And if it consistently does this in an organization and shows down, down, down for four consecutive weeks we declare them in a State of Emergency.

Now, the declaration is issued by Secretarial Executive Director, which is a positive order. In other words, it's a written, posted order; people are not left in the dark concerning this State of Emergency. You just had a unit on this course go into a State of Emergency. Now, there are several policy letters connected with this which I won't particularly bother to delineate. But there are certain actions which one has to undertake when a State of Emergency is declared.

The first of these actions is, well, you can say promote – that applies to an organization. To an individual you'd better be – say produce. That's the first action. Regardless of any other action, regardless of anything else, why, that is the first thing they have to put their attention on.

Very often you will find out that the moment that the emergency was noticed... Well, let's take you: You find your money is going downhill at a great rate, and you're not getting as much money in as you should have been getting in and there's less and less money and so forth. Well, you actually are in a State of Emergency.

Now, the proper thing to do, according to Mr. Wilson, a thetan that wandered in from someplace... Well, he did. He had an ambition to end Britain. And that's libel and slander so we'll have to cut it off the tape. But anyway, he really made this statement: He says England should be a fourth-class power. And he's making his postulate. You didn't know that he said that? Oh yes, man. That's a matter of publicized public statement, made right after leaving the United States before he was elected.

Anyhow, he's making it. But now, you see, he finds the organization called the government in a poor state economically, so he economizes.

The United States government does this all the time. As soon as they find out that their treasury balance doesn't equal their *squidawoof* and the ideas of the secretary of the treasury that he just got from the first cell of the Communist Party or wherever it is – or wherever they get their ideas.

The United States government, you know, runs its economics today straight off Karl Marx' *Das Kapital*. If you don't believe it, read *Das Kapital*, if you can. Now, that sounds awfully rabble-rouse and very extreme, but it happens to be a very banal statement. It's even been noticed by the *Wall Street Journal*. The formula of economics in *Das Kapital* is "From each according to his ability to pay and to each according to his need." Socialism. That's the formula of taxation contained in Karl Marx's *Das Kapital*, written about 1879, something like that. See? And the governments of the world are following this today. And these capitalistic governments are having a ball with this.

Well now, supposing when they find that they're going broke they economize. Supposing they take that as their first step. *Ahhhhh*. Every time they recover from an emergency they will be smaller and less able. If that's all they do. Do you follow? They have violated this actual formula of Emergency. There *is* an actual formula of Emergency. It *does* exist in this universe. It's in the woof and warp of the universe itself. And its first line is – its first line is – the first broad, big action which you take is *promote*.

You better jolly well promote. And that carries with it on the part of an individual or factory the idea that he better make his intentions known, and so on.

Now, after you have promoted and after you've got that well in hand, you economize. But you have to do that first. Don't bother about economy; bother about promoting.

Exactly what is promotion? Well, look it up in the dictionary. It's making things known; it's getting things out; it's getting oneself known, getting one's products out or something like this.

In the form of an artist, the idea – he finds he's – his statistics are shot. He suddenly looks up one day and the bank balance is down to nothing and that sort of thing and the landlord is camping on the first landing and so forth. Well, he's – he must first and foremost promote.

He better take those three academy paintings that he was busy dabbling with, and he better sit up all night long and finish those things real fast. He better wrap all those other paintings that he'd already finished; he better get them off to a gallery awful quick. And he better call up a press boy of some kind or another and say, "I am having an exhibition." See, and it didn't matter how many pounds, shillings or pence he had to borrow to make the phone calls or put the ad in the paper or get a – some literature printed that he was having an exhibit. You see, that didn't matter. *Promote*, man. Let's get it up there; let's get it out there; let's get the lines straightened up, see? *Huuh!*

Now economize. You follow?

And then – I'm giving you the very rough formula. And then he's got to prepare to deliver. Now, he actually during his promotion could have sold a half a dozen paintings. Well, then he economizes, and then he paints them and delivers. Got the idea?

So it's in that action. And when you find your statistic is down you first have to promote, and when you got your promotion well in hand then you better economize, and then you jolly well better prepare to deliver.

And that's the one-two-three. If you do it backwards, you've had it.

Now, there's another condition known as Affluence. And this is one of the most dangerous conditions there is and nobody recognizes it as such. Let's take – let's take some fellow on the south side of the northeast side of lower Chicago. And he's always been going along with twenty-five cents in his pocket. That was about the most money he ever had in his pocket. And all of a sudden, he gets in a crap game and he wins ten thousand dollars. Well, what's his normal operation? *Whoa! Huh!*

I remember a famous movie Victor McLaglen paid – played in, that showed a beautiful rendition of this. It was *The Informer*. And he's paid a huge sum of money for turning in one of his fellow Irish Republican Army soldiers. And he just blows this, don't you see? It's a marvelous example. The first impulse somebody gets when they get that much is to – is to get very rich indeed.

So what's this fellow on the lower east side of south Chicago's lower north side – what's this fellow do? Oh, well, he buys himself a house, the future payments of which are going to be \$175 a month. He buys himself a car, the future payments of which are going to be... He's got all the down payments for these things, you see? He buys himself a watch. He lays out a bunch of clothes that he doesn't need. And he neglects to pay off anybody that he owes. And his ten thousand dollars is gone. He now owes another twenty thousand and he hasn't got a prayer of paying that off. He's violated the condition of Affluence. And the state of Affluence Formula has been definitely, wildly violated.

Now, the first thing you must do in Affluence is economize – just right now: You got ten thousand bucks. You didn't expect it from anyplace. You didn't know it was going to be there, and so forth. Just quickly cover it up with your hat and economize. Say, "Where are we wasting money?" [laughter] Bang! You must, just at once.

And then make very, very, very sure that you don't buy anything that has any future commitment to it. Don't buy anything with any future commitments, don't hire anybody with any future commitments, nothing. See, that's all part of that economy. Clamp it down.

Get every bill that you can possibly scrape up from anyplace, every penny you owe anywhere under the sun, moon and stars, and pay them. Pay every bill is your next big broad step. Pull everything down in all directions until you've got it down to as close to zero as you can get or zero.

Now, invest the remainder in service facilities; make it more possible to deliver. See, service facilities.

And part of the formula is to discover what caused the condition of Affluence and strengthen it. You see? Move your operation or what your life or you're doing, and so forth, slightly over, so that it admits this zone and area of affluence.

Now, if you do those things and so forth, why, life will look like a dream. But you notice that the condition of Emergency, if handled at the beginning with economy, would inhibit getting out anything in order to produce enough money to raise the statistic. So if you went into a condition of Emergency and economized instantly, you either might always remain in this condition of Emergency or if you recovered from it you would find your organization was smaller or you were smaller or you had less scope, because you have applied the state of Affluence formula to the condition of Emergency.

And all you've got to do is misapply one of these formulas – be in condition B and say you're in condition A, or continuing condition A when you have moved into condition B; in other words, be operating on the wrong formula – and you'll wrap the organization up. You'll wrap it up.

And part of the Emergency Formula, since... These things will be published in great detail. Actually, there's about thirteen steps to one of these formulas. There are certain major points. These are the ones I'm taking up.

If for instance, you didn't – you went into a condition of Emergency and then you didn't change – after you'd promoted, you didn't make any changes in your operation – well, you just head for another condition of Emergency, see? So that has to be part of it. You better change your operating basis. You better do something to change the operating basis, because that operating basis led you into an Emergency, so you sure better change it.

But Affluence – Affluence: You must have been doing something awful right to get in that much money. Well, you jolly well better discover what it is! That's the search that you go into. At its proper numbered slot, you go into a search and overhaul anything and review it all. After you've provided some service facilities and you're straightened up, and that's the end of all of that big kettle of money that came in, then you had just better look-look-look-look-look-look. What the devil did cause this? Because you may have the wrong idea of what caused it. It might have been a complete fluke, or it might have been this or that.

But you better – better hunt and research and look at it and watch it very carefully and say, "Aaah, yes, yes! That's because I st..." Well, in the case of a painter, you see: "That's because I started being nice to editors' and painters' and art gallery people's wives. That was that

program I went out on last month of 'Be nice to the hostess.' *Hm*. So after this I'm always going to be nice to the hostess." Don't you see? Oh, it works like a bomb, see? Gorgeous. After that, nice to the hostess, conditions of Affluence happen every now and then. You follow? It'll be some screwball thing of this particular character.

You might have thought that it was because the world was suddenly more conscious of art. That had nothing to do with it, see? Until somebody can define what art is, the world is not likely to become more conscious of it. [laughter]

So here is a – here is a case where you could go into a – an operating condition unknowingly, pay no attention to it, keep running as though you were in another operating condition, and all of a sudden just go appetite over tin cup; the whole thing just crashes and you don't quite know what happened to you. It's all a big mystery. But if you know these operating formulas (of which, by the way, there are five), why, you're jolly well – well-off.

The lowest, most basic of them and the most snarly one is the condition of Emergency. When you're in a State of Emergency, boy, that's snap and pop.

Well now, part of a condition of Emergency contains this little line of "you've got to stiffen discipline" or "you've got to stiffen ethics." To an individual this would simply mean, well, not go down to the pub every Friday night, you know? Let's stiffen up the discipline; let's stay home and grind the midnight oil away, you see? Let's stay home and do one's homework or something. You get the idea? Discipline stiffened up. Be a little more regular on the job. Work a little harder. Something of this sort, see? Don't goof quite so much. Don't make so many mistakes. This would be part of that operating action.

And, as a net result, organizationally, when a state of Emergency is assigned, supposing the activity doesn't come out of that emergency. Regardless of what caused the emergency, supposing the activity just doesn't come out of the emergency, in spite of the fact that they have been labeled state of Emergency, they have been directed to follow the formula, they have been told to snap and pop and get that thing straightened out, and they're still found to be goofing; the statistic is going down and continues to go down and so forth. What do you do? There's only one thing left to do and that's discipline, because life itself is going to discipline the individual. Life itself is going to discipline the individual very cruelly and savagely.

Living in another age, in a less socialistic period, why, the net product of it was starving to death. In a business, why, it'd be going into bankruptcy, see? It's a crash situation.

And it usually winds up in an ethical situation. Fellow who's starving to death will quite normally steal. Bankruptcies wind up in bankruptcy courts. It becomes an ethical situation whether one likes it or not. You've got justice staring you in the teeth.

So, the rule of the game is that if a state of Emergency is ignored and the steps are not taken successfully (do you understand "not taken successfully" is different than "not taken"?), why – and the condition is continued, then you get an announcement after a while that the condition has been continued. And if the condition is continued beyond a specified period of time, why, that's it. It has to walk forward into an ethics matter. Because how else could you straighten out that activity? There must be somebody goofing like crazy, sitting on most of the comm lines, do you see? There – you've got some ethical problem involved with it.

There's somebody who won't function. Do you see? There's somebody who's got the brakes on so that you can hear – smell them smoke. And so you walk forward into an ethical situation.

Now, the state of Normal Operation is the second condition and that is supposed to be just normal operation. It means not "stability." You could call it a condition of stability and it probably should be called a condition of stability except for this one little factor: This universe does not admit of a static state – not using our definition of the word static – but it won't admit a no-increase, no in... no-decrease. You cannot have a condition in this universe where there is no increase and no decrease. That's a totally stable condition; there is no such thing in this universe from one end of it to the other. It's – there isn't anything that always remains the same.

You take some of the hardest substances there are, which oddly enough are plutonium and some other such elements; those things diminish, you see, or explode. You take lead. You say, "Well, lead will stay there a long time." Well, I invite you to look at the lead on some churches, and so forth, and you'll find out that it's diminishing. As hardy as the element is supposed to be it's still diminishing.

And you take a tree or a body after it attains its supposed size and so forth, why, it actually doesn't have a long period of an absolute plane. You see, it's either increasing, increasing, increasing and when it goes into that plane, and so forth, you'll find out that it's really decreasing. So that very old people have actually shrunk in size.

You understand, I'm not talking about this from the viewpoint of "it is right." I'm just saying this is the way the universe is rigged. I'm giving you some laws that I managed to strip out of this universe. And where the agreement of beings and their interlockings of organizations and materiel and that sort of thing – where these things function, well, you'll find out they're governed by these universal laws.

These are quite interesting because they over – they completely knock out economics as we have known it. And they supplant a different operating basis for economics. We don't expect to be teaching anybody these things, particularly, but we certainly are interested in using them ourselves. They're very valuable data.

The condition of Normal Operation, then, is not one of stability. And therefore, I'm not going to call it "stability," – although it's probably supposed to be called "stability" – because it can't be. Normal Operation must be a reg... routine or gradual increase. And there must be a regular, routine, gradual increase. And if there is no gradual increase there will not be a condition of stability. You cannot have a total, even state of existence which does not eventually fall on its head. The second you get this even state in this universe, it starts to deteriorate. So a state of stability would eventually deteriorate.

Well, to prevent a deterioration you must have an increase. That increase doesn't have to be spectacular but it has to be something. There has to be a bit of an increase there.

Well, the way you maintain an increase is when you're in a state of Normal Operation you don't change anything – you don't change a blessed thing. You just let it go and you're very benign about the whole thing. Ethics are very mild. The justice factor is quite mild and

quite reasonable, don't you see? And there's nothing very desperate going on, you see? There's no savage actions taken particularly. People come to – sitting around in an old shirt or something like that. Well, let them sit around in an old shirt. Maybe that has part of the increased statistic. You're not sure, see? But don't go plowing around.

Now, what you do do is you very carefully examine every slightest rise in a statistic. Every time a statistic betters – let me put it more accurately – every time the statistic betters then look it over carefully and find out what bettered it, and then do that. That's the only changes you make. And every time a statistic worsens slightly, quickly find out why and remedy it. And you just jockey those two factors: the statistic bettering, the statistic worsening. Repair the statistic worsening and you'll find out inevitably some change has been made in that area where a statistic worsens. Some change has been made. You better get that change off the lines in a hurry. And what – when you find that a statistic is bettering, something like that, you better find out *how* it is bettering.

You very often find out it may depend on an individual. You maybe got a new – a new person on some post, or something like that, and they're doing extremely well, you see? Well, one of the ways to better it is pat them on the back and hold them up as an example, don't you see? Give them a little bump in pay, something of this sort, don't you see? But increase that statistic.

We've sent out a mailing or we've done something or we've approached somebody or we've talked to a different type of person recently, and suddenly our statistic is a little bit better. Well, we'd better add it up very carefully that we talked to this type of person, and without abandoning what we were doing before, also do this other one. Do you see?

And therefore, you will find that your statistic is just – keeps bettering and the worsening statistics tend to fall away. And you just keep riding this horse on that sort of a jockey basis. It's just a very nice – it isn't a – it isn't a lazy operation; it's a very alert one. You watch your – you watch your statistics.

Now, let me give you an example of how I speak of this organizationally. Of course, we have OIC boards and that sort of thing to watch statistics by and everything has to be staticizable. That is to say, you've got to be able to get a statistic on anything, anywhere in an operation. If you can't, why it's all on rumor and God knows what all, and you very soon will be in trouble. Maybe your own life is only in trouble because you don't staticize it.

Very seldom does a clerk, for instance, ever look at his pay as a statistic. If some fellow, for instance, has been getting nothing but that same paycheck now for the past two or three years, that's a State of Emergency. Do you follow? Although the statistic hasn't dwindled, that's the other way you can get into a State of Emergency because sooner or later that's going to dwindle; that's going to crash.

You never saw anything quite so silly. We've got a couple of organizations which never rise and never fall. And sure enough, after about two or three years of never rising and never falling, one of them had a hysterical cable in here the other day that it couldn't pay its rent. See?

Oh, well. Without anything dramatic occurring it had gotten itself into an emergency, see? The statistic hadn't even visibly declined. It was just the fact that here was this line – level – level – level – level – level, no increase over these years. *Poof*. All of a sudden, *bang*. It's into some kind of a State of Emergency that has sneaked up on it, you see?

The State of Emergency that would sneak up on it, to somebody that had a gross income across here, happens to be in the woof and warp of the universe itself. You have things like inflation; things become less valuable. So if you had the same income, it won't buy as much. And actually that was a declining statistic. Do you follow? I mean, although it looked level, it was really declining. The civilization around it was growing so it didn't have the relative importance to the civilization around it that it should have had. See? So it wasn't really level at all. And all of a sudden there it is in an emergency – can't pay it's rent.

So the individual clerk who has been dragging down X number of dollars per week over the past three years and has had no rise of any kind whatsoever – no rise, no prospects of a rise or anything like that – does not realize that he is looking at catastrophe. He thinks he's looking at security, the idiot. But for sure, if he has had no change of any kind in pay status for that period of time, he's looking at a personal emergency, if only because inflation itself will catch up with him. His twenty-five cent pieces now don't buy as many cigarettes as they used to, so it's actually a declining statistic. In the expansion of the world around him and the crowd that he is moving with, and so forth, their statistics are changing and his isn't. There's more recreation available to be purchased by his fellow man, but he isn't now getting more money with which to purchase the recreation. See, these little tiny factors will enter in to his life and although he hasn't watched it at all, he sees this level statistic and doesn't realize he's in a state of Emergency.

Well, how does he get out of a state of Emergency? Obviously, ask Mr. Wilson – economize. Oh, you treat it as a state of Affluence, huh? Well, look, whether he knows it or not, he is acting as though he's in a state of Affluence. And if he tries to follow the thing by first economizing without promoting, he's going to then get all of the consequences of Emergency. If you start applying one of these condition formulas to the wrong condition, you will get into operation the consequences of the one you *are* applying, you see – the one you are in. It's being neglected. So that if you want to *really* go into an Emergency, be in an emergency and apply an Affluence Formula. In Emergency apply Affluence Formula – boy, you're in Emergency! It'll crash you. Do you follow that? And all of that is hidden and out of view.

We're not talking now about something that's just dreamed up or that's a good idea. This was what lay in back of the operation of the machine called the physical universe. If these things didn't occur – whether amongst living forms or organizations or chemicals or rocks or something like this – if these – these actions didn't occur, one kind or another... How – it is very hard to see. Yet they are there. Matter follows these formulas. Other things follow these formulas, you see?

Now of course, they become a little more flexible when you apply them to life, and there's a little more life can do about it. Just to have – doesn't lie there like a – like a rock and simply erode, see? Life has more volition and so can apply the condition very definitely.

So here – here let us take a condition of Normal Operation – individual is in Normal Operation, apparently, and then the curve no longer goes up and it lies there level; everybody feels secure; they all feel it's all going all right. Twitterwit and Featherbrain & Company Solicitors – they've *always* been there, see, so they will *always be there*, of course. And much to their astonishment they wind up in a bankruptcy court. And how the devil did they get there, because their income had never changed? They say, "How'd – how'd it happen?" you know? "*Hu-uh!*"

So life is very fateful and life is very fantastic and life is very incomprehensible. Well, they didn't know the laws, and that was the real law they should have been following. Twitwit and Featherbrain & Company, and so forth, had no business having a totally even income since 1832. [laughter] They didn't do anything to improve it, it was in a – in – going into an Emergency. And it will eventually react as though it's in an Emergency. And because they're ignoring handling an Emergency, of course, it becomes a *real* emergency. And the next thing you know, why, there's...

They don't ever know how this happens to them, by the way. There's one of the most famous boot makers in the ent... in the – in England – Peel – went by the boards the other day. So help me Pete, they have made boots for royalty since time immemorial. Probably Henry VIII had his boots made at Peel & Company, see? Fantastic. They did this fabulous job of boot making. They're no longer amongst us. And they blamed it on all kinds of things. They blamed it in all different directions. The funny part of it is that they were so apathetic about the whole thing, they didn't even bother to sell the name of the company. Any fool could have bought the name of the company and turned a line of Boston-made – Lynn, Massachusetts-made shoes and stamped them "Peel." And – that's what they did to Stetsons. You can no longer really get a Stetson that's a Stetson. Dobbs, or somebody, bought up Stetson, and they just stamp "Stetson" on the hats.

Well, they were so apathetic about this whole thing and it was so incomprehensible to them, they just suddenly went out of business, you know? They did. Well, along about – along about 1835 at the very latest they should have started advertising. [laughs] It didn't matter how many – how many royal feet were covered by Peel boots, see? That – royalty and so forth. They probably never even thought of giving somebody five thousand pounds or something like that to wear the name of the company on his boots in white letters or something, you know? I mean, they – however crude it was they thought of nothing. Do you see?

And that's how civilizations go to pieces. Civilizations generally don't know these formulas and they go *bzzzt!* "Well, there's always been a Roman Empire. There will always be a Roman Empire." Actually the Roman Empire went into Affluence, tried to treat it as Normal Operation and disappeared from the ken of man. The Affluence they went into was brought about by Julius Caesar. He expanded the empire's borders fantastically, suddenly and immediately. He also violated the normal operating procedure of the Roman Empire which was Pax Romana: build the roads, keep them open and keep peace everywhere and trade with everybody and rule nobody – to hell with them. And that was the way the Roman Empire was doing, and it was doing all right. They'd been going like that for, oh, a long time.

All of a sudden this bird comes along, and he gets the idea of conquest. He was doing a rehearsal for Hitler or somebody. And he gets this idea that the thing to do is expand the borders and get rich and make everybody rich and make everybody rich *suddenly*, without any basic structure or anything. So oh my God, he was taking in this area, that area and the other area – this very area right here was tremendously affected by this nut.

It was typical, by the way, as I was telling you the other day about how they follow people who haven't got good sense. There was an epileptic homosexual. God almighty. Marvelous. How in the hell anybody would listen to him I wouldn't know. But you're probably not aware of the fact that the main battles fought for the possession of the British Isles were fought just a few miles from Saint Hill here, over in the Ashdown Forest. They were just over the hill over here.

Well, this nut did such things as take the British Isles, which for years and years – decades – had been getting Roman pottery and Roman cloth and Roman coins; and the old Phoenician tin ship line, and so forth, was coming into the south here. They were in trade, don't you see? And this channel over here, you could jump across it if you felt not too heavy one day. And the stuff had been coming over from Europe. And the British Isles here were in very close communication with the (quote) Roman Empire (unquote). They were – the civilization was very nice and they were very enamored with this new civilization. (It looked new to them.)

And they, for instance, had an older civilization that they were going on which you found remnants of in Ireland. Well, it was over here fairly strong and it had wicker chariots and things like this. And this new civilization looked good to them. That pottery looked good, and those togas, they looked real good and so forth. And they actually would have lined up on the shore the way people do occasionally with Scientologists in a group, you know? They want to know all about it, you know? What is all this? You know? And so on. And if you haven't got a suppressive present, why, they get you talking for hours.

The British would have lined up on the beach down here if they'd heard the Romans were coming over to show them how to fix up a few things, you know? They would have said, "Hurrah," you know? "Hello, how are you?" you know. "Gosh," you know, "been waiting for you for a long time. Me, I know some Latin. Listen," you know? "*Pax vobiscum*," you know?

No, this nut Caesar, he gets – he gets some little baskets or something they call ships and sails across this. And he lands on the beach in a hostile battle array and has got to find somebody to fight. And he finds some people to fight. And of course they fought him because it looked sure like an invasion. He had himself a ball, and then for some hundreds of years, why, you had this country stumbling along and trying to intervene in the politics of the Roman Empire, and outside the Roman Empire but inside the Roman Empire, and occasionally running the Roman Empire. Oh, wild.

Affluence. He all of a sudden got this tremendous quantity of territory, tremendous quantities of peoples. Did it all wrong way to. Didn't deliver really. He gave them slavery, not Roman civilization. They didn't treat it by the formula of Affluence. They just squandered the

wealth of the empire on this so-called conquest of new wealth and that was the end of the Roman Empire. And it after that...

Certain other political factors existed in the world. The Chinese, by the way, about the year one, licked the Russians. That's not well known but – the Russians haven't publicized it. They've said more about inventing TV than they have about that particular thing. But the Chinese licked them, and it fought them down to a nub. And they retreated – the Russians did – and they actually vacated and evacuated all of Siberia. And the Chinese drove them straight down into what is now the Urals and so forth. Boy, they were running and they were running hard, you know? They were scared. And they were sufficiently powerful even so... China was at the height of her civilized might, you see? About the – that was the *real* thing that occurred in the year zero. It wasn't Christ, it was this cataclysm.

And in went the Chinese and out went the Russian people, and they hit over into this area of Poland. And they kept hitting against that area. And they took all the peoples that were in the area of Poland and central Europe, and so on, and that actually had been on this side of the Urals, and so on, and those people were just forced out of their homeland by these new people that had been chased down, defeated by the Chinese.

And those people then migrated south, and they kept migrating in waves and fighting, and so forth. And they were actually streams of refugees, and they kept crossing the Danube, and so forth. And the Roman, he didn't know what this was all about. If he'd been smart he would have treated this as a new affluence of some kind or another, he wouldn't have fought these people. They frankly were not in a warlike state of mind. They were defeated – they had been defeated by the peoples the Chinese had defeated, you see?

Oh, they were without household goods or bread or any other doggone thing, and they were coming down in streams. And then they'd get organized somewhere up around the German forests or somewhere down into France somewhere, and they would form into an area that was trying to find some way out. And the Roman Empire barred their retreat from these Russians that had been chasing them out. And that actually is, apparently, the real basis of the – oh, things like the Vandals and other erasures of Roman history. These birds were just driven down on the empire. And they had all sorts of wild adventures, and so forth. But it wiped it out.

But the Roman, by that time – he couldn't stand up to anything. He probably could have handled these people politically if he'd still been operating on his old basis of *Pax Romana*. He'd still have been trying to keep the peace and keep the roads open. He would have said, "Yeah, well, there's a lot of country over there that doesn't have anybody in it. Why don't you people go over there," you know? Something like that. Instead of that he had to hold down this phony empire that Julius Caesar had put together that gave him boundaries. Up to that time he'd owned the whole world without putting any signposts on it, don't you see?

Julius Caesar went out and gave them affluence by putting up some signposts saying "This is Roman territory." So they couldn't handle these barbarian invasions and they're no longer with us. I don't know if you haven't noticed recently, but I noticed in the last war that nobody was ever very worried about being faced by Italian troops. Broke their backs.

Now, these various conditions... And there, there historically, was a huge condition of Affluence which was begun and which wound up appetite over tin cup.

Now, furthermore, the Russians didn't do all right on their defeat because they went into an emergency but didn't promote. See? They didn't – they didn't follow any kind of a formula. Well, you have to dream up what they'd have to do, you see? They would have had to have promoted something:

"We are useful to you Chinese," don't you see? Or "People of the Balkans, we come in peace," you know or something. They – all they did was just walk out there defeated and everybody they ran into, cut his head off you know? *Uh-uhh*. They didn't know much about formulas.

But you can get yourself in one of the most remarkable appetite-over-tincup states that you ever cared to be in, in your life: just apply the wrong formula to your own personal existence. This doesn't just apply to big organizations, big civilizations – applies to the individual. You go into one of these conditions, you're in it without knowing. You've got to be in one or another of these conditions, you see? There isn't any other con – there isn't this thing of no-condition. And you're in one or another of them.

And the funny part of it is, a state of Emergency – you know, a state of Emergency continued is still a state of Emergency, only it's worse. And that state of Emergency not recovered from with no Emergency Formula ended is *worse*. And then – that condition is continued and so forth; it's worse! There is no condition of "emergency over, because everything is dead." That's one of the horrible things to look at in this universe: nothing ends.

You could probably take any pc and get the – get the tail end of some duel he had at some unimaginable point of the past and you find out to some degree the duel is still going on. It's quite interesting. He never really gave up, you see? He was killed in the duel but he never – never really gave up. You see? The total persistence of the universe is one of the most amazing features of it. It *will* persist. Survival of anything and everything is the God and watchword by which it functions.

So what about this guy? He's in a condition of Emergency – and he becomes – he used to be a bank president and becomes a clerk. All right, he's still in a condition of Emergency, and he doesn't repair that as a clerk so he becomes a skid row bum. Well, he's still in a condition of Emergency, and he doesn't repair that so he becomes negative skid row bum. And then he goes down to a point where he still can't – he can't even pick up a body or function in any way whatsoever, so he's *still* in a condition of Emergency. At no time along the line does he pull out of this condition of Emergency. He's still trying to handle it as the wrong condition or something like that.

You want to know what the dwindling spiral is: It's really just applying the wrong formula to an existing situation. And that'll give you a dwindling spiral every time. And the handiest one to go into, of course, is Emergency because when the others aren't repaired or handled properly, why, Emergency then occurs. That's why we know far more about Emergency than the other states.

Now, there's a condition of Power Change...

I might as well tell you the other two conditions. There's – the first one is the state of Emergency. The next one is the state of Normal Operation, parenthesis (stability) – but don't be fooled by the word, thinking it's level. The next one is a state of Affluence. And the next one is a state of Power Change.

And the state of Power Change is the – where you have a company running all right, let us say, but the general manager has been hired by some other company because he has such a successful record. Now, this is one of the most mishandled states anybody ever heard of. You know, you get that cliché. "The new broom sweeps clean"? Well, it doesn't only sleep queen [sweep clean], man, it just sweeps everything out.

You're always getting a condition whereby Mr. Sykes has taken over now in the main central bank, and he has left the branch bank where he has been so successful. And his job is taken over by Bill Smithers. And Bill Smithers moves into this little local branch position, and the new broom sweeps clean. He violates the formula almost always. It just seems to be sewn into his makeup to knock it off. And it's just ignorance, you see? Well, he makes changes.

Now look, the little bank must have been doing all right if its boss was able to take off to become a manager of a bigger bank. Must have been doing okay, huh? Well, if that little bank was doing all right and if it was in a state of Normal Operation – which it normally would have been in for anybody to have been promoted out of it – this new bird coming in: Actually, life is a beautiful song if he follows the condition formula, and there – that's perfectly easy. You just *don't change anything*. Power change: don't change anything. Just because power has changed, don't change anything.

Now look, it applies to the individual on the basis that the new manager of this little district bank – the *new* manager of the little district bank – has been, previous to that, the chief cashier. Well, he's had a power change, see? He's from chief cashier to manager of the little local bank. Well, what do they normally do? What does a wog normally do when he runs into this situation? Well, you know very well, the wife has to have a bigger house and they have to have a better car, don't they? That's obvious. He's got to be the part, hasn't he? He's got to have more – better clothes to live up to this. It's obvious.

He's got to have – he's got to have a better front, you know? And they have to have more social affairs and make more social contacts, don't they, which makes it less possible for anybody to get his job done, don't you see? Also runs up a nice bill of expenses on entertainment and all this sort of thing. But if it were only that, it would simply be the individual violating it. He goes ahead and violates the formula for the local bank.

Well, it's always irritated him, the fact that he has had to say "Good morning, governor," or something, when the manager came in, you see? This has always irritated him and he hasn't got any better sense than to alter the operating procedure. So when he comes in he doesn't let his new chief cashier say "Good morning, governor," don't you see? He decides that this had better be that he is met in the office with most of the papers of the day. So the chief cashier is supposed to be in the office with most of the papers of the day. Well, he never gets a chance, then, even to hang up his hat. He's hit with all the papers, don't you see? And he gets all the chitchat of the bank before he can even breathe.

So this makes him a little bit sore, so he gets mean to people in his immediate vicinity and spoils the morale, see? So people make a few more mistakes than they ordinarily would have made in adding up the figures. And then there's this new rule about the tea break. He has decided that he had better put the tea break from *lufluf* to *blu-luf* see, and this is a big change. And then there's another change and there's another change and there's another change and there's another change. The new broom is busy sweeping a bank clean of being any bank. And the next thing you know there's no bank. See, its statistic goes *psheew!*

So you want to ask, why is it when they have moved off Bill Smithers to become the head of the whole chain, do they have such a hell of a time replacing him in the local – local area? Well, it isn't that the guys that replace him are stupid or incapable of doing the job or something. It's just they don't know this formula.

What a song it is to inherit a pair of successful boots. That is really a song. There's nothing to it. Just step in the boots and don't bother to walk. [laughter] And this is somehow or another considered by people reprehensible, you see? You're supposed to strike out on your own. You're supposed to put your own personality on the... Bull! Put on the boots, but don't walk, man.

You just sit around for a while. Just sit around. And people want things signed – you know, immediately, that you're going to get – all of the pressure points in the organization are going to come to you at once, and – the fellow who had it before you had all these pressure points. But he must have resisted them successfully because they're – still exist. See there? See? So anybody wants anything signed that your predecessor didn't sign, don't sign it. That's an easy rule to follow, isn't it? This absolutely is the laziest position that anybody could ever occupy. And that's the only way it can be occupied – with total laziness. *Don't do anything!*

Keep your eyes open, learn the ropes and, depending on how big the organization is, after a certain time, why, see how it's running and run it as normal operating condition. If it's not in anything but a normal operating condition just apply the normal operating condition to it. Go around and – besides the little routine that's done, why, go around and snoop around and find out what made it a little bit better that week, you know, and reinforce that. And what worsened a little bit and take that out that made it worse, you see, and just sniff around. By that time you're so – you're so well acquainted with the operation, you know everybody by his first and last names, and you know this, that and the other thing, and you know where all the papers are, and you know the favorite dodges, and you've seen all these things happen, don't you see? And frankly, the operation will just keep on moving on up. It would move ahead very successfully.

Because quite normally there are only two kinds of replacements, only two circumstances – not conditions – but there are only two circumstances which require replacement: the very successful one or the very unsuccessful one. So the place was probably not in a condition of Affluence. It was probably in a condition of very steady Normal Operation for a long time which eventually came to the fifth – the fifth one which is Power. And the fifth condition, unless there is some other condition I've overlooked in it, is Power – the condition of Power.

Now, this fellow, in operating this bank, had operated under normal operating conditions, coped with all of its emergencies, didn't go blooey in all the affluences, and so forth. And he finally got into a position where he himself had assumed a position of power in the eyes of his own superiors.

See? He must be quite a bloke. He must be extending the activities of his organization all around. And he is operating at a position of where, for instance, power – well, somebody asks him for his position or opinion on something or other, and he says so-and-so and so-and-so. Well, his position of power is simply that they say, "Oh, yes, well, that's the way it is?" Even his superiors, you see?

In other words, the operation was running so well, and so forth, he eventually found himself in a position of power. And so the reason he gets promoted is, of course, he's outgrown the zone that that power matches, so they move him up to a higher power position. Quite elementary in its actual look. It – he'd inevitably move up to a higher power position anyway.

And when he does so he would leave, of course, an operation which was – which was in a position of Power. That would be its actual condition quite normally. When the fellow was promoted creditably, then the organization he leaves behind must be in a condition of Power.

If the organization is in a condition of Emergency, well, then God knows what you do. Now, the fellow who walks into the boots of somebody who has left it in disgrace... Very often there are two or three replacements before they finally set it down and stabilize it. Because every once – one of these guys will – well, they try to act – maybe their – maybe in the last job they had they inherited a condition, you see, of normal operating condition, see? And they found out they didn't have to do anything and it all came off all right. So the next one they inherit – they inherit, it's in a condition of Emergency. Its statistics have gone to hell, causing the boss to be fired. So they decide not to do anything, you see? Ooh. No, no, no, no, no. All he's got to do when he inherits one in Emergency is nothing extraordinary – it's just apply the state of Emergency Formula to it, which is *immediately promote!*

"Oh, statistics down? Oh well, let's see, what do we normally produce around here? We produce eggs. All right. Eggs. Good. Who do we use for our advertising? We've got an advertising manager or an accountant anyplace? Or we – any firm that advertises for us?"

They say, "Well, Smythe & Company has been our advertising firm for the last hundred years."

"Oh, wait a minute. This organization is in Emergency in spite of them. Well, we're going to get a new one. But meanwhile, Smythe & Company can turn out this campaign, and I'll also get somebody else to turn out a campaign, too."

"Smythe & Company, get out the standard campaign. That – the one that last produced a lot of egg selling. Now, repeat that whole campaign."

But the fellow says, "Oh, you mean, you wanted the girls with the bows on their..."

"I won't – I don't care whether they had bows on their hair or not. Just repeat the campaign! That was the last point of success. So get that one out quick. Can you – can you get that out? Any time – where the – in the next... Well, I'll give you lots of time; you've got until yesterday."

"Oh," the fellow says, "but you haven't paid your last account," and so forth.

"Well, we – I – that's – that's something else. I haven't got anything to do with that and neither do you. The only chance you ever got to get your account paid, son, is just to get out that advertising campaign *flash* and so forth. And if you don't get out the advertising campaign *flash*, why, you lose our account, and you're also going to lose your bill. So take your choice."

They say, "He speaks sooth."

So they get a promote out, don't you see? And he meanwhile – meanwhile gets ahold of another firm that's going to replace this other firm, and he says, "Get out an egg campaign. Right away. Sell lots of eggs."

And the fellow says, "We've always had an idea about selling egg campaign. We have a radio ad, and this rooster comes in and winks, you see?"

And you say, "How's he going to wink on the radio?"

"Well," they say, "well, we had it worked..."

"Well, good. Put on the whole program. That's right. That's it. Fine. Fine."

And the board of directors, a bunch of old fuddy-duddies or something, are sitting around saying, "But how are you going to pay for all this?"

"Pay for it?"

See, they're trying to put the Emergency formula into the Affluence formula, and so forth.

"Well, fine. We'll – I'll give you a complete memorandum on that. I'll give you a memorandum on that by next Monday. Yes, sir! Yeah, we'll give you a complete memorandum on the whole thing." ("Grace, copy something out of an economics textbook or something, would you?") [laughter] "All right, very good. Now..." See, he also handles that by promote. He's going to give them something, don't you see?

And then after he's got this firm over here putting on the last successful campaign, he's got a new firm that is going to take their position if the new firm succeeds – when he's got all that promotion out, then he sits down to his desk and works all night long, every night and gets out *the* promotion that's going to save the bacon. Got the idea? On *all* lines and regardless of *any* expense. And then he makes *sure* that it happens. And then the next thing you know that organization's curve starts going up.

Elementary. Sometimes it takes longer. Sometimes it's sooner. Sometimes you hold your breath for a long time: Your promotional period is just week after week after week. "Oh my God, that last promotion didn't bite. Let's get something new here. Let's get something

going." You know? Keep it up until you all of a sudden see the statistic start to recover, and then economize.

And then just say, "All right, no purchase orders. Nothing. Nobody can have anything. No, I don't – can't pay any bills. I'm awfully sorry. Nobody can pay any bills. I mean – no, we can't buy anything. You say they're going to cut off the water tomorrow; well, I don't know how we'll bathe." [laughs] Just shut it off right there.

And then say, "How the – where the hell..." We haven't even thought of this up to this point: "Now, where are we going to get some eggs?" Horribly enough that's the only *possible* way it can be done. If you work it in reverse and worry about getting the eggs before you sell any eggs, you're going to go crash in this universe before you have an opportunity, don't you see? So now you've got a new fantastic and frantic condition which you are now going to have to enter in on.

"Where are we going to get the eggs?"

"Why, I thought you knew, Joe."

"No, I didn't know." [laughter]

Big conference with juniors, "Are there any eggs?"

Somebody says, "Well, there are Irish eggs. Nobody has ever sold those over here before."

"Oh yeah? Irish eggs. *Hmm!* I thought we had lots of eggs."

"Oh, no, no, no, no. You – you forgot, the thing that caused the emergency, and that sort of thing, was because hen-bite got loose amongst the hens and they all died."

"Oh, is that so?"

But you see, now, it requires real frantic, fast operating skill with which to get a supply. And if you're very, very clever, why, the first order that comes in from the big wholesaler for eggs you immediately fill it. How that happened is a concatenation of miracles, don't you see? But you fill it. You make good there because you – your next thought is to prepare to deliver and in the lag – when your promotion was going out and everything else – in that lag you are actually able, then, to prepare to deliver. See? So you conference with your juniors and so forth.

"They got lots of eggs in Ireland. They haven't been able to sell any eggs in Ireland for some time. You know there used to be a tariff and it more or less got uncusomary to import eggs from Ireland, and so forth. They're – and they don't use them anymore."

"Why?"

"Well, because they're brown eggs."

"Oh, yeah? Well, I thought... They're brown eggs. Well – how white – white eggs. Let's see, white – eggs are white and brown. All right. Very good. And do housewives have anything against white eggs?"

"Well, no. As a matter of fact, they used to have a superstition that brown eggs were healthier and made better cakes, or something. They – in old cookbooks you used to see occasionally 'Brown egg...' You know? 'You use six brown eggs for this particular type of cake.'"

"No kidding? And they have brown eggs in Ireland. All right. Good. We've got all of that propaganda going. We've got all that campaign going, and so forth. We will release another propaganda campaign now that brown eggs... And we'll quote old Betty Kettlebottom's recipe for brown eggs. [laughter] Yeah, yeah. We'll fix that up, and here we go, and here's – and we'll get in the Irish eggs."

And the wholesaler calls up and he says, "Say, those eggs you just shipped us, they're brown eggs."

And you say, "There's no additional charge." [laughter] "They're not dyed; they're natural."

And he'll go, "Are they?" and accepts the brown eggs.

That's how the universe goes together, and that's what fast management of an existing area is. And anybody by knowing these formulas, actually, could apply them to his personal life in a very wonderful fashion.

I'll repeat them again for you: There's the condition of Emergency – the state of Emergency, same thing; the Normal Operation; of Affluence – state of Affluence (sudden peaks of income); and Power Change, where the guy comes off; and the last one is Power – and the condition of Power. And a condition of Power Change merely means the old boss and the new boss. That can play hob.

Very often we have gotten into this in Scientology. Because I've left an operating area and it's been taken over by somebody else, we've gotten into a condition of Power Change. And instead of sitting back quietly, why, whoever inherited the boots changed some of the things that I had going, don't you see? They didn't reinforce them, and the area would go *bzzt!* And they couldn't quite tell why it had gone down so fast, and it – attributed it to my magic personality. Well, there might have been something to that, I will have to admit. But actually, it wasn't actually attributable to that at all.

It was that during the time I was there I had certain operating lines moving, and nobody kept those same lines moving exactly the way I kept them moving. And of course, Power Change – somebody else took over the control of that immediate area, why, they'd move those lines, they'd make changes, they wouldn't keep those lines flowing. If the guy had been very clever, he would have gone through the exact same routine of every day that I went through. He would have signed nothing that I wouldn't sign. He wouldn't have changed a single order. He would look through the papers that had been issued at that period of time – these are the orders that are extant – and he would have just gotten busy as the devil just enforcing those orders. And his operation would have increased and increased and increased and increased.

Now, when an operation, then, after I leave it does collapse – you know, it goes downhill (it doesn't ever totally collapse, but it goes downhill) – then you know very well what happened after I left. Somebody changed all the orders. See, it wasn't that the public

responded badly or something like that. It's just that somebody must have shifted all of the orders. That's all. Very elementary. You can trace it very easily, you see?

But the condition of Power is quite interesting. And that, of all of them, is the most fascinating – not because one is particularly power-happy but because it is peculiar. It's peculiar in that it apparently belies what you would normally think and expect to do as a Operating Thetan, because that is a condition of Power. And moving up into that condition of Power you have to follow its formulas.

Now, I've written its formulas down. I'm not going to try to quote those formulas to you at the present moment – I don't have the full list and I might tell you a little bit wrong. But I will tell you this about it: is what you mustn't do is disconnect. Isn't that peculiar? That's the first law of a condition of Power is *don't disconnect*. That will bring about catastrophe for both you and anybody else.

Now, look at what might happen. Here we have an operating Scientology organization – we can see it organizationally very easily – and it's operating pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. And after a while, some of the boys get the idea "Why are we demanding any money from preclears? After all, we've been operating in this area for some time; only our currency is used in this area. Why charge anything? Furthermore, we can mock up and put in place and haul in from the granite quarries outside the town all the building material we want. Why are we buying anything?" See?

And a bunch of these birds get pretty eager beaver and they start to do it themselves. And then they say, "Well, we really don't have to have any students or preclears." And it's the violation of that formula alone which brought about implanting, trapping and an antagonism toward thetans – the violation of the state of Power. And the first thing it is, is don't disconnect.

You'll find out that people whine and complain about this. How about the big boy who becomes the big boy, and he's been a local boy in some town, and all of a sudden he becomes a big boy. And he's highly powerful on Wall Street. And he never again speaks to any of his friends in the old home town. Jesus, those people resent that. That is so much the matter of the thing that I can tell you personally that it's almost impossible to speak to them. That is to say, if you've been in an area where you've been very well known and you suddenly become, oh, you might say, become a celebrity or something like that – these people won't believe that you want to talk to them, you see? They're so used to having the formula violated. You get the idea?

You'll find that you've been to Saint Hill, and you've – you're in the org, and you go back. And you've always had a good time talking to Josie Ann, and so – the receptionist and so forth. And you'll find out that, although she'll chatter with you and that sort of thing, she has a feeling like you're quite superior now. It's going to be you who has to break down the communication barrier that's erected. You'll find out that very often these people have drifted off from you.

And you wait until you've gone through VII, and you've gotten yourself well up the line on Clear, and you can handle Power Processes, which gives you total dominion over any type of case there is. Now, we haven't talked about your state of case; we've just talked about

what you can do and the reputation of what you've got or what you are – just that, you see? We're not talking about you being able to do anything beyond your business, see? Wow! One of your hardest jobs will be not disconnecting. You'll find out there are certain people around who are now absolutely sure that you don't any – want to – any longer want to talk to them. And you start communicating with these people, and they will give you some of the weirdest reactions: Some of them flash back at you. Some of them are too respectful of you. Some are very propitiative of you. Your conversation quite commonly starts out with "Oh, I thought you would have forgotten all about me." This is quite weird, you see?

In other words, beings in the universe fully expect that you're going to violate the first position of the Power condition, which is disconnect. They think you're going to disconnect.

Well, let's supposing this organization got itself so that it was totally self-sufficient: it didn't have to train anybody; it didn't have to process anybody; it didn't have to do a thing. Next thing you know, this community, anywhere around it, is going to think of nothing but implantation, stakes, violating any freedom that a thetan might have. They're going to become *very* suppressive. They're being denied service for one thing. No bridge was put in.

One of the most *dangerous* things we could do – if we just wanted to blow up everybody in this room, there's one terribly dangerous thing that we could do: We could just not make what we know available. For instance, to have the Power Processes being performed at Saint Hill, and let's limit them totally to staff at Saint Hill. Huh! Somebody is going to get upset. Well, they get upset enough when you don't let everybody do them. You're not willing to sit still, you see, and watch somebody out in Keokuk process somebody into the ground because nobody star-rated him on the bulletin, don't you see? Because we have no way of star-rating somebody in Keokuk on these bulletins.

So we keep it corralled just to that degree and you'll see a little bit of natter. But actually the public at large, and so forth, in responding to me on this sort of thing, quite well accepts the idea that certain of these materials, the better – the stronger, tougher of these materials should be in trained hands. They think that's a good idea. And that's as far as we go. Yes, we say they should be in very trained hands and that we should have an ethics of their proper application. That's about the only thing that worries people. They're still available, don't you see? People can still get these things, and so forth. We haven't disconnected.

Supposing I announced, "Well, I walked across the bridge now, and I've given you some materials and so forth, and I'm leaving. I've got an appointment at the Central Galaxy, and so forth. It's about time I reported back anyway – I've got to collect my back pay." You'd see some wild things occurring. You'd be just a little bit amazed at how wild they would be. You say, "Well, it doesn't make much difference because after all he's given us all the materials, and he's done all this and he's all done that, and so forth," and so on. I say, "Well, I'm Clear now, and I'm moving on up to OT, and so forth. And hope – wish you people some luck. Bye."

Back in the old days, when I'd get dis... I would never get discouraged particularly but I'd just get to thinking about my own concerns and that sort of thing, and I told some people, "I'm not going to be around forever," and so forth. And I've had several people immediately

break down and cry and get upset and a couple of others get angry, and so forth – a very misemotional mess. Do you see?

No! Power! Position of power! Don't disconnect. Even though you're promoted to general from colonel of a regiment, don't be such a fool as to think that you can totally disconnect from that regiment. Because the only way you can't disconnect from the regiment is to disconnect from it. You can't just deny your connections. What you've got to do is take ownership and responsibility for your connections.

Now, the condition of Power is the guy going into a condition of Power or the organization going into a condition of Power. And the condition of Power Change – that state – is actually a fellow assuming a condition which has been held from Power. You get the difference? You're replacing Bill, who was in a condition of Power. He was actually in the condition of Power. Now, when he moves off, disconnects – when he's gone – then the Power Change is who took over. Do you see? That applies to taking over a post, do you see? Or the upgrade of the power of an organization also is covered under that same formula, weirdly enough.

And then this post up here of the assumption of this state of Power, and so forth, is governed by its own formula. And the first thing it's got to do is make a record of all of its lines. And that's the only way it will ever be able to disconnect.

Now, for instance, if you were a very, very succ... I'll give – show you this applies big and small, see? Supposing you were a very, very successful – you were a very, very successful Receptionist in an organization, and you were so successful that you were made the Registrar or something, see? Supposing something like this went on.

Well actually, that is an upgrade of power, isn't it? Now, you don't permit the person who takes over the post to operate in a condition of Power Change unless you make a total record of your post. So on a condition of Power, the first thing you have to do is write up your whole post. And you'll find out if you don't write up your whole post, you're going to be stuck with a piece of that post since time immemorial. And a year or so later somebody will *still* be coming to you asking you about that post which you occupied, because you didn't write up your post. Do you see? So you made it possible for the next bloke in – whether he does or not, that's beside the point; but you've made it possible for the next fellow in to assume that state of Power Change, of changing nothing, because you've shown what was there, so he knows now what not to change. You got it?

But if you didn't write it up, then he could change it, and you're being pulled back to that post continuously. And that's the surest way in the world to be snapped in against some old post that you have held, and that's how never to get away from a post. It's just, don't write up the post of Reception, and go ahead and take the post of Registrar. And don't be very surprised, however, if you spend 50 percent of your time answering the telephone while being a Registrar.

And you say, "What wonderful mechanics are involved here. This – these new – these new people that take over these Reception posts, they're just girls and they're no good and they don't care..." Now, let's make sure before we start being too critical: Did we ever write up this post, Registrar? Did we ever really leave the post? Did we leave it in a condition that it

could be left? And then, did we just negate the whole post after we left it, or occasionally did we walk by and say, "How's the post coming?" See?

It's no sudden disconnection, man. That's what it really amounts to. Don't go disconnecting. This is one of the most foul tricks that this universe plays at this particular time, is permit death. They have a thing called the last will and testament, and that's a bequeathment. Who the hell cares about the bequeathment; how about the bird's lines? See?

This guy is the school janitor, and he says, "Well, the world can get along without the school janitor," and so forth. "And it's not important," and you know? And he kicks the bucket. And "I leave my – I leave my Sunday suit to the garbage man," you know? And he thinks he's done his job, see? How's he get a time track. *Hmph-hmph-hmph-hmph-hmph!* He just never wrote up the hat of janitor so it could be occupied. In other words, he didn't take responsibility for his former situation; not having taken responsibility for it, he's stuck with it. It was his former position, and he didn't take responsibility for it so, of course, he's stuck with it. Naturally.

He should have written up, instead of the last will and testament... He says, "Oh, oh, I've got TB now and I'm kicking the bucket. And the doctors have promised me that they're going to kill me in a few days." [laughter] "What should I do?" You know? What should he do? There's only one answer, man. There's only one answer. He'd better write up his post. It isn't whether or not he's in a condition of Power Change or not; he's in a condition of Power with relationship to the janitor. See?

He may be doing poorly personally and may be in another personal condition. He may be personally in a condition of Emergency, but as far as his post is concerned, he's in a position of Power. He is *the* janitor. And he just ought to get that old stub of a pencil and that old account book and sit down – and lie down and somehow or other get himself comfortable enough to say, "Ya empties the ashes every Tuesday. And you'll find the fuse on switch box number 17 is always blowing..."

And he – responsibility is, write the thing up and get it into the hands of the guy that's going to take care of it. *Now* if the other guy doesn't take care of it, that's *his* track, brother, that's not yours. Do all you can to make the post occupiable. Sooner or later somebody is going to come along and occupy the post properly.

Condition of Power Change: that might go appetite over tin cup two or three times until somebody sees this old account book. "What's this?" "Well, that's old Sammy's write-up of his job." "Oh, 'Switch box number 17 – 16 goes out – .' Well, I'll be a son of a gun, it does, too. Hey, where's this? 'Every Tuesday, that's the best time.' Oh good. Of course, this stuff about the hot water doesn't apply. We've had a new boiler since." Well, they had to have a new boiler because they didn't apply the old hat. You get the idea?

So one, in his own personal life and in operation of a post, a state of an organization, a state of a family, state of a civilization or the state of a planet or a sector, well of course, all comes under the heading of the states of condition. And if they're in one state of condition, operate into another, they for sure will fail.

These will be issued in the not-too-distant future in the form of a very exact bulletin giving you a number of exact steps for every one of them. There are quite a few steps, one right after the other. And they can be applied by cross-relating them to an individual; they'll be written up mainly for an organization, of course. But they can be applied crossways to that.

And one of these days, students – in the not-too-different future, I think probably by Tuesday of next week – students will be declared in a condition of Emergency if their statistic goes down. That's the statistic of the number of passes. So you're going less examination and more statistic, you see?

Your statistic goes down and that's what determines whether or not you go to Review. state of Emergency, don't you see? What do you have to do in a state of Emergency? Well, it's covered exactly in the state of Emergency. And you find out if you follow the state of Emergency, why, you come out at the other end smiling and smelling like a rose. [laughter]

The – it is a wonderful fact that those things did exist and that they do regulate existence, regulate life, and that life can therefore be followed. But I invite you to do one thing after these are issued and you get an opportunity to study them. I invite you to do one thing, and that is take some existing civilization aspect, take the course of existence of some government and estimate that government's state, see? Find out what state that government really is in, and then watch the newspapers for the measures which that government is taking. You'll go into stitches.

Contained in these is why the British Empire has become smaller. Every time they went into a State of Emergency or a state of Affluence, then they would assume the wrong formula. And the second that they assumed the wrong formula, of course, they'd emerge at the other end of the situation smaller. That's always the case: You want to become smaller – just always apply the wrong condition. Apply the wrong formula and you'll get it every time.

Now, the United States has got a bunch of formulas going right now. I don't know what they're operating on at the present time. But it's quite interesting – it's quite interesting. It would be, rather, a quite interesting mental exercise just to estimate what condition are they in, see? What should be the assigned condition? Now, that's the assigned condition; what's the formula? All right, the formula is so-and-so. Well, what are they doing? And you'll generally find out they're in some other wild condition that had nothing whatsoever to do with the condition that they are in. And then you wonder why statesmen fail and wars happen and things get worse and civilizations go by the boards, and why the Dominican Republic flag will be flying over the White House any day now.

Anyway, I think you can have some fun with this. But much more important than this, you could probably set yourself up as a business advisory bureau that would actually bring out of the woods any failing business in the world. You could set yourself up as an adviser – just using these states, see, and doing nothing but urge that they be taken, don't you see? Boy, they'd think, how wise, how wise you are, don't you see? And, "How does he know those things?" And once – if we did this, then we would supplant... I'm not advising anybody to do this. It's just a gag. We use it operationally ourselves. But a fellow by the name of Keynes, Lord Keynes, is the top dog in today's economics. And he only has one law and that's *increase want*. That's his law: *increase want*. And I've worked that out economically. If you increased

want – if you wanted really to increase want, you'd just have to starve everybody to death, and you would have reached and attained the end product of Lord Keynes' central law.

And as far as I can see, that's about as far as anybody has gotten on states of condition in modern civilization. And I hope we can do a bit better.

Thank you very much.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 1 SEPTEMBER AD 15
Issue VII

Remimeo
All Hats

Div 1
ETHICS

ETHICS PROTECTION

Ethics actions must parallel the purposes of Scientology and its organizations.

Ethics exists primarily to get technology in. Tech can't work unless Ethics is already in. When tech goes out Ethics can (and is expected to) get it in. For the purpose of Scientology amongst others, is to apply Scientology. Therefore when tech is in, Ethics actions tend to be dropped. Ethics continues its actions until tech is in and as soon as it is, backs off and only acts if tech goes out again.

The purpose of the org is to get the show on the road and keep it going. This means production. Every division is a production unit. It makes or does something that can have a *statistic* to see if it goes up or down. Example: a typist gets out 500 letters in one week. That's a statistic. If the next week the same typist gets out 600 letters that's an **up** statistic. If the typist gets out 300 letters that's a **down** statistic. Every post in an org can have a statistic. So does every portion of the org. The purpose is to keep production (statistics) up. This is the only thing that gives a good income for the staff member personally. When statistics go down or when things are so organized you can't get one for a post, the staff members' pay goes down as the org goes down in its overall production. The production of an organization is only the total of its individual staff members. When these have down statistics so does the org.

Ethics actions are often used to handle down individual statistics. A person who is not doing his job becomes an Ethics target.

Conversely, if a person *is* doing his job (and his statistic will show that) Ethics is considered to be *in* and the person is *protected* by Ethics.

As an example of the proper application of Ethics to the production of an org, let us say the Letter Registrar has a high statistic (gets out lots of effective mail). Somebody reports the Letter Registrar for rudeness, somebody else reports the Letter Registrar for irregular conduct with a student. Somebody else reports the Letter Registrar for leaving all the lights on. Proper Ethics Officer action = look up the general statistics of the Letter Registrar, and seeing that they average quite high, file the complaints with a yawn.

As the second example of Ethics application to the production of an org, let us say that a Course Supervisor has a low statistic (very few students moved out of his course, course

number growing, hardly anyone graduating, a bad Academy statistic). Somebody reports this Course Supervisor for being late for work, somebody else reports him for no weekly Ad comm report and bang! Ethics looks up the person, calls for an Ethics Hearing with trimmings.

We are not in the business of being good boys and girls. We're in the business of going free and getting the org production roaring. Nothing else is of any interest then to Ethics but (a) getting tech in, getting it run and getting it run right and (b) getting production up and the org roaring along.

Therefore if a staff member *is* getting production up by having his own statistic excellent. Ethics sure isn't interested. But if a staff member isn't producing, shown by his bad statistic for his post, Ethics is fascinated with his smallest misdemeanor.

In short a staff member can get away with murder so long as his statistic is up and can't sneeze without a chop if it's down.

To do otherwise is to permit some suppressive person to simply Ethics chit every producer in the org out of existence.

When people do start reporting a staff member with a high statistic, what you investigate is the person who turned in the report.

In an ancient army a particularly brave deed was recognized by an award of the title of Kha-Khan. It was not a rank. The person remained what he was, **but** he was entitled to be forgiven the death penalty ten times in case in the future he did anything wrong. That was a Kha-Khan.

That's what producing, high statistic staff members are – Kha-Khans. They can get away with murder without a blink from Ethics.

The average fair to poor statistic staff member of course gets just routine ethics with hearings or courts for too many misdeeds. The low statistic fellow gets a court if he sneezes.

Ethics *must* use all org discipline only in view of the production statistic of the staff member involved.

And Ethics must recognize a Kha-Khan when it sees one – and tear up the bad report chits on the person with a yawn.

To the staff member this means – if you do your job you are protected by Ethics. And if you aren't so protected and your statistic is high, cable me.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 27 OCTOBER 1964

Remimeo
Franchise
All Students
All staff

**POLICIES ON PHYSICAL HEALING, INSANITY
AND POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES**

It has been the long standing policy of Central Organizations to handle physical illness and insanity in the following manner.

HEALING

Any process labelled "healing", old or new refers to healing by mental and spiritual means and should therefore be looked upon as the relief of difficulties arising from mental and spiritual causes.

The proper procedure in being requested to heal some complained of physical disability is as follows:

1. Require a physical examination from whatever practitioners of the physical healing arts may be competent and available;
2. Clearly establish that the disability does not stem from immediately physical causes;
3. If the disability is pronounced to be curable within the skill of the physical practitioner and is in actual fact a disease or illness which surrenders to contemporary physical treatment, to require the person to be so treated before Scientology processing may be undertaken;
4. If, however, the physical practitioner's recommendation includes surgery or treatment of an unproven nature or the illness or disease cannot be accurately diagnosed as a specific physical illness or disease with a known cure, the person may be accepted for processing on the reasonable assumption that no purely physical illness is proven to exist, and that it is probably mental or spiritual in origin.

POLICIES REGARDING THE INSANE

With insane persons or persons with a proven record of insanity, do the following:

1. Establish to the best of your ability within reasonable administrative limits and known tests that any HGC pc accepted for processing does not have a history of deserved institutionalization in an insane asylum or similar place;
2. Process only those persons who have no such history;
3. Do not recommend any other treatment by practitioners in the field of insanity where there exists any evidence that such practitioners injure, disable or maltreat patients by violently reacting drugs, by painful shocks, surgery or other barbaric and outdated means of "mental treatment";
4. If no recommendation is possible under (3) above, recommend only rest and a change of environment, but not in a professional capacity.

POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES

Policies similar to those regarding physical illness and insanity exist for types of persons who have caused us considerable trouble.

These persons can be grouped under "Potential Trouble Sources". They include:

- (a) Persons intimately connected with persons (such as marital or familial ties) of known antagonism to mental or spiritual treatment or Scientology. In practice such persons, even when they approach Scientology in a friendly fashion, have such pressure continually brought to bear upon them by persons with undue influence over them that they make very poor gains in processing and their interest is solely devoted to proving the antagonistic element wrong.

They, by experience, produce a great deal of trouble in the long run as their own condition does not improve adequately under such stresses to effectively combat the antagonism. Their present time problem cannot be reached as it is continuous, and so long as it remains so, they should not be accepted for auditing by any organization or auditor.

- (b) Criminals with proven criminal records often continue to commit so many undetected harmful acts between sessions that they do not make adequate case gains and therefore should not be accepted for processing by organizations or auditors.
- (c) Persons who have ever threatened to sue or embarrass or attack or who have publicly attacked Scientology or been a party to an attack and all their immediate families should never be accepted for processing by a Central Organization or an auditor. They have a history of only serving other ends than case gain and commonly again turn on the organization or auditor. They have already barred themselves out by their own overts against Scientology and are thereafter too difficult to help, since they cannot openly accept help from those they have tried to injure.
- (d) Responsible-for-condition cases have been traced back to other causes for their condition too often to be acceptable. By Responsible-for-condition cases is meant the person who insists a book or some auditor is "wholly responsible for the terrible condition

I am in". Such cases demand unusual favours, free auditing, tremendous effort on the part of auditors. Review of these cases shows that they were in the same or worse condition long before auditing, that they are using a planned campaign to obtain auditing for nothing, that they are not as bad off as they claim, and that their antagonism extends to anyone who seeks to help them, even their own families. Establish the rights of the matter and decide accordingly.

- (e) Persons who are not being audited on their own determinism are a liability as they are forced into being processed by some other person and have no personal desire to become better. Quite on the contrary they usually want only to prove the person who wants them audited wrong and so do not get better. Until a personally determined goal to be processed occurs, the person will not benefit.
- (f) Persons who "want to be processed to see if Scientology works" as their only reason for being audited have never been known to make gains as they do not participate. News reporters fall into this category. They should not be audited.
- (g) Persons who claim that "if you help such and such a case" (at great and your expense) because somebody is rich or influential or the neighbours would be electrified should be ignored. Processing is designed for bettering individuals, not progressing by stunts or giving cases undue importance. Process only at convenience and usual arrangements. Make no extraordinary effort at the expense of other persons who do want processing for normal reasons. Not one of these arrangements has ever come off successfully as it has the unworthy goal of notoriety, not betterment.
- (h) Persons who "have an open mind" but no personal hopes or desires for auditing or knowingness should be ignored, as they really don't have an open mind at all, but a lack of ability to decide about things and are seldom found to be very responsible and waste anyone's efforts "to convince them".
- (i) Persons who do not believe anything or anyone can get better. They have a purpose for being audited entirely contrary to the auditor's and so in this conflict, do not benefit. When such persons are trained they use their training to degrade others. Thus they should not be accepted for training or auditing.
- (j) Persons attempting to sit in judgment on Scientology in hearings or attempting to investigate Scientology should be given no undue importance. One should not seek to instruct or assist them in any way. This includes judges, boards, newspaper reporters, magazine writers, etc. All efforts to be helpful or instructive have done nothing beneficial as their first idea is a firm "I don't know" and this usually ends with an equally firm "I don't know". If a person can't see for himself or judge from the obvious, then he does not have sufficient powers of observation even to sort out actual evidence. In legal matters, only take the obvious effective steps – carry on no crusades in court. In the matter of reporters, etc. it is not worth while to give them any time contrary to popular belief. They are given their story before they leave their editorial rooms and you only strengthen what they have to say by saying anything. They are no public communication line that sways much. Policy is very definite. Ignore.

To summarize Potential Trouble Sources, the policy in general is to cut communication as the longer it is extended the more trouble they are. I know of no case where the types of persons listed above were handled by auditing or instruction. I know of many cases where they were handled by firm legal stands, by ignoring them until they changed their minds, or just turning one's back.

In applying such a policy of cut-communication one must also use judgement as there are exceptions in all things and to fail to handle a person's momentary upset in life or with us can be quite fatal. So these policies refer to non-Scientology persons in the main or persons who appear on the outer fringes and push toward us. When such a person bears any of the above designations we and the many are better off to ignore them.

Scientology works. You don't have to prove it to everyone. People don't deserve to have Scientology as a divine right, you know. They have to earn it. This has been true in every philosophy that sought to better man.

THE STRESS OF POLICY

All the above "Potential Trouble Sources" are also forbidden training and when a person being trained or audited is detected to belong under the above headings (a) to (j) he or she should be advised to terminate and accept refund which must be paid at once and the full explanation should be given them at that time. Thus the few may not, in their own turmoil, impede service to and the advance of the many. And the less enturbulence you put on your lines, the better, and the more people you will eventually help.

Scientology is an applied philosophy designed and developed to make the able more able. In this sphere it is tremendously successful.

Efforts to involve philosophy with medical imperialism, psychiatric sadism, the bigoted churchman, bring about a slowing of our progress.

These people are sick spiritually because of their own continuous harmful actions against patients and the society and are beyond our normal means to help.

These policies will continue in existence until such time as those interested care to invest the time and treasure necessary to build the institutions and re-educate the professions which now practice medical and physical mental healing, and this is definitely not within our time, but would belong to some remote future when more men are sane.

However, such a programme would depend upon the continued existence of the medical imperialist and the psychiatrist and as their more reprehensible activities are rather new and very radical they may be abandoned by public and government long before Scientology could help them. This is probably the more likely occurrence as even in Russia, the Communist has now forsworn all violent treatments of the insane according to their delegates to the London Medical Conference of this year, and Russian practitioners look with contempt and scorn upon the Western psychiatrist. The medical doctor of England, taken over by Socialism, has lost his ambition for medical imperialism and has no contest with Scientology. In the United States the American Medical Association has become locked in mortal combat with

the government and probably will be socialized entirely in a few years due to fee abuses and lack of gains. The medical doctor remains strong only in more backward small nations such as Australia where world trends are late in arriving.

Even the Church in Rome is considering a surrender of principles and amalgamation with other faiths in an effort to save a dwindling religious membership.

Thus there may be no medical practitioner as we know him left in a few decades. Membership in the psychiatric profession is declining.

In the place of these institutions, if we ever get around to them, we may find ourselves dealing with completely different practices in the fields of physical healing and the treatment of the insane. All we ask of them is that they are competent in their treatments and less greedy for monopoly than their predecessors. And if this is so, then our policies will then remain fully in force, but in a spirit of co-operation, not with the desire to protect ourselves and the public from them and the products of their bungling.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jw.cden

[See also HCO P/Ls 5 November 1964, CORRECTIONS TO HCO POLICY LETTERS, next page; 27 October 1964 (reissued 23 June 1967), POLICIES ON PHYSICAL HEALING, INSANITY AND POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES; 7 April 1965, Issue II, HEALING POLICY IN FIELD; 21 February 1969, CANCELLATION OF "CORRECTIONS TO HCO POLICY LETTERS" – POL LTR OF NOVEMBER 5, 1964; 13 March 1969, ADDITION TO HCO POL LTR OF 23 JUNE 1967 "POLICIES ON PHYSICAL HEALING, INSANITY AND POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES " – POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES (b); and 7 May 1969, POLICIES ON "SOURCES of TROUBLE".]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 22 MARCH 1967

Remimeo
Level 0

IMPORTANT

ADMIN KNOW-HOW

ALTER-IS AND DEGRADED BEINGS

Alteration of orders and tech is worse than non-compliance.

Alter-is is a covert avoidance of an order. Although it is apparently often brought about by non-comprehension, the non-comprehension itself and failure to mention it, is an avoidance of orders.

Very degraded beings alter-is. Degraded ones refuse to comply without mentioning it. Beings in fair condition try to comply but remark their troubles to get help when needed. Competent higher toned beings understand orders and comply if possible but mainly do their jobs without needing lots of special orders.

Degraded beings find *any* instruction painful as they have been painfully indoctrinated with violent measures in the past. They therefore alter-is any order or don't comply.

Thus in auditing pcs or in org, where you find alter-is (covert non-compliance) and non-compliance, given sensible and correct tech or instructions, you are dealing with a degraded low level being and should act accordingly.

One uses very simple low level processes on a degraded being, gently.

In admin, orgs and especially the Tech Div where a staff member alter-ises, or fails to comply you are also dealing with a degraded being but one who is too much a pc to be a staff member. He cannot be at cause and staff members must be at cause. So he or she should not be on staff.

This is a primary senior datum regulating all handling of pcs and staff members.

A degraded being is not a suppressive as he can have case gain. But he is so PTS that he works for suppressives only. He is sort of a super-continual PTS beyond the reach really of a simple S & D and handled only at Sect 3 OT Course.

Degraded beings, taking a cue from SP associates, instinctively resent, hate and seek to obstruct any person in charge of anything or any Big Being.

Anyone issuing *sensible* orders is the first one resented by a degraded being.

A degraded being lies to his seniors, avoids orders covertly by alter-is, fails to comply, supplies only complex ideas that can't ever work (obstructive) and is a general area of entur-

bulence, often mild seeming or even "cooperative", often even flattering, sometimes merely dull but consistently alter-ising or non-complying.

This datum appeared during higher level research and is highly revelatory of earlier unexplained phenomena – the pc who changes commands or doesn't do them, the worker who can't get it straight or who is always on a tea break.

In an area where suppression has been very heavy for long periods people become degraded beings. However, they must have been so before already due to track incidents.

Some thetans are bigger than others. None are truly equal. But the degraded being is not necessarily a natively bad thetan. He is simply so PTS and has been for so long that it requires our highest level tech to finally undo it *after* he has scaled up all our grades.

Degraded beings are about 18 to 1 over Big Beings in the human race (minimum ratio). So those who keep things going are few. And those who will make it without the steam of the few in our orgs behind them are zero. At the same time, we can't have a world full of them and still make it. So we have no choice.

And we can handle them, even when they cannot serve, at higher levels.

This is really OT data but we need it at lower levels to get the job done.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jp.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 3 MAY 1972R
Revised 18 December 1977

Remimeo
Executive Hats

(Revision in this type style)

Important

Executive Series 12

ETHICS AND EXECUTIVES

Any person holding an executive post (head of department or above) is deemed an **Executive**.

Evaluation has revealed that the breakdown in many orgs is a failure on the part of executives to wear their ethics and justice hats.

It has been found that below administrative Whys there is usually an ethics situation as well, which, unhandled, causes the administrative Why not to function or raise stats.

In an area which is downstat, it is the duty of an executive to investigate and find any out-ethics situation and get it corrected.

Ethics is a personal thing in relation to a group. Unethical people are those who do not have ethics in on themselves personally.

It is the responsibility of the executive to see to it that persons under his control and in his area *get their personal ethics in and keep them in*.

Dishonesty, false reports, an out-ethics personal life, should be looked for and, by persuasion, should be corrected.

When an executive sees such things, he or she must do all he can to get the person to get his own ethics in.

When an area is downstat, the executive must at once suspect an out-ethics scene with one or more of the personnel, and must investigate and persuade the person to be more honest and ethical and correct the out-ethics condition found.

If this does not correct, and if the person or area remains downstat, the executive must declare the person or area in Danger and apply HCO PL 9 APR. 72, "CORRECT DANGER CONDITION HANDLING."

The situation, if it does not correct, thereafter becomes a matter of full group justice with Courts and Comm Evs. Persons whose ethics have remained out must be replaced.

The seniors of an executive are bound to enforce this policy and to use it on any executives whose personal ethics are out and who fail to apply it. It will be found that those who do not apply this policy letter have themselves certain dishonesties or out-ethics situations.

It is vital to any organization, to be strong and effective, to be ethical.

The most important zone of ethical conduct in an organization is at or near the top.

Ethical failure, at the top or just below it, can destroy an organization and make it downstat.

Historical examples are many.

Therefore, it is policy that an executive must keep ethics in on himself and those below him, or be disciplined or commoved and removed from any post of authority, and someone found who is himself ethical and keep ethics in on those under his authority.

The charge in any such case for a staff member or executive is **failure to uphold or set an example of high ethical standards.**

Such offenses are composed of

1. **Dishonesty.**
2. Use of false statements to cover up a situation.
3. Representing a scene to be different than it actually is to cover up crimes and escape discipline.
4. Irregular 2D connections and practices.
5. Drug or alcoholic addiction.
6. Encouraging out-ethics.
7. Condoning or failing to effectively handle an out-ethics situation in self or others as an in-charge, officer or executive.

TECHNICAL

People with out-ethics withholds cannot see. This is proven by the brilliant return of perception of the environment in people audited effectively and at length on such processes.

Such people also seek to place a false environment there and actually see a false environment.

People whose ethics are low will enturbulate and upset a group as they are seeking to justify their harmful acts against the group. And this leads to more harmful acts.

Out-ethics people go rapidly into Treason against the group.

A person whose ethics have been out over a long period goes "out of valence." They are "not themselves."

Happiness is only attained by those who are **honest** with themselves and others.

A group prospers only when each member in it has his own personal ethics in.

Even in a PTS (potential trouble source) person, there must have been out-ethics conduct toward the suppressive personality he or she is connected with for the person to have become PTS in the first place.

People who are physically ill are PTS *and are out-ethics* toward the person or thing they are PTS to!

Thus a group to be happy and well, and for the group to prosper and endure, its individual members must have their own ethics in.

It is up to the executive or officer to see that this is the case and to **do** the actions necessary to make it come about, and the group an ethical group.

EXEC OR OFFICER'S STEPS FOR GETTING IN ETHICS ON A STAFF MEMBER

STEP I

Inform the person personally he is in Danger condition by reason of acts or omissions, down stats, false reports or absence or 2D or whatever the circumstances are.

He is in fact **in** Danger because somebody is going to act sooner or later to hit him.

He may be involved already in some other assignment of condition.

But this is between you and him.

He is in danger because you are having to bypass him to get his ethics in, a thing he should do himself.

If he cooperates and completes this rundown and it comes out all right, you will help him.

If he doesn't cooperate, you will have to use group justice procedures.

This is his chance to get ethics in on himself with your help before he really crashes.

When he accepts this fact, Step I is done. Go to Step 2.

STEP 2

Ethics is gotten in by definition on the person.

Get the definitions fully understood.

The following words must be Method 4 word cleared on all the words and the words in their definitions on the person being handled.

"Ethics: The study of the general nature of morals (morals [plural] [noun]: *The principles of right and wrong conduct*) and of the specific moral choices to be made by the individual in his relationship with others."

"The rules or standards governing the conduct of the members of a profession."

"Justice: 1. Moral rightness; equity. 2. Honor, fairness. 3. Good reason. 4. Fair handling: due reward or treatment. 5. *The administration and procedure of the law.*"

"False: Contrary to fact or truth; without grounds; incorrect. Without meaning or sincerity; deceiving. Not keeping faith. Treacherous. Resembling and being identified as a similar or related entity."

"Dishonest: Disposed to lie, cheat, defraud or deceive."

"Pretense: A false reason or excuse. A mere show without reality."

"Betray: To be disloyal or faithless to."

"Out-Ethics: An action or situation in which an individual is involved contrary to the ideals and best interests of his group. An act or situation or relationship contrary to the ethics standards, codes, or ideals of the group or other members of the group. An act of omission or commission by an individual that could or has reduced the general effectiveness of a group or its other members. An individual act of omission or commission which impedes the general well-being of a group or impedes it in achieving its goals."

Do not go to Step 3 of this until all the above words are cleared by Method 4 Word Clearing.

STEP 3

Ask the person what out-ethics situation he or she is involved in.

It may take the person some time to think of it, or he may suppress it and be afraid to say it for fear of consequences. Reassure him that you are only trying to help him.

He may have brought it up in a session but did not apply it as out-ethics. Coax him through this.

If his conduct and actions are poor or downstat, he for sure will be able to come up with an out-ethics personal scene.

Sometimes the person is secretly PTS and is connected to a suppressive or antagonistic person or group or thing. In such an instance he will roller-coaster as a case or on post or have accidents or be ill frequently. (See PTS tech for material on this and for future handling. Checksheet BPL 31 May 1971RG, Issue IV, "PTS and SP detection, Routing and handling checksheet", but go on handling with these steps.)

Sometimes the person just uses PR (brags it up and won't come clean). In this case, an auditing session is required.

If the person gets involved in self-listing, get him audited on HCOB 20 Apr. 72, C/S Series 78, which gives the auditing session procedure. A person can become very upset over a wrong item. It is easily repaired, but it *must* be repaired if this happens.

By your own 2WC or whatever means or repair get this Step 3 to a clear-cut out-ethics situation, clearly stated. Do not forget to go on with this eventually if there is a delay in completing it. GIs will be in if correct.

STEP 4

Have the person work out how the out-ethics situation in which he or she is involved would be a betrayal of the group or make them false to the group or its ideals.

Do not make the person guilty. Just get them to see it themselves.

When they have seen this clearly and have cognited on it completely, go to next step.

STEP 5

The person is now ready to apply the **first dynamic danger formula** to himself.

Give him this formula and explain it to him.

First dynamic formula

The formula is converted for the 1st dynamic to

- 1st 1. Bypass habits or normal routines.
- 1st 2. Handle the situation and any danger in it.
- 1st 3. Assign self a Danger condition.
- 1st 4. Get in your own *personal ethics* by finding what you are doing that is out-ethics and use self-discipline to correct it and get honest and straight.
- 1st 5. Reorganize your life so that the dangerous situation is not continually happening to you.
- 1st 6. Formulate and adopt firm policy that will hereafter detect and prevent the same situation from continuing to occur.

Now usually the person is already involved in another *group* situation of down stats or overt products or bad appearance or low conditions, Courts, Comm Evs, for something.

It does not matter what other condition he was in. From you he is in *Danger*.

So 1st 1. and 1st 2. above apply to the *group* situation he finds himself in.

He has to assign *himself* a Danger condition as he recognizes now he has been in danger from himself.

1st 4. has been begun by this rundown.

It is up to him or her to finish off 1st 4. by applying the material in Steps 2 and 3. He or she has to use self-discipline to correct his own out-ethics scene and get it honest and straight, with himself and the group.

1st 5. is obvious. If he doesn't, he will just crash again.

1st 6. In formulating and adopting firm policy, he must be sure it aligns with the group endeavor.

When he has worked all this out **and demonstrated it in life**, he has completed the personal Danger Rundown.

He can then assign himself Emergency and follow the Emergency Formula (HCO PL 23 September 67, pg. 189-190, Vol 0 OEC, "Emergency").

STEP 6

Review the person and his stats and appearance and personal life.

Satisfy yourself that the steps above and the out-ethics found were all of it. That no wrong item has been found. That the person is not PTS.

Handle what you find. But if you find that the person did not improve and gave it all a brush-off, you must now take the group's point of view and administer group justice.

Your protection of the person is at end because he had his chance and is apparently one of those people who depend on others to keep his ethics in for him and can't keep them in himself. So use group justice procedures thereafter.

If the person made it and didn't fall on his head and is moving on up now **as shown by honest stats and condition of his post**, you have had a nice win and things will go much better.

And that's a win for everybody.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

Revision assisted by
Pat Brice
LRH Compilations Unit I/C

LRH:PB:dr.gm

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 26 DECEMBER 1968

Remimeo

(Note: This data is turned out as an HCO B *and* a Pol Ltr [issued as each one] as may apply very broadly in both the OEC and Level IV or above Courses.)

THE THIRD PARTY LAW

I have for a very long time studied the causes of violence and conflict amongst individuals and nations.

If Chaldea could vanish, if Babylon turn to dust, if Egypt could become a badlands, if Sicily could have 160 prosperous cities and be a looted ruin before the year zero and a near desert ever since – and all this in **spite** of all the work and wisdom and good wishes and intent of human beings, then it must follow as the dark follows sunset that something must be unknown to Man concerning all his works and ways. And that this something must be so deadly and so pervasive as to destroy all his ambitions and his chances long before their time.

Such a thing would have to be some natural law unguessed at by himself.

And there *is* such a law, apparently, that answers these conditions of being deadly, unknown and embracing all activities.

The law would seem to be:

A third party must be present and unknown in every quarrel for a conflict to exist.

or

For a quarrel to occur, an unknown third party must be active in producing it between two potential opponents.

or

While it is commonly believed to take two to make a fight, a third party must exist and must develop it for actual conflict to occur.

It is very easy to see that two in conflict are fighting. They are very visible. What is harder to see or suspect is that a third party existed and actively promoted the quarrel.

The usually unsuspected and "reasonable" third party, the bystander who denies any part of it is the one that brought the conflict into existence in the first place.

The hidden third party, seeming at times to be a supporter of only one side, is to be found as the instigator.

This is a useful law on many dynamics.

It is the cause of war.

One sees two fellows shouting bad names at each other, sees them come to blows. No one else is around. So *they*, of course, "caused the fight". But there *was* a third party.

Tracing these down, one comes upon incredible data. That is the trouble. The incredible is too easily rejected. One way to hide things is to make them incredible.

Clerk A and Messenger B have been arguing. They blaze into direct conflict. Each blames the other. **Neither one is correct and so the quarrel does not resolve since its true cause is not established.**

One looks into such a case **thoroughly**. He finds the incredible. The wife of Clerk A has been sleeping with Messenger B and complaining alike to both about the other.

Farmer J and Rancher K have been tearing each other to pieces for years in continual conflict. There are obvious, logical reasons for the fight. Yet it continues and does not resolve. A close search finds Banker L who, due to their losses in the fighting, is able to loan each side money, while keeping the quarrel going, and who will get their lands completely if both lose.

It goes larger. The revolutionary forces and the Russian government were in conflict in 1917. The reasons are so many the attention easily sticks on them. But only when Germany's official state papers were captured in World War II was it revealed that *Germany* had promoted the revolt and financed LENIN to spark it off, even sending him into Russia in a blacked out train!

One looks over "personal" quarrels, group conflicts, national battles and one finds, if he searches, the third party, unsuspected by both combatants or if suspected at all, brushed off as "fantastic". Yet careful documentation finally affirms it.

This datum is fabulously useful.

In marital quarrels the *correct* approach of anyone counseling, is to get both parties to carefully search out the *third* party. They may come to many *reasons* at first. These *reasons* are not beings. One is looking for a third *party*, an actual *being*. When both find the third party and establish proof, that will be the end of the quarrel.

Sometimes two parties, quarreling, suddenly decide to elect a being to blame. This stops the quarrel. Sometimes it is not the right being and more quarrels thereafter occur.

Two nations at each other's throats should each seek conference with the other to sift out and locate the actual third party. They will always find one if they look, and they *can* find the right one. As it will be found to exist in fact.

There are probably many technical approaches one could develop and outline in this matter.

There are many odd phenomena connected with it. An accurately spotted third party is usually not fought at all by either party but only shunned.

Marital conflicts are common. Marriages can be saved by both parties really sorting out *who* caused the conflicts. There may have been, in the whole history of the marriage, several, but only one at a time.

Quarrels between an individual and an organization are nearly always caused by an individual third party or a third group. The organization and the individual should get together and isolate the third party by displaying to each other all the data they each have been fed.

Rioters and governments alike could be brought back to agreement could one get representatives of both to give each other what they have been told by *whom*.

Such conferences have tended to deal only in recriminations or conditions or abuses. They must deal in beings only in order to succeed.

This theory might be thought to assert also that there are no bad conditions that cause conflict. There are. But these are usually **remedial by conference unless a third party is promoting conflict.**

In history we have a very foul opinion of the past because it is related by recriminations of two opponents and has not spotted the third party.

"Underlying causes" of war should read "hidden promoters".

There are no conflicts which cannot be resolved unless the true promoters of them remain hidden.

This is the natural law the ancients and moderns alike did not know.

And not knowing it, being led off into "reasons", whole civilizations have died.

It is worth knowing.

It is worth working with in any situation where one is trying to bring peace.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:rw.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 8 SEPTEMBER 1964

Remimeo
Franchise
Sthil Students

LEVELS II to IV

OVERTS, WHAT LIES BEHIND THEM?

I recently made a very basic discovery on the subject of overts and would like to rapidly make a note of it for the record.

You can call this the "Cycle of an Overt".

4. A being appears to have a motivator.
3. This is because of an overt the being has done.
2. The being committed an overt because he didn't understand something.
1. The being didn't understand something because a word or symbol was not understood.

Thus all caved-in conditions, illness, etc, can be traced back to a misunderstood symbol, strange as that may seem.

It goes like this:

1. A being doesn't get the meaning of a word or symbol.
2. This causes the being to misunderstand the area of the symbol or word (who used it whatever it applied to);
3. This causes the being to feel different from or antagonize toward the user or whatever of the symbol and so makes it all right to commit an overt;
4. Having committed the overt, the being now feels he has to have a motivator and so feels caved in.

This is the stuff of which Hades is made. This is the trap. This is why people get sick. This is stupidity and lack of ability.

This is why Clay Table Auditing works.

Clearing a pc then consists only of locating the area of the motivator, finding what was misunderstood and getting the word made into clay and explained. The overts blow. Pure magic.

The trick is locating the area where the pc has one of these.

This is discussed further in Saint Hill lecture of 3 Sept 1964, but is too important a discovery to leave only in tape form.

The cycle is Misunderstood word or symbol – separation from ARC with the things associated with the word or symbol – overt committed – motivator felt necessary to justify the overt – decline of freedom, activeness, intelligence, well being and health.

Knowing this and the technology of auditing one can then handle and clear these symbols and words and produce the gains we have described as being clear, for the things causing the decline are cleared out of the being.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 12 FEBRUARY 1967

Reissued 22 July 1979

Corrected & reissued 4 September 1979

Course Org Exec

(HCO PL 12 FEB 67 ADMIN KNOW-HOW THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF
LEADERS reissued as an HCOB; as well as existing in HCO PL form.)

Admin Know-How

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF LEADERS

A few comments on **Power**, being or working close to or under a power, which is to say a leader or one who exerts wide primary influence on the affairs of men.

I have written it this way, using two actual people to give an example of magnitude enough to interest and to furnish some pleasant reading. And I used a military sphere so it could be seen clearly without restimulation of admin problems.

The book referenced is a fantastically able book by the way.

THE MISTAKES OF SIMON BOLIVAR AND MANUELA SAENZ

Reference: The book entitled:

The Four Seasons of Manuela by Victor W. von Hagen, a biography.

A Mayflower Dell Paperback. Oct 1966. 6/-

Simon Bolivar was the liberator of South America from the yoke of Spain.

Manuela Saenz was the liberatress and consort.

Their acts and fates are well recorded in this moving biography.

But aside from any purely dramatic value the book lays bare and motivates various actions of great interest to those who lead, who support or are near leaders.

Simon Bolivar was a very strong character. He was one of the richest men in South America. He had real personal ability given to only a handful on the planet. He was a military commander without peer in history. Why he would fail and die an exile to be later deified is thus of great interest. What mistakes did he make?

Manuela Saenz was a brilliant, beautiful and able woman. She was loyal, devoted, quite comparable to Bolivar, far above the cut of average humanoids. Why then did she live a vilified outcast, receive such violent social rejection and die of poverty and remain unknown to history? What mistakes did she make?

BOLIVAR'S ERRORS

The freeing of things is the reverse unstated dramatization (the opposite side of the coin) to the slavery enjoined by the mechanisms of the mind.

Unless there is something to free men into, the act of freeing is simply a protest of slavery. And as no humanoid is free while aberrated in the body cycle, it is of course a gesture to free him politically as it frees him only into the anarchy of dramatizing his aberrations with NO control whatever and without something to fight exterior and with no exteriorization of his interest he simply goes mad noisily or quietly.

Once as great a wrong as depraving beings has been done there is of course no freedom short of freeing one from the depravity itself or at least from its most obvious influences in the society. In short one would have to de-aberrate a man before his whole social structure could be de-aberrated.

If one lacked the whole ability to free man wholly from his reactive patterns, then one could free man from their restimulators in the society at least. If one had the whole of the data (but lacked the Scientology tech), one would simply use reactive patterns to blow the old society apart and then pick up the pieces neatly in a new pattern. If one had no inkling of how reactive one can get (and Bolivar of course had no knowledge whatever in that field), there yet remained a workable formula used "instinctively" by most successful practical political leaders.

If you free a society from those things you see wrong with it and use force to demand it do what is right, and if you carry forward with decision and thoroughness, and without continual temporizing you can, in the applications of your charm and gifts, bring about a great political reform or improve a failing country.

So Bolivar's first error, most consistent it was, too, was contained in the vital words "you see" in the above paragraph. He didn't look and he didn't even listen to sound intelligence reports. He was so sure he could glow things right or fight things right or charm things right that he never looked for anything wrong to correct until it was too late. This is the ne-plus-ultra of personal confidence, amounting to supreme vanity. "When he appeared it would all come right" was not only his belief but his basic philosophy. So the first time it didn't work, he collapsed. All his skills and charm were channeled into this one test. Only that could he observe.

Not to compare with Bolivar but to show my understanding of this:

I once had a similar one. "I would keep going as long as I could and when I was stopped I would then die." This was a solution mild enough to state and really hard to understand until you had an inkling of what I meant by keeping going. Meteors keep going – very, very fast. And so did I. Then one day ages back I finally was stopped after countless little stoppings by social contacts and family to prepare me culminating in a navy more devoted to braid than dead enemies and literally I quit. For a while I couldn't get a clue of what was wrong with me. Life went completely unlivable until I found a new solution. So I know the frailty of these single solutions. Not to compare myself but just to show it happens to us all, not just Bolivars.

Bolivar had no personal insight at all. He could only "outsight" and even then he did not look or listen. He glowed things right. Pitifully it was his undoing that he could. Until he no longer could. When he couldn't glow he roared and when he couldn't roar he fought a battle. Then civic enemies were not military enemies so he had no solution left at all.

It never occurred to him to do more than personally magnetize things into being right and victorious.

His downfall was that he made far too heavy use of a skill simply because it was easy. He was too good at this one thing. So he never looked to any other skill and he never even dreamed there was any other way.

He had no view of any situation and no idea of the organizational or preparatory steps necessary to political and personal victory. He only knew military organization which is where his organizational insight ceased.

He was taught on the high wine of French revolt, notorious in its organizational inability to form cultures, and that fatally by a childhood teacher who was intensely impractical in his own private life (Simon Rodriguez, an unfrocked priest turned tutor).

Bolivar had no personal financial skill. He started wealthy and wound up a pauper, a statistic descending from one of the, if not the, richest man in South America down to a borrowed nightshirt to be buried in as an exile. And this while the property of Royalists was wide open, the greatest land and mine valuables of South America wide open to his hand and that's not believable! But true. He never collected his own debt of loans to governments even when the head of those governments.

So it is no wonder we find two more very real errors leading to his downfall. He did not get his troops or officers rewarded and he did not aim for any solvency of the states he controlled. It was all right if there were long years of battle ahead for them to be unpaid as no real riches were yet won, but not to reward them when the whole place was at his disposal! Well!

The limit of his ability consisted of demanding a bit of cash for current pay from churches – which were not actively against him at first but which annoyed them no end – and a few household expenses.

He could have (and should have) set aside all Royalist property and estates for division amongst all officers, their men and his supporters. It had no owners now. And this failure cost the economy of the country the tax loss of all those productive estates (the whole wealth of the land). So it is no wonder his government, its taxable estates now inoperative or at best lorded by a profiteer or looted by Indians, was insolvent. Also, by failing to do such an obvious act he delivered property into the hands of more provident enemies and left his officers and men penniless to finance any support for their own stability in the new society and so for his own.

As for state finance the great mines of South America, suddenly ownerless, were overlooked and were then grabbed and worked by foreign adventurers who simply came in and took them without payment.

Spain had run the country on the finance of mine tithes and general taxes. Bolivar not only didn't collect the tithes, he let the land become so worthless as to be untaxable. He should have gotten the estates going by any shifts and should have state operated all Royalist mines once he had them. To not do these things was complete, but typically humanoid, folly.

In doing this property division he should have left it all up to officers' committees operating as courts of claim without staining his own hands in the natural corruption. He was left doubly open as he not only did not attend to it, he also got the name of corruption when anybody did grab something.

He failed as well to recognize the distant widespread nature of his countries despite all his riding and fighting over them and so sought tightly centralized government, not only centralizing states but also centralizing the various nations into a federal state. And this over a huge land mass full of insurmountable ranges, impassable jungles and deserts and without mail, telegraph, relay stages, roads, railroads, river vessels or even foot bridges repaired after a war of attrition.

A step echelon from a pueblo (village) to a state, from a state to a country and a country to a federal state was only possible in such huge spaces of country where candidates could never be known personally over any wide area and whose opinions could not even be circulated more than a few miles of burro trail, where only the pueblo was democratic and the rest all appointive from pueblo on up, himself the ratifier of titles if he even needed that. With his own officers and armies controlling the land as owners of all wrested from Royalists and the crown of Spain, he would have had no revolts. There would have been little civil wars of course but a court to settle their final claims could have existed at federal level and kept them traveling so much over those vast distances it would have crippled their enthusiasm for litigation on the one hand and on the other, by dog eat dog settlements, would have given him the strongest rulers – if he took neither side.

He did not step out and abdicate a dictatorial position. He mistook military acclaim and ability for the tool of peace. War only brings anarchy, so he had anarchy. Peace is more than a "command for unity", his favorite phrase. A productive peace is getting men busy and giving them something to make something of that they want to make something of and telling them to get on with it.

He never began to recognize a suppressive and never considered anyone needed killing except on a battlefield. There it was glorious. But somebody destroying his very name and soul, and the security of every supporter and friend, the SP Santander, his vice-president, who could have been arrested and executed by a corporal's guard on one one-hundredth of available evidence, could suborn the whole treasury and population against him, without Bolivar, continually warned, loaded with evidence, ever even reprimanding him. And this brought about his loss of popularity and his eventual exile.

He also failed in the same way to protect his military family or Manuela Saenz from other enemies. So he weakened his friends and ignored his enemies just by oversight.

His greatest error lay in that while dismissing Spain he did not dismiss that nation's most powerful minion, the Church, and did not even localize it or reward a South American separate branch to loyalty or do anything at all (except extort money from it) to an organiza-

tion which continually worked for Spain as only it could work – on every person in the land in a direct anti-Bolivar reign of terror behind the scenes. You either suborn such a group or you take them out when they cease to be universal and become or are an enemy's partner.

As the Church held huge properties and as Bolivar's troops and supporters went unpaid even of the penny soldiers' pay, if one was going to overlook the Royalist estates, one could at least have seized the Church property and given it to the soldiers. General Vallejo did this in 1835 in California, a nearly contemporary act, with no catastrophe from Rome. Or the penniless countries could have taken them over. You don't leave an enemy financed and solvent while you let your friends starve in a game like South American politics. Oh no.

He wasted his enemies. He exported the "godos" or defeated Royalist soldiers. They mostly had no homes but South America. He issued no amnesties they could count on. They were shipped off or left to die in the "ditch" – the best artisan in the country among them.

When one (General Rodil) would not surrender Calloa fortress after Peru was won, Bolivar after great gestures of amnesty failed to obtain surrender and then fought the fort. Four thousand political refugees and four thousand Royalist troops died over many months in full sight of Lima, fought heavily by Bolivar only because the fort was fighting. But Bolivar had to straighten up Peru urgently not fight a defeated enemy. The right answer to such a foolish commander as Rodil as Bolivar did have the troops to do it, was to cover the roads with cannon enfilade potential to discourage any sortie from the fort, put a large number of his own troops in a distant position of offense but ease and comfort and say, "We're not going to fight. The war's over, silly man. Look at the silly fellows in there, living on rats when they can just walk out and sleep home nights or go to Spain or enlist with me or just go camping", and let anybody walk in and out who pleased, making the fort Commander (Rodil) the prey of every pleading wife and mother without and would-be deserter or mutineer within until he did indeed sheepishly give up the pretense – a man cannot fight alone. But battle was glory to Bolivar. And he became intensely disliked because the incessant cannonade which got nowhere was annoying.

Honors meant a great deal to Bolivar. To be liked was his life. And it probably meant more to him than to see things really right. He never compromised his principles but he lived on admiration, a rather sickening diet since it demands in turn continuous "theatre". One is what one is, not what one is admired or hated for. To judge oneself by one's successes is simply to observe that one's postulates worked and breeds confidence in one's ability. To have to be told it worked only criticizes one's own eyesight and hands a spear to the enemy to make his wound of vanity at his will. Applause is nice. It's great to be thanked and admired. But to work only for that? And his craving for that, his addiction to the most unstable drug in history – fame – killed Bolivar. That self offered spear. He told the world continually how to kill him – reduce its esteem. So as money and land can buy any quantity of cabals, he could be killed by curdling the esteem, the easiest thing you can get a mob to do.

He had all the power. He did not use it for good or evil. One cannot hold power and not use it. It violates the power formula. For it then prevents others from doing things if they had some of the power so they then see as their only solution the destruction of the holder of the power as he, not using power or delegating it, is the unwitting block to all their plans. So

even many of his friends and armies finally agreed he had to go. They were not able men. They were in a mess. But bad or good they had to do something. Things were desperate, broken down and starving after 14 years of civil war. Therefore they either had to have some of that absolute power or else nothing could be done at all. They were not great minds. He did not need any "great minds", he thought, even though he invited them verbally. He saw their petty, often murderous solutions and he rebuked them. And so held the power and didn't use it.

He could not stand another personality threat.

The trouble in Peru came when he bested its real conqueror (from the Argentine), La Mar, in a petty triumph over adding Guayaquil to Columbia. Bolivar wished to look triumphant again and didn't notice it really cost him the support and Peru the support of La Mar – who understandably resigned and went home, leaving Bolivar Peru to conquer. Unfortunately, it had already been in his hands. La Mar needed some troops to clean up a small Royalist army that was all. La Mar didn't need Peru's loss of Guayaquil – which never did anybody any real good anyway!

Bolivar would become inactive when faced with two areas' worth of problems – he did not know which way to go. So he did nothing.

Brave beyond any general in history on the battlefield, the Andes or in torrential rivers, he did not really have the bravery needed to trust inferior minds and stand by their often shocking blunders. He feared their blunders. So he did not dare unleash his many willing hounds.

He could lead men, make men feel wonderful, make men fight and lay down their lives after hardships no army elsewhere in the world has ever faced before or since. But he could not use men even when they were begging to be used.

It is a frightening level of bravery to use men you know can be cruel, vicious, and incompetent. He had no fear of their turning on him ever. When they finally did only then he was shocked. But he protected "the people" from authority given to questionably competent men. So he really never used but three or four generals of mild disposition and enormously outstanding ability. And to the rest he denied power. Very thoughtful of the nebulous "people" but very bad indeed for the general good. And it really caused his death.

No. Bolivar was theatre. It was all theatre. One cannot make such errors and still pretend that one thinks of life as life, red-blooded and factual. Real men and real life are full of dangerous, violent, live situations and wounds hurt and starvation is desperation itself especially when you see it in one you love.

This mighty actor, backed up with fantastic personal potential, made the mistake of thinking the theme of liberty and his own great role upon the stage was enough to interest all the working, suffering hours of men, buy their bread, pay their whores, shoot their wives' lovers and bind their wounds or even put enough drama into very hard pressed lives to make them want to live it.

No, Bolivar was unfortunately the only actor on the stage and no other man in the world was real to him.

And so he died. They loved him. But they were also on the stage too, where they were dying in his script or Rousseau's script for liberty but no script for living their very real lives.

He was the greatest military general in any history measured against his obstacles, the people and the land across which he fought.

And he was a complete failure to himself and his friends.

While being one of the greatest men alive at that. So we see how truly shabby others in leaders' boots amongst men must be.

MANUELA SAENZ

The tragedy of Manuela Saenz as Bolivar's mistress was that she was never used, never really had a share and was neither protected nor honored by Bolivar.

Here was a clever, spectacular woman of fantastic fidelity and skill, with an enormous "flaire", capable of giving great satisfaction and service. And only her satisfaction ability was taken and that not consistently nor even honestly.

In the first place, Bolivar never married her. He never married anybody. This opened up a fantastic breach in any defense she could ever make against her or his enemies who were legion. So her first mistake was in not in some way contriving a marriage.

That she had an estranged husband she had been more or less sold to was permitted by her to wreck her life obliquely.

She was too selfless to be real in all her very able plotting.

For this marriage problem she could have engineered any number of actions.

She had the solid friendship of all his trusted advisers, even his old tutor. Yet she arranged nothing for herself.

She was utterly devoted, completely brilliant and utterly incapable of really bringing off an action of any final kind.

She violated the power formula in not realizing that she had power.

Manuela was up against a hard man to handle. But she did not know enough to make her own court effective. She organized one. She did not know what to do with it.

Her most fatal mistake was in not bringing down Santander, Bolivar's chief enemy. That cost her everything she had before the end and after Bolivar died. She knew for years Santander had to be killed. She said it or wrote it every few days. Yet never did she promise some young officer a nice night or a handful of gold to do it in a day when dueling was in fashion. It's like standing around discussing how the plainly visible wolf in the garden that's eating the chickens must be shot, even holding a gun, and never even lifting it while all one's chickens vanish for years.

In a land overridden with priests she never got herself a tame priest to bring about her ends.

She was a fantastic intelligence officer. But she fed her data to a man who could not act to protect himself or friends, who could only fight armies dramatically.

She did not see this and also quietly take on the portfolio of secret police chief. Her mistake was waiting to be asked – to be asked to come to him, to act. She voluntarily was his best political intelligence agent. Therefore she should have also assumed further roles.

She guarded his correspondence, was intimate with his secretaries. And yet she never collected or forged or stole any document to bring down enemies either through representations to Bolivar or a court circle of her own. And in an area with that low an ethic, that's fatal.

She openly pamphleteered and fought violently as in a battle against her rabble.

She had a great deal of money at her disposal. In a land of for-sale Indians she never used a penny to buy a quick knife or even a solid piece of evidence.

When merely opening her lips she could have had any sequestered Royalist estate she went to litigation for a legitimate legacy never won and another won but never paid.

They lived on the edge of quicksand. She never bought a plank or a rope.

Carried away by the glory of it all, devoted completely, potentially able and a formidable enemy, she did not act.

She waited to be told to come to him even when he lay dying and exiled.

His command over her who never obeyed any other was too absolute for his own or her survival.

Her assigned mistakes (pointed out at the time as her caprice and play acting) were not her errors. They only made her interesting. They were far from fatal.

She was not ruthless enough to make up for his lack of ruthlessness and not provident enough to make up for his lack of providence.

The ways open to her for finance, for action, were completely doorless. The avenue stretched out to the horizon.

She fought bravely but she just didn't take action.

She was an actress for the theatre alone.

And she died of it. And she let Bolivar die because of it.

Never once did Manuela look about and say, "See here, things mustn't go this wrong. My lover holds half a continent and even I hold the loyalty of battalions. Yet that woman threw a fish!"

Never did Manuela tell Bolivar's doctor, a rumoured lover, "Tell that man he will not live without my becoming a constant part of his entourage, and tell him until he believes it or we'll have a new physician around here."

The world was open. Where Theodosius, the wife of Emperor Justinian II of Constantinople, a mere circus girl and a whore, ruled harder than her husband but for her husband behind his back – and made him marry her as well, Manuela never had any bushel basket of

gold brought in to give Bolivar for his unpaid troops with a "Just found it, dear" to his "Where on Earth . . . ?" after the Royalist captives had been carefully ransomed for jail escapes by her enterprising own entourage and officer friends. She never handed over any daughter of a family clamoring against her to Negro troops and then said, "Which over-verbal family is next?"

She even held a colonel's rank but only used it because she wore man's clothing afternoons. It was a brutal, violent, ruthless land, not a game of musical chairs.

And so Manuela, penniless, improvident, died badly and in poverty, exiled by enemies and deserted by her friends.

But why not deserted by her friends? They had all been poverty-stricken to a point quite incapable of helping her even though they wanted to – for she once had the power to make them solvent. And didn't use it. They were in poverty before they won but they did eventually control the land. After that why make it a bad habit?

And so we see two pathetic, truly dear, but tinsel figures, both on a stage, both far removed from the reality of it all.

And one can say, "But if they had not been such idealists they never would have fought so hard and freed half a continent", or "If she had stooped to such intrigue or he had been known for violent political actions they would never have had the strength and never would have been loved."

All very idealistic itself. They died "in the ditch" unloved, hated and despised, two decent brave people, almost too good for this world.

A true hero, a true heroine. But on a stage and not in life. Impractical and improvident and with no faintest gift either one to use the power they could assemble.

This story of Bolivar and Manuela is a tragedy of the most piteous kind.

They fought a hidden enemy, the Church; they were killed by their friends.

But don't overlook how impractical it is not to give your friends power enough when you have it to give. You can always give some of it to another if the first one collapses through inability. And one can always be brought down like a hare at a hunt who seeks to use the delegated power to kill you – if you have the other friends.

Life is not a stage for posturing and "Look at me!" "Look at me." "Look at me." If one is to lead a life of command or a life near to command one must handle it as life. Life bleeds. It suffers. It hungers. And it has to have the right to shoot its enemies until such time as comes a golden age.

Aberrated man is not capable of supporting in his present state, a golden declared age for three minutes, given all the tools and wealth of the world.

If one would live a life of command or one near to a command, one must then accumulate power as fast as possible and delegate it as quickly as feasible and use every humanoid in long reach to the best and beyond his talents if one is to live at all.

If one does not choose to live such a life then go on the stage and be a real actor. Don't kill men while pretending it isn't real. Or one can become a recluse or a student or a clerk. Or study butterflies or take up tennis.

For one is committed to certain irrevocable natural laws the moment one starts out upon a conquest, either as the man in charge or a person near to him or on his staff or in his army. And the foremost law, if one's ambition is to win, is of course to win.

But also to keep on providing things to win and enemies to conquer.

Bolivar let his cycle run to "freedom" and end there. He never had another plan beyond that point. He ran out of territory to free. Then he didn't know what to do with it and didn't know enough, either, to find somewhere else to free. But of course all limited games come to end. And when they do their players fall over on the field and become rag dolls unless somebody at least tells them the game has ended and they have no more game nor any dressing room or houses but just that field.

And they lie upon the field, not noticing there can be no more game since the other team has fled and after a bit they have to do something and if the leader and his consort are sitting over on the grass being rag dolls too, of course there isn't any game. And so the players start fighting amongst themselves just to have a game And if the leader then says, "No, no" and his consort doesn't say, "Honey, you better phone the Baltimore Orioles for Saturday", then of course the poor players, bored stiff, say, "He's out." "She's out." "Now we're going to split the team in half and have a game."

And that's what happened to Bolivar and Manuela. They had to be gotten rid of for there was no game and they didn't develop one to play while forbidding the only available game – minor civil wars.

A whole continent containing the then major mines of the world, whole populations were left sitting there, "freed." But none owned any of it though the former owners had left. They weren't given it. Nor were they made to manage it. No game.

And if Bolivar had not been smart enough for that he could at least have said, "Well! You monkeys are going to have quite a time getting the wheels going but that's not my job. You decide on your type of government and what it's to be. Soldiers are my line. Now I'm taking over those old estates of mine and the Royalist ones near by and the emerald mines just as souvenirs and me and Manuela we're going home." And he should have said that 5 minutes after the last Royalist army was defeated in Peru.

And his official family with him, and a thousand troops to which he was giving land would have moved right off smartly with him. And the people after a few screams of horror at being deserted would have fallen on each other, sabered a state together here and a town there and gotten busy out of sheer self protection in a vital new game, "Who's going to be Bolivar now?"

Then when home he should have said, "Say those nice woods look awfully Royalist to me, and also those 1,000,000 hectares of grazing land, Manuela. Its owner once threw a Royalist fish, remember? So that's yours."

And the rest of the country would have done the same and gotten on with the new game of "You was a Royalist."

And Bolivar and Manuela would have had statues built to them by the **ton** at once as soon as agents could get to Paris with orders from an adoring populace.

"Bolivar, come rule us!" should have gotten an "I don't see any unfree South America. When you see a French or Spanish army coming, come back and tell me."

That would have worked. And this poor couple would have died suitably adored in the sanctity of glory and (perhaps more importantly) in their own beds, not "in a ditch".

And if they had had to go on ruling they could have declared a new game of "Pay the soldiers and officers with Royalist land." And when that was a gone game, "Oust the Church and give its land to the poor friendly Indians."

You can't stand bowing back of the footlights forever with no show even if you are quite an actor. Somebody else can make better use of any stage than even the handsomest actor who will not use it.

Man is too aberrated to understand at least 7 things about power:

1. Life is lived by lots of people. And if you lead you must either let them get on with it or lead them on with it actively.
2. When the game or the show is over, there must be a new game or a new show. And if there isn't somebody else is jolly well going to start one and if you won't let anyone do it the game will become "getting you."
3. If you have power use it or delegate it or you sure won't have it long.
4. When you have people use them or they will soon become most unhappy and you won't have them any more.
5. When you move off a point of power, pay all your obligations on the nail, empower all your friends completely and move off with your pockets full of artillery, potential blackmail on every erstwhile rival, unlimited funds in your private account and the addresses of experienced assassins and go live in Bulgravia and bribe the police. And even then you may not live long if you have retained one scrap of domination in any camp you do not now control or if you even say, "I favour Politician Jiggs." Abandoning power utterly is dangerous indeed.

But we can't all be leaders or figures strutting in the limelight and so there's more to know about this:

6. When you're close to power get some delegated to you, enough to do your job and protect yourself and your interests, for you can be shot, fellow, shot, as the position near power is delicious but dangerous, dangerous always, open to the taunts of any enemy of the power who dare not really boot the power but can boot you. So to live at all in the shadow or employ of a power you must yourself gather and USE enough power to hold your own – without just nattering to the power to "kill Pete", in straightforward or more suppressive veiled ways to him as these wreck the power that supports yours.

He doesn't have to know all the bad news and if he's a power really he won't ask all the time, "What are all those dead bodies doing at the door?" And if you are clever, you never let it be thought **he** killed them – that weakens you and also hurts the power source. "Well, boss, about all those dead bodies, nobody at all will suppose you did it. She over there, those pink legs sticking out, didn't like me." "Well," he'll say if he really is a power, "why are you bothering me with it if it's done and you did it. Where's my blue ink?" Or "Skipper, three shore patrolmen will be along soon with your cook, Dober, and they'll want to tell you he beat up Simson." "Who's Simson?" "He's a clerk in the enemy office downtown." "Good, when they've done it, take Dober down to the dispensary for any treatment he needs. Oh yes. Raise his pay." Or "Sir, could I have the power to sign divisional orders?" "Sure."

7. And lastly and most important, for we all aren't on the stage with our names in lights, always push power in the direction of anyone on whose power you depend. It may be more money for the power, or more ease, or a snarling defense of the power to a critic, or even the dull thud of one of his enemies in the dark, or the glorious blaze of the whole enemy camp as a birthday surprise.

If you work like that and the power you are near or depend upon is a power that has at least some inkling about how to be one, and if you make others work like that, then the power-factor expands and expands and expands and you too acquire a sphere of power bigger than you would have if you worked alone. Real powers are developed by tight conspiracies of this kind pushing someone up in whose leadership they have faith. And if they are right and also manage their man and keep him from collapsing through overwork, bad temper or bad data, a kind of juggernaut builds up. Don't ever feel weaker because you work for somebody stronger. The only failure lies in taxing or pulling down the strength on which you depend. All failures to remain a power's power are failures to contribute to the strength and longevity of the work, health and power of that power. Devotion requires active contribution outwards from the power as well as in.

If Bolivar and Manuela had known these things they would have lived an epic, not a tragedy. They would not have "died in the ditch", he bereft of really earned praise for his real accomplishments even to this day. And Manuela would not be unknown even in the archives of her country as the heroine she was.

Brave, brave figures. But if this can happen to such stellar personalities gifted with ability tenfold over the greatest of other mortals, to people who could take a rabble in a vast impossible land and defeat one of Earth's then foremost powers, with no money or arms, on personality alone, what then must be the ignorance and confusion of human leaders in general, much less little men stumbling through their lives of boredom and suffering?

Let us wise them up, huh? You can't live in a world where even the great leaders can't lead.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jp.rd.gal

CERTAINTY

Vol. 13 No. 3 [March, 1966]

Official Periodical of
SCIENTOLOGY
in the British Isles

WHAT IS GREATNESS?

L. Ron Hubbard

The hardest task one can have is to continue to love one's fellows despite all reasons he should not.

And the true sign of sanity and greatness is to so continue.

For the one who can achieve this, there is abundant hope. For those who cannot, there is only sorrow, hatred and despair, and these are not the things of which greatness or sanity or happiness are made.

A primary trap is to succumb to invitations to hate. There are those who appoint one their executioners. Sometimes for the sake of the safety of others, it is necessary to act, but it is not necessary also to hate them.

To do one's task without becoming furious at others who seek to prevent one is a mark of greatness – and sanity. And only then can one be happy.

Seeking to achieve any single desirable quality in life is a noble thing. The one most difficult and most necessary to achieve is to love one's fellows despite all invitations to do otherwise.

If there is any saintly quality, it is not to forgive. "Forgiveness" is a much lower level action and is rather censorious.

True greatness merely refuses to change in the face of bad actions against one – and a truly great person loves his fellows because he understands them.

After all, they are all in the same trap. Some are oblivious of it, some have gone mad because of it, some act like those who betrayed them. But all, all are in the same trap – the generals, the street sweepers, the presidents, the insane. They act the way they do because they are all subject to the same cruel pressures of this universe.

Some of us are subject to those pressures and still go on doing our jobs. Others have long since succumbed and rave and torture and strut like the demented souls they are.

To re-save some of them is a dangerous undertaking. Were you to approach many ruling heads in the world and offer to set them free (as only a Scientologist can) they would go berserk, cry up their private police and generally cause unpleasantness. Indeed, one did – he was later assassinated by no desire of ours but because of the incompetence of his own fellows about him. He could have used Scientology. Instead, he promptly tried to shoot it down by ordering raids and various berserk actions on Scientology organizations. That he was then shot had nothing to do with us, but only demonstrated how incompetent and how mortal he really was.

As we become stronger, we can be completely openhanded with our help. Until we do, we can at least understand the one fact that greatness does not stem from savage wars or being known. It stems from being true to one's own decency, from going on helping others whatever they do or think or say and despite all savage acts against one; to persevere without changing one's basic attitude toward Man.

A fully trained Scientologist is in a far better position to understand than a partly trained one. For the Scientologist who really knows is able not only to retain confidence in himself and what he can do, but also can understand why others do what they do and so knowing, does not become baffled or dismayed by small defeats. To that degree, true greatness depends on total wisdom. They act as they do because they are what they are – trapped beings, crushed beneath an intolerable burden. And if they have gone mad for it and command the devastation of whole nations in errors of explanation, still one can understand why and can understand as well the extent of their madness. Why should one change and begin to hate just because others have lost themselves and their own destinies are too cruel for them to face.

Justice, mercy, forgiveness, all are unimportant beside the ability not to change because of provocation or demands to do so.

One must act, one must preserve order and decency, but one need not hate or seek vengeance.

It is true that beings are frail and commit wrongs. Man is basically good but can act badly.

He only acts badly when his acts done for order and the safety of others are done with hatred. Or when his disciplines are founded only upon safety for himself regardless of all others; or worse, when he acts only out of a taste for cruelty.

To preserve no order at all is an insane act. One need only look at the possessions and environment of the insane to realize this. The able keep good order.

When cruelty in the name of discipline dominates a race, that race has been taught to hate. And that race is doomed.

The real lesson is to learn to love.

He who would walk scatheless through his day must learn this.

Never use what is done to one as a basis for hatred. Never desire revenge.

It requires real strength to love Man. And to love him despite all invitations to do otherwise, all provocations and all reasons why one should not.

Happiness and strength endure only in the absence of hate. To hate alone is the road to disaster. To love is the road to strength. To love in spite of all is the secret of greatness. And may very well be the greatest secret in this universe. ◇