

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 11 APRIL 1970

Remimeo

THIRD DYNAMIC TECH

The material contained in HCO BULLETINS applies to the FIRST DYNAMIC -self, the individual.

The data, material and procedures contained in POLICY LETTERS apply to the THIRD DYNAMIC-the dynamic of groups,

In applying HCOBs as in auditing a preclear, you see that following a certain procedure results in the remedy of a certain personal situation.

In applying HCO Policy Letters, you see that by following or continuing certain Third Dynamic procedures you remedy, handle or continue certain situations which relate to groups.

In both cases, SURVIVAL is the keynote of the end result.

HCOB auditing tech increases the survival of the individual as an individual.

HCO Pol Ltr Third Dynamic Tech increases the survival of the group.

Man has always had a certain amount of know-how in both individual and group matters of survival but he has never had any high level of result.

It is easy to see auditing improve the individual when it is exactly and expertly applied.

Similarly one can see Third Dynamic Tech improve the group and its survival potential.

Just as there is "squirrel" auditing (alter-ised and unworkable) so there can be "squirrel" Third Dynamic Tech.

An executive who has no familiarity with HCO Pol Ltrs can make an awful lot of mistakes.

It is an easy pretense that First Dynamic Tech existed. But no one got any better when Man knew no more than the mumbo-jumbo he had before 1950. Since then real results occur. But they only occur when the actual tech of Dianetics and Scientology is correctly applied.

The same situation existed in the field of the Third Dynamic. The pretense was that "business" tech was successful, to name one. But 17 out of 19 businesses fail every year and the whole of the business world is under threat from the ideology of communism. Strikes, legislation, banking and other catastrophes daily remain unhandled by "business tech." So there's only pretense that "business tech" applies to groups successfully. It is at best a dying technology.

The failure is that previous Third Dynamic Tech did not seek out and learn the basic laws on which it must have existed.

You have seen the First Dynamic Tech of auditing develop over the decades to a highly precise and very workable body of knowledge. The current search began in about 1931. By 1970 it was in full practice over the world.

The need of organizations to serve the First Dynamic Tech beginning in 1949 forced further and further into view the absence of Third Dynamic Tech and its vital need.

With much hard experience the data now contained in **HCO Policy Letters** was won. In 1965 I began an active search for the basic laws of the Third Dynamic. What has been found since then has been recorded on tapes or published in HCO Pol Ltrs.

If auditing took 38 years to bring to a highly polished state, then the 20 years of experience of which only 5 were devoted to an active effort to locate the basic laws can be seen to be an incomplete study.

But incomplete or not, the data and drills contained in HCO Policy Letters are a great advance over what Man had.

For instance, in 1950-51, using the crude organizational tech Man then had, the first board of directors of Dianetics Foundations failed utterly. Any and all off-on-the-wrong-foot moves which became later woes to us were laid in at that time by some of the finest legal, accounting and PR experts one could retain.

Twenty years later our organizations, traveling on our developed Third Dynamic Tech (and even now poorly known by staffs) have enabled us to survive in the teeth of old vested interests and not only that to expand as well.

This is due to the practical know-how we have dredged up and used and which you find in HCO Policy Letters.

Naturally, we have not had time to develop Third Dynamic Drills for every situation. We have not had time even to train all our staffs.

But the basic knowledge is there, recorded on tape and on HCO Pol Ltrs and when known, understood and used it gives us survival, expansion and prosperity. When it isn't known or understood or used, only then do we sag.

If a study of our Third Dynamic Tech is approached from the viewpoint that it is for use and when known, understood and used that it will deliver an expected result, then one has a proper framework for the study of it.

If one thinks it is a series of orders, or just some random ideas, then one will not have the use of it.

The short span of men's lives inhibits the full development of any one subject in one lifetime. Thus there is a lot of room for further expansion of our Third Dynamic Tech. But the basic laws can be found in it and many exact drills are contained in it and it has great value in any zone of application.

What we now know and use of our Third Dynamic Tech is all that has forwarded our survival so far.

Thus its wider understanding and use in our own organizations is the key to prosperity and expansion.

An "old experienced Scn executive" (who has a lot of this know-how) can go into a collapsing org and boom it. The data he is using is all in these policy letters. He knows it is there for use and he uses it in action.

The elements he uses are in HCO Policy Letters.

The data encompasses Third Dynamic Tech. It is applied very much like one applies the First Dynamic Tech to the individual.

In its present state of development, like early auditing material, Third Dynamic Tech is used to think with, and only the bright mind will achieve its full potential in action.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dz.cden.nf Founder

Copyright © 1970

by L. Ron Hubbard

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

2

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 26 APRIL 1970R

Remimeo REVISED 15 MARCH 1975

Data Series IR

THE ANATOMY OF THOUGHT

There are many types of thought. Unless one knows these types he can make serious errors on administrative lines.

In the unpublished work "Excalibur" (most of which has been released in HCOBs, PLs and books) there was an important fundamental truth. This was

SANITY IS THE ABILITY TO RECOGNIZE DIFFERENCES, SIMILARITIES AND IDENTITIES.

This is also intelligence.

Two or more facts or things that are totally unlike are **DIFFERENT**. They are not the same fact or same object.

Two or more facts or things that have something in common with one another are **SIMILAR**.

Two or more facts or things that have all their characteristics in common with one another are **IDENTICAL**.

SEMANTICS

In a subject developed by Korzybski a great deal of stress is given to the niceties of words. In brief a word is **NOT** the thing. And an object exactly like another object is different because it occupies a different space and thus "can't be the same object."

As Alfred Korzybski studied under psychiatry and amongst the insane (his mentor was William Alanson White at Saint Elizabeth's insane asylum in Wash., D.C.) one can regard him mainly as the father of confusion.

This work, '*general semantics*,' a corruption of semantics, (meaning really "significance" or the "meaning of words") has just enough truth in it to invite interest and just enough curves to injure one's ability to think or communicate. Korzybski did not know the formula of human communication and university professors teaching semantics mainly *ended up* assuring students (and proving it) that no one can communicate with anyone because nobody really knows what anybody else means.

As this "modern" (it was known to the Greeks, *was a specialty of Sophists* and *was also* used by Socrates) penetration into culture affects all education in the West today, it is no wonder that

current communication is badly strained. Schools no longer teach basic logic. *Due to earlier miseducation in language and no real education in logic* much broken-down "think" *can occur* in high places.

A system of thinking derived from a study of psychotics is not a good yardstick to employ in solving problems. Yet the "thinking" of heads of states is based on illogical and irrational rules. Populations, fortunately less "well-educated," are assaulted by the irrational (kooky) "thinking" of governments. This "thinking" is faulty mainly because it is based on the faulty logic shoved off on school children. "You must study geometry because that is the way you think" is an idiocy that has been current for the past two or three decades in schools.

I have nothing against Korzybski. But the general impact of "general semantics"

3

has been to give us stupified schoolboys who, growing up without any training in logic except general semantics are giving us problems. Increasingly we are dealing with people who have never been taught to think and whose native ability to do so has been *hampered* by a false "education."

ADMINISTRATIVE TROUBLE

At once this gives an administrator trouble. Outside and inside his sphere of influence he is dealing with people who not only can't think but have been taught carefully to reach irrational conclusions.

One can make a great deal of headway and experience a lot of relief by realizing the way things are and not getting exasperated and outraged by the absurdities that he sees being used as "solutions." He is dealing with people who in school were not only not taught to think but were *often* taught the impossibility of thinking or communicating.

This has a very vast influence on an administrator. Things that are perfectly obvious to him get so muddled when passed for decision to others that an administrator tends to go into apathy or despair.

For instance it is completely logical to him that some activity must either cut its expenses or make more money before it goes broke. So he passes this on as an order demanding that the activity balance up its income-outgo ratio. He gets back a "solution" that they "get a huge sum each week from their reserves" so they will be "solvent." The administrator feels rattled and even betrayed. What reserves? Do they have reserves? So he demands to know, has this activity been salting away reserves he knew nothing about? And he receives a solemn reply-no they don't have any reserves but they consider the administrator should just send them money!

The idiocy involved here is that the "logic" of the persons in that activity is not up to realizing that you cannot take more out of something than is in it.

And the activity mentioned is not alone. Today the "assets" of a company are said by "competent economists" to be its property-good will-cash added to its debts! In short, if you have ten pennies and owe $E1000$ then your assets are $E1000-0-10!$

Yes, you say, but that's crazy! And you're right.

For an example of modern "think" the Ford Foundation *is believed to have* financially *supported* the arming of revolutionary groups so they will be dependent upon the capitalistic system and won't overthrow it even though the revolutionary group could not exist without Ford Foundation support!

A war is fought and continued for years to defend the property rights of landlords against peasants although the landlords are mostly dead.

Electronic computers are exported under government license and paid for by the exporter and shipped to an enemy who could not bomb the exporter without them in order to prevent the enemy from bombing the exporter.

Yes, one says. That's treason. Not necessarily. It is the inability to think! It is the result of suppressing the native ability by false systems of "logic."

PROPER DEFINITIONS

People who annoy one with such weird "solutions" do not know certain *differences*.

Thoughts are infinitely divisible into *classes* of thought.

In other words, in thought there are certain wide *differences* which are very different indeed.

A FACT is something that can be proven to exist by visible evidence.

An OPINION is something which may or may not be based on any facts.

4

Yet a sloppy mind sees no *difference between* a FACT and somebody's opinion.

In courts a psychiatrist (who is an AUTHORITY) says "Joe Doakes is crazy." Joe Doakes is promptly put away for ten years, tortured or killed. Yet this statement is just an OPINION uttered by somebody whose sanity is more than suspect and what's more is taken from a field "psychiatry" which has no basis in fact since it cannot cure or even detect insanity.

A vast number of people see no difference at all in FACTS and OPINIONS and gaily accept both or either as having equal validity.

An administrator continually gets opinions on his lines which are masquerading as facts.

If opinion instead of facts is used in solving problems then one comes up with insane solutions.

Here is an example: By *opinion* it is assumed there are 3000 pounds of potatoes available in a crop. An order is therefore written and payment (\$300 at 100 a pound) is made for the crop. One sack of potatoes is delivered containing 100 pounds. That sack was the fact. Loss is 2900 pounds of potatoes,

An administrator runs into this continually. He sends somebody to find an electric potato peeler "just like the one we had." He gets back a paring knife because it is the same.

The administrator orders a similar type of shirt and gets overcoats.

The administrator feels he is dealing with malice, sharp practice, laziness, etc., etc. He can lose all faith in honesty and truthfulness.

The ACTUAL REASON he is getting such breakdowns is

SANITY IS THE ABILITY TO RECOGNIZE DIFFERENCES, SIMILARITIES AND IDENTITIES.

The people with whom he is dealing can't *think to* such a degree that they give him insane situations. Such people are not crazy. Their thinking is suppressed and distorted by modern "education." "You can't really communicate to anybody because the same word means different things to everyone who uses it." In other words, all identities are different.

A BASIC LAW is usually confused by students with an INCIDENTAL FACT. This is conceiving a similarity when one, the law, is so far senior to the fact that one could throw the fact away and be no poorer.

When a student or an employee cannot USE a subject he studies or cannot seem to understand a situation his disability is that basics are conceived by him to be merely similar to incidental remarks.

The law, "Objects fall when dropped," is just the same to him as the casual example "a cat jumped off a chair and landed on the floor." Out of this he fixedly keeps in mind two "things he read"-objects fall **when dropped, a cat jumped** off a chair and landed on the floor. He may see these as having identical value whereas they are similar in subject but widely different in VALUE.

You give this person a brief write-up of company policy. "Customers must be satisfied with our service," begins the write-up. Of course that's a law because it has been found to be catastrophic to violate it. On down the page is written, "A card is sent to advise the customer about the order." The employee says he understands all this and goes off apparently happy to carry out his duties. A few weeks later Smith and Co. write and say they will do no more business with you. You hastily try to find out WHY. If you're lucky enough to track it down, you find the shipping clerk sent them a card saying, "Your order was received and we don't intend to fill it."

You have the clerk in. You lay down the facts. He looks at you glumly and says

5

he's sorry. He goes back and pulls another blooper. You threaten to fire him. He's now cost the company \$54,000. He is contrite.

All he understands is that life is confusing and that for some mysterious reason you are mad at him, probably because you are naturally grouchy.

What he *doesn't* know is what the administrator seldom taps. It isn't that he doesn't know "company policy." It's that he doesn't know the difference between a law and a comment!

A law of course is something with which one thinks. It is a thing to which one aligns other junior facts and actions. A law lets one PREDICT that if ALL OBJECTS FALL when not supported, then of course cats, books and plates can be predicted in behavior if one lets go of them. As the employee hasn't a clue that there is any difference amongst laws, facts, opinions, orders or suggestions he of course cannot think as he doesn't have anything to which he can align other data or with which to predict consequences.

He doesn't even know that company policy is, "Too many goofs equals fired." So when he does get sacked he thinks "somebody got mad at him."

If you think this applies only to the "stupid employee," know that a whole government service can go this way. Two such services only promoted officers to high rank if they sank their own ships or got their men killed! Social acceptability was the only datum used for promotion and it followed that men too socially involved (or too drunk) of course lost battles.

An organization, therefore, can itself be daffy if it has a concept that laws and facts and opinions are all the same thing and so has no operating policies or laws.

Whole bodies of knowledge can go this route. The laws are submerged into incidental facts. The incidental facts are held onto and the laws never pointed up as having the special value of aligning other data or actions.

An administrator can call a conference on a new building, accidentally collect people who can't differentiate amongst laws, facts, opinions or suggestions-treating them of equal value-and find himself not with a new building but a staggering financial loss.

As the world drifts along with its generations less and less taught and more and more suppressed in thinking, it will of course experience more and more catastrophes in economics, politics and culture and so go boom. As all this influences anyone in any organization it is an important point.

PERSONNEL

In despair an administrator enters the field of choosing personnel by experience with them. He embraces a very cruel modern system that fires at once anybody who flubs.

Actually he is trying to defend himself against some hidden menace he has never defined but which haunts him day by day.

The majority of people with whom he deals-and especially governments-cannot conceive of

1. differences,
2. similarities,
3. identities.

As a result they usually can't tell a FACT from an OPINION (because all differences are probably identities and all identities are different and all similarities are imaginary).

A=A=A

We have a broad dissertation on this in *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* as it **affects insane behavior**. Everything is everything else. Mr. X looks at a

6

horse knows it's a house knows it's a school teacher. So when he sees a horse he is respectful.

When anyone in an org is sanely trying to get things done he sometimes feels like

he is spinning from the replies and responses he gets to orders or requests. That's because observation was faulty or think was faulty at the other end of the comm line. As he tries to get things done he begins to realize (usually falsely) that he is

regarded as odd for getting impatient.

THE WAYS OUT

There are several ways out of this mess.

- a. One is to issue orders that demand close observation and execution. Issuance of clear orders provides no faintest opportunity of error, assumption or default.
- b. Another is to demand that an order is fully understood before it is executed.
- c. A third is to be sure one totally understands any order one receives before one goes off to do it or order it done.
- d. One is to deal only in ORDERS and leave nothing to interpretation.
- e. Another is to pretest personnel on one's lines for ability to observe and conceive differences, similarities and identities.
- f. The effective way is to get the personnel processed.
- g. A useful way is to educate people with drills until they can think.
- h. Another way is to defend one's areas by excluding insofar as possible adjacent areas where crippled think is rampant.
- i. A harsh way is to plow under zones whose irrationality is destructive (such as psychiatry).

THOUGHT CONFUSIONS

Wherever you have thought confusions (where FACT = OPINION, where Suggestion = Orders, where an observation is taken as a direction, etc., etc., etc.) an administrator is at serious risk.

Misunderstoods pile up on these short circuits. Out of misunderstands come hostilities. Out of these come overwork or destruction.

The need for all discipline can be traced back to the inability to think. Even when appearing clever, criminals are idiots; they have not ever thought the thought through. One can conclude that anyone on management lines, high or low, is drastically affected by irrational think.

Individuals to whom differences are identities and identities are differences can muddle up an operation to a point where disaster is inevitable.

These are the third dynamic facts **with which** an organization lives daily.

The fault can be very subtle so as to nearly escape close search or it can be so very broad so that it is obvious and ridiculous. But on all admin lines, the point that fails has not achieved the basic law

SANITY IS THE ABILITY TO RECOGNIZE DIFFERENCES, SIMILARITIES AND IDENTITIES.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.nf Copyright © 1970, 1975 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 11 MAY 1970

Remimeo

*Data Series 2**LOGIC*

The subject of logic has been under discussion for at least three thousand years without any clean breakthrough of real use to those who work with data.

LOGIC means the subject of reasoning. Some in ages past have sought to label it a science. But that can be discarded as pretense and pompousness.

If there were such a "science" men would be able to think. And they can't.

The term itself is utterly forbidding. If you were to read a text on logic you would go quite mad trying to figure it out, much less learn how to think.

Yet logic or the ability to reason is vital to an organizer or administrator. If he cannot think clearly he will not be able to reach the conclusions vital to make correct decisions.

Many agencies, governments, societies, groups, capitalize upon this lack of logic and have for a very long time. For the bulk of the last 2,000 years the main western educator-the Church-worked on the theory that Man should be kept ignorant. A population that is unable to think or reason can be manipulated easily by falsehoods and wretched causes.

Thus logic has not been a supported subject, rather the opposite.

Even western schools today seek to convince students they should study geometry as "that is the way they think." And of course it isn't.

The administrator, the manager, the artisan and the clerk each have a considerable use for logic. If they cannot reason they make costly and time-consuming errors and can send the entire organization into chaos and oblivion.

Their stuff in trade are data and situations. Unless they can observe and think their way through, they can reach wrong conclusions and take incorrect actions.

Modern Man thinks mathematics can serve him for logic and most of his situations go utterly adrift because of this touching and misplaced confidence. The complexity of human problems and the vast number of factors involved make mathematics utterly inadequate.

Computers are at best only servomechanisms (crutches) to the mind. Yet the chromium-plated civilization today has a childish faith in them. It depends on who asks the questions and who reads the computer's answers whether they are of any use or not. And even then their answers are often madhouse silly.

Computers can't *think* because the rules of live logic aren't fully known to Man and computer builders. One false datum fed into a computer gives one a completely wrong answer.

If people on management and work lines do not know logic the organization can go adrift and require a fabulous amount of genius to hold it together and keep it running.

Whole civilizations vanish because of lack of logic in its rulers, leaders and people.

So this is a very important subject.

8

UNLOCKING LOGIC

I have found a way now to unlock this subject. This is a breakthrough which is no small win. If by it a formidable and almost impossible subject can be reduced to simplicity then correct answers to situations can be far more frequent and an organization or a civilization far more effective.

The breakthrough is a simple one.

BY ESTABLISHING THE WAYS IN WHICH THINGS BECOME ILLOGICAL ONE CAN THEN ESTABLISH WHAT IS LOGIC.

In other words, if one has a grasp of what makes things illogical or irrational (or crazy, if you please) it is then possible to conceive of what makes things logical.

ILLOGIC

There are 5 primary ways for a relay of information or a situation to become illogical.

1. Omit a fact.
2. Change sequence of events.
3. Drop out time.
4. Add a falsehood.
5. Alter importance.

These are the basic things which cause one to have an incorrect idea of a situation.

Example: "He went to see a communist and left at 3:00 A.M." The omitted facts are that he went with 30 other people and that it was a party. By omitting the fact one alters the importance. This omission makes it look like "he" is closely connected to communism! When he isn't.

Example: "The ship left the dock and was loaded." Plainly made crazy by altering sequence of events.

Example: "The whole country is torn by riots" which would discourage visiting it in 1970 if one didn't know the report date of 1919.

Example: "He kept skunks for pets" which as an added falsehood makes a man look odd if not crazy.

Example: "It was an order" when in fact it was only a suggestion, which of course shifts the importance.

There are hundreds of ways these 5 mishandlings of data can then give one a completely false picture.

When basing actions or orders on data which contains one of the above, one then makes a mistake.

REASON DEPENDS ON DATA.

WHEN DATA IS FAULTY (as above) THE ANSWER WILL BE WRONG AND LOOKED UPON AS UNREASONABLE.

There are a vast number of combinations of these 5 data. More than one (or all 5) may be present in the same report.

Observation and its communication may contain one of these 5.

If so, then any effort to handle the situation will be ineffective in correcting or handling it.

9

USE

If any body of data is given the above 5 tests, it is often exposed as an invitation to acting illogically.

To achieve a logical answer one must have logical data.

Any body of data which contains one or more of the above faults can lead one into illogical conclusions.

The basis of an unreasonable or unworkable order is a conclusion which is made illogical by possessing one or more of the above faults.

LOGIC

Therefore logic must have several conditions:

1. All relevant facts must be known.
2. Events must be in actual sequence.
- 3 Time must be properly noted.
4. The data must be factual, which is to say true or valid.
5. Relative importances amongst the data must be recognized by comparing the facts with what one is seeking to accomplish or solve.

NOT KNOW

One can always know something about anything.

It is a wise man who, confronted with conflicting data, realizes that he knows at least one thing-that he doesn't know.

Grasping that, he can then take action to find out.

If he evaluates the data he does find out against the five things above, he can clarify the situation. Then he can reach a logical conclusion.

DRILLS

It is necessary to work out your own examples of the 5 violations of logic.

By doing so, you will have gained skill in sorting out the data of a situation.

When you can sort out data and become skilled in it, you will become very difficult to fool and you will have taken the first vital step in grasping a correct estimate of any situation.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:dz.nf Copyright © 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

10

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 11 MAY 1970-1

Remimeo ADDITION OF 23 SEPTEMBER 1977

Data Series 2-1

FURTHER ILLOGICS

Data Series 2, "Logic," lists the 5 primary points of illogic. There are 3 more points of illogic that evaluators should know well and use.

These are

ASSUMED "IDENTITIES" ARE NOT

IDENTICAL

ASSUMED "SIMILARITIES" ARE NOT

SIMILAR OR SAME CLASS OF THING

ASSUMED "DIFFERENCES" ARE NOT

DIFFERENT

Knowledge and study of Data Series I R "Anatomy of Thought" and Data Series 2 "Logic" will give one an understanding of what these outpoints, above, mean and how to recognize and use them in evaluation.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Assisted by

Lt. Og) Suzette Hubbard

AVU Verif Officer

LRH:SH:nt.nf Copyright © 1970, 1977 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

11

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 12 MAY 1970

Remimeo

Data Series 3

BREAKTHROUGHS

There are two breakthroughs, actually, that have been made here in the age-old philosophic subject of logic.

The first is FINDING A DATUM OF COMPARABLE MAGNITUDE TO THE SUBJECT.

A single datum or subject has to have a datum or subject with which to compare it before it can be fully understood.

By studying and isolating the principles that make a situation illogical one can then see what is necessary to be logical. This gives us a subject that could be called "Illogicality Testing" or "Irrationality Location" but which would be better described as DATA ANALYSIS. For it subjects data and therefore SITUATIONS to tests which establish any falsity or truth.

The other breakthrough consists of the discovery that no rules of logic can be valid unless one also includes the *data* being used. The nearest the ancients came to this was testing the premise or basis of an argument.

Trying to study logic without also having the answers to *data is* like describing everything about an engine without mentioning what fuel it runs on; or making a sentence like "He argued about" or "She disliked" without completing it.

Logic concerns obtaining answers. And answers depend on *data*. Unless you can test and establish the truth and value of the data being used, one cannot attain right answers no matter what Aristotle may have said or what IBM may have built.

The road to logic begins with ways and means of determining the value of the data to be employed in it.

Without that step no one can arrive at logic.

Two things that are equal to each other and to which a third is equal are all equal to one another. If A equals B and B equals C, then C equals A. Great. This is often disputed as a theorem of logic and has been ever since Aristotle said so. There is even a modern cult of non-Aristotelian logic.

The facts are that the ancient theorem is totally dependent on the DATA used in it. Only if the DATA is correct does the theorem work.

Lacking emphasis on the *data* being used, this theorem can be proven true or false at will. The philosophers point out the fallacy without ever giving emphasis to data evaluation.

DATA ANALYSIS

Unless you can prove or disprove the data you use in any logic system, the system itself will be faulty.

This is true of the IBM computer. It is true of CIA intelligence conclusions. It is true of Plato, Kant, Hume and your own personal computer as well.

12

DATA ANALYSIS is necessary to ANY logic system and always will be.

Ships run on oil, electric motors on electricity and logic runs on data.

If the data being stuffed into a computer is incorrect, no matter how well a computer is planned or built or proofed up against faults you can get a Bay of Pigs.

In mathematics no formula will give an answer better than the data being used in it.

VALID ANSWERS MAY ONLY BE ATTAINED IN USING VALID DATA.

Thus, if the subject of data analysis is neglected or imperfect or unknown or unsuspected as a step, then wild answers to situations and howling catastrophes can occur.

If data analysis becomes itself a codified subject, regardless of what formula is going to be used, then right answers can only then be attained.

THE MIND AS A COMPUTER

The mind is a remarkable computer.

It is demonstrable that a mind which has the wrong answers removed from it becomes brighter, IQ soars.

Therefore for our purposes we will consider the mind capable of being logical.

As processing improves the mind's ability to reach right answers, then we can assume for our purposes that if a person can straighten out his data he can be logical and will be logical and can attain right answers to situations.

The fallacy of the mind is that it can operate on wrong data.

Thus if we specialize in the subject of DATA ANALYSIS we can assume that a person can attain right answers.

As an administrator (and anyone else) has to reach conclusions in order to act and has to act correctly to ensure his own or his group's continued survival, it is vital that he be able to observe and conclude with minimal error.

Thus we will not be stressing HOW to think but how to analyze that with which one thinks-which is DATA.

This gives us the importance and use of data analysis.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.rd.nf Copyright © 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

13

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 15 MAY 1970

Remimeo

Data Series 4

DATA AND SITUATION ANALYZING

The two general steps one has to take to "find out what is really going on" are

1. Analyze the data,
2. Using the data thus analyzed, to analyze the situation.

The way to analyze data is to compare it to the 5 primary points and see if any of those appear in the data.

The way to analyze the situation is to put in its smaller areas each of the data analyzed as above.

Doing this gives you the locations of greatest error or disorganization and also gives you areas of greatest effectiveness.

Example: There is trouble in the Refreshment Unit. There are 3 people in the unit. Doing a data analysis on the whole area gives us a number of outpoints. Then we assign these to A, B and C who work in the unit and find B had the most outpoints. This indicates that the trouble in the Refreshment Unit is with B. B can be handled in various ways such as his hat, his attendance, etc. Note we analyzed the data of the main area and assigned it to the bits in the area, then we had an analyzed situation and we could handle.

Example: We analyze all the data we have about the Bingo Car Plant. We assign the data thus analyzed as out (outpoints) to each function of the Bingo Car Plant. We thus pinpoint what function is the worst off. We then handle that function in various ways, principally by organizing it and grooving in its executives and personnel.

There are several variations.

WE OBTAIN AN ANALYSIS OF THE SITUATION BY ANALYZING ALL THE DATA WE HAVE AND ASSIGNING THE OUTPOINT DATA TO THE AREAS OR PARTS. THE AREA HAVING THE MOST OUTPOINTS IS THE TARGET FOR CORRECTION.

In confronting a broad situation to be handled we have of course the problem of finding out what's wrong before we can correct it. This is done by data analysis followed by situation analysis.

We do this by grading all the data for outpoints (5 primary illogics). We now have a long list of outpoints. This is data analysis.

We sort the outpoints we now have into the principal areas of the scene. The majority will appear in *one* area. This is situation analysis.

We now know what area to handle.

Example: Seventy data exist on the general scene. We find 21 of these data are irrational (outpoints). We slot the 21 outpoints into the areas they came from or apply to. Sixteen came from area G. We handle area G.

14

0007"

EXPERIENCE

The remarkable part of such an exercise is that the data analysis of the data of a period of 1 day compares to 3 months operating *experience*.

Thus data and situation analysis is an instant result where experience takes a lot of time.

The quality of the data analysis depends on one knowing the ideal organization and purpose on which the activity is based. This means one has to know what its activities are supposed to be from a rational or logical viewpoint.

A clock is supposed to keep running and indicate time and be of practical and pleasant design. A clock factory is supposed to make clocks. It is supposed to produce enough clocks cheaply enough that are good enough to be in demand and to sell for enough to keep the place solvent. It consumes raw

materials, repairs and replaces its tools and equipment. It hires workmen and executives. It has service firms and distributors. That is the sort of thing one means by *ideal* or theoretical structure of the clock company and its organization.

Those are the *rational* points.

From the body of actual current today data on the clock company one spots the outpoints for a DATA ANALYSIS.

One assigns the outpoints to the whole as a SITUATION ANALYSIS.

One uses his admin know-how and expertise to repair the most aberrated subsection.

One gets a functioning clock factory that runs closer to the ideal.

Military, political and PR situations, etc., are handled all in the same way.

We call these two actions

DATA ANALYSIS,

SITUATION ANALYSIS.

DEFINITIONS

SITUATION - The broad general scene on which a body of current data exists.

DATA - Facts, graphs, statements, decisions, actions, descriptions, which are supposedly true.

OUTPOINT - Any one datum that is offered as true that is in fact found to be illogical when compared to the 5 primary points of illogic.

PLUSPOINT - A datum of truth when found to be true compared to the 5 points.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:dz.mrb.mes.nf Copyright c 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

15

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 15 MAY 1970

Issue 11

Remimeo

Data Series 5

INFORMATION COLLECTION

It is a point of mystery how some obtain their information. One can only guess at how they do it and looking at results wonder if it is actually done at all.

Obtaining information is necessary for any analysis of data.

If one obtains and analyzes *some* information he can get a hint of what information he should obtain in what area. By obtaining *more* data on that area he can have enough to actively handle.

Thus how one obtains information becomes a very important subject.

Nations have whole mobs of reporters sent out by newspapers, radio, TV and magazines to collect information. Politicians go jaunting around collecting information. Whole spy networks are maintained at huge expense to obtain information.

The Japanese in the first third of the 20th century had two maxims: "Anyone can spy." "Everyone must spy." The Germans picked this up. They had their whole populations at it. The Russian KGB numbers hundreds of thousands. CIA spends billions. MI-6 well you get the idea.

It is not amiss however to point out that those 2 nations that devoted the most effort to espionage (Japan and Germany) were BOTH DEFEATED HORRIBLY.

Thus the QUANTITY of data poured in is not any guarantee of understanding.

Newspapers today are usually devoted to propaganda, not news. Politicians are striving to figure out another nation's evil intentions, not to comprehend it.

The basic treatise on data collection and handling used to found the US intelligence data system ("strategic intelligence") would make one laugh-or cry.

All these elaborate (and expensive) systems of collecting information are not only useless, they are deluding. They get people in plenty of trouble.

A copy of *Time* magazine (US) analyzed for outpoints runs so many outpoints per page when analyzed that one wonders how any publication so irrational could continue solvent. And what do you know! It is going broke!

Those countries that spend the most on espionage are in the most trouble. They weren't in trouble and then began to spend money. They began to spy and then got into trouble!

News media and intelligence actions are not themselves bad. But irrational news media and illogical intelligence activity are psychotic.

So information collection can become a vice. It can be overdone.

If one had every org in a network fill out a thousand reports a week he would not obtain much information but he sure would knock them out of comm.

16

There is a moderate flow of information through any network so long as it is within the capability of the comm lines and the personnel.

Thus we get a rule about collecting data in administrative structures.

NORMAL ADMIN FLOWS CONTAIN ENOUGH DATA TO DO A DATA AND SITUATION ANALYSIS.

And

THE LESS DATA YOU HAVE THE MORE PRECISE YOUR ANALYSIS MUST BE.

And

INDICATORS MUST BE WATCHED FOR IN ORDER TO UNDERTAKE A SITUATION ANALYSIS.

And

A SITUATION ANALYSIS ONLY INDICATES THE AREA THAT HAS TO BE CLOSELY INSPECTED AND HANDLED.

Thus, what is an "indicator"?

An *indicator* is a visible manifestation which tells one a situation analysis should be done.

An indicator is the little flag sticking out that shows there is a possible situation underneath that needs attention.

Some indicators about orgs or its sections would be-dirty or not reporting or going insolvent or complaint letters or any nonoptimum datum that departs from the ideal.

This is enough to engage in a data and situation analysis of the scene where the indicator appeared.

The correct sequence, then, is

1. Have a normal information flow available.
2. Observe.
3. When a bad indicator is seen become very alert.
4. Do a data analysis.
5. Do a situation analysis.
6. Obtain more data by direct inspection of the area indicated by the situation analysis.
7. Handle.

An incorrect sequence, bound to get one in deep trouble is

- A. See an indicator,
- B. ACT to handle.

17

This even applies to emergencies IF ONE IS FAST ENOUGH TO DO THE WHOLE CORRECT CYCLE IN A SPLIT SECOND.

Oddly enough anyone working in a familiar area CAN do it all in a split second.

People that can do it like lightning are known to have "fast reaction time." People who can't do it fast are often injured or dead.

Example of an emergency cycle: Engineer on duty, normal but experienced perception. Is observing his area. Hears a hiss that shouldn't be. Scans the area and sees nothing out of order but a small white cloud. Combines sight and hearing. Moves forward to get a better look. Sees valve has broken. Shuts off steam line.

Example of an incorrect action. Hears hiss. Pours water on the boiler fires.

ADMIN CYCLE

When you slow this down to an Admin Cycle it becomes very easy. It follows the same steps.

It is not so dramatic. It could string out over months unless one realized that the steps I to 7 should be taken when the first signs show up. It need not. However it sometimes does.

Sometimes it has to be done over and over, full cycle, to get a full scene purring.

Sometimes the "handle" requires steps which the area is too broken down to get into effect and so becomes "Handle as possible and remember to do the whole cycle again soon."

Sometimes "handle" is a program of months or years duration; its only liability is that it will be forgotten or thrown out before done by some "new broom."

DATA COLLECTION

But it all begins with **having a normal flow** of information available and OBSERVING. Seeing a bad indicator one becomes alert and fully or quickly finishes off the cycle.

BAD INDICATOR

What is a "bad indicator" really?

It is merely an outpoint taken from the 5 primary outpoints.

It is not "bad news" or "entheta" or a rumor. The "bad news" could easily be a falsehood and is an outpoint because it is false bad news!

"Good" news when it is a falsehood is an outpoint!

RELIABLE SOURCE

Intelligence services are always talking "reliable sources." Or about "confirmed observation."

These are not very reliable ways of telling what is true. The master double spy Philby as a head MI-6 adviser was a Russian spy. Yet for 30 years he determined "reliable sources" for the US and England!

If three people tell you the same thing it is not necessarily a fact as they might all

18

have heard the same lie. Three liars don't make one fact-they make three outpoints.

So it would seem to be very difficult to establish facts if leading papers and intelligence services can't do it!

Yes it is tough to know the truth.

But the moment you begin to work with them, it is rather easy to locate outpoints.

You are looking for outpoints. When they are analyzed and the situation is analyzed by them you then find yourself looking at the truth if you follow the cycle I to 7.

It's really rather magical.

If you know thoroughly what the 5 primary outpoints are they leap into view from any body of data.

Oscar says he leads a happy married life. His wife is usually seen crying. It's an outpoint-a falsehood.

The Omaha office is reported by Los Angeles to be doing great. It fails to report. The LA datum does not include that it is 6 months old. Three outpoints, one for time, one for falsehood, one for omitted datum.

Once you are fully familiar with the 5 primary outpoints they are very obvious.

"We are having pie for supper" and "We have no flour" at least shows out of sequence!

It is odd but all the "facts" you protest in life and ridicule or growl about are all one or another of the outpoints.

When you spot them for what they are then you can actually estimate things. And the pluspoints come into view.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.rd.nf Copyright © 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

19

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 17 MAY 1970R

Remimeo REVISED 16 SEPTEMBER 1978

(Revisions in this type style)

(Revised to correct typographical errors in paragraphs 2 and 4 under

'FAULTS' section.)

Data Series 6R

DATA SYSTEMS

Two bad systems are in current use on data.

The first is "reliable source." In this system a report is considered true or factual only if the source is well thought of. This is a sort of authority system. Most professionals working with data collection use this. Who said it? If he is considered reliable or an authority the data is considered true or factual. Sources are graded from A to D. A is highest, D lowest. The frailty of this system is at once apparent. Philby, as a high British intelligence official, was a Russian spy for 30 years. Any data he gave the UK or US was "true" because he was a "reliable source." He had every Western agent who was being sent into communist areas "fingered" and shot. The West became convinced you could not enter or overthrow communist held areas and stopped trying! Philby was the top authority! He fooled CIA and MI-6 for years!

Psychiatrists are "authorities" on the mind. Yet insanity and criminality soar. They are *the* "reliable sources" on the mind.

Need I say more?

The other system in use is multiple report. If a report is heard from several areas or people it is "true." **The Russian KGB** has a Department D that forges documents and plants them in several parts of the world. They are then "true."

Propaganda spokesmen located all over the world say the same thing to the press on every major occasion. This becomes "public opinion" in government circles and so is "true" because it is published and comes from so many areas.

Five informants could all have heard the same lie.

Thus we see these two systems of evaluation are both birdbrain.

TWO PROBLEMS

The two problems that information collection agencies have are

1. Data evaluation and
2. How to locate the areas they should closely investigate.

For (1), data evaluation, they use primarily reliable source and multiple report.

EVERY ITEM RECEIVED THAT IS NOT "RELIABLE" OR "MULTIPLE" IS WASTE-BASKETED.

They throw out all outpoints and do not report them!

Their agents are thoroughly trained to do this.

20

As for (2), areas to investigate, they cannot pinpoint where they should investigate or even what to investigate because they do not use their outpoints.

Using outpoints and data and situation analysis they would know exactly where to look at, at what.

ERRORS

The above data errors are practiced by the largest data collection agencies on the planet-the "professionals." These advise their governments! And are the only advisers of their governments. Thus you can see how dangerous they are to their own countries.

Naturally they have agents who have what is called "flair." These, despite all systems, apply logic. They are so few that Eisenhower's intelligence adviser, General Strong, said in his book that they are too scarce so one is better off with a vast organization.

These agencies are jammed with false reports and false estimations.

An event contemporary with this writing where the US invaded Cambodia shows several data and situation errors. Yet the Viet Cong HQ were using computers. Yet their HQ was wiped out. The US President used CIA data which does not include, by law, data on the US. So the info on which the US President was acting was 50% missing! He was only told about the enemy evidently. When he ordered the invasion the US blew up!

A rather big outpoint (omitted facts) don't you think?

FAULTS

The reason I am using intelligence examples is because these are the biggest human data collection "professionals" in the world.

The collection and use of data to estimate situations to guide *national* actions and the data collection by a housewife going shopping are based on the same principles.

Mrs. Glutz, told by a "reliable source," Nellie Jones, that things are cheaper at Finkleberries and told by enough TV admen she should buy KLEANO tends to do just that. Yet Blastonsteins is really cheaper and by shaving up laundry soap and boiling it she can have ten dollars worth of KLEANO for about fifty cents.

Errors in *national* data collection give us war and high taxes and for Mrs. Glutz gives her a busted budget and stew all week.

So at top and bottom, any operation requires a grasp of data evaluation and situation estimation.

Those who do it will win and those who don't, go up in a cloud of atomic particles or divorce papers!

Logic and illogic are the stuff of survive and succumb.

There are those who wish to survive.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Revision assisted by

Pat Brice

LRH Compilations Unit I/C

LRH:PB:nt.dr.nf Copyright © 1970, 1978 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

21

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 18 MAY 1970

Remimeo

Data Series 7

FAMILIARITY

If one has no familiarity with how a scene (area) ought to be, one cannot easily spot outpoints (illogical data) in it.

This is what also could be called an IDEAL scene or situation. If one doesn't know the *ideal* scene or situation then one is not likely to observe non-ideal points in it.

Let us send a farmer to sea. In a mild blow, with yards and booms creaking and water hitting the hull, he is sure the ship is about to sink. He has no familiarity with how it should sound or look so he misses any real outpoints and may consider all pluspoints as outpoints.

Yet on a calm and pretty day he sees a freighter come within 500 feet of the side and go full astern and thinks everything is great.

An experienced officer may attempt madly to avoid collision and all the farmer would think was that the officer was being impolite! The farmer, lacking any familiarity with the sea and having no *ideal* as to what smooth running would be, would rarely see real outpoints unless he drowned. Yet an experienced sailor, familiar with the scene in all its changing faces sees an outpoint in all small illogicals.

On the other hand, the sailor on the farm would completely miss rust in the wheat and an open gate and see no outpoints in a farm that the farmer knew was about to go bust.

The rule is

A PERSON MUST HAVE AN IDEAL SCENE WITH WHICH TO COMPARE THE EXISTING SCENE.

If a staff hasn't got an idea of how a real org should run, then it misses obvious outpoints.

One sees examples of this when an experienced org man visiting the org tries to point out to a green staff (which has no ideal or familiarity) what is out. The green staff grudgingly fixes up what he says to do but lets go of it the moment he departs. Lacking familiarity and an ideal of a perfect org, the green staff just doesn't see anything wrong or anything right either!

The consequences of this are themselves illogical. One sees an untrained executive shooting all the producers and letting the bad hats alone. His erroneous ideal would be a quiet org, let us say. So he shoots anyone who is noisy or demanding. He ignores statistics. He ignores the things he should watch merely because he has a faulty ideal and no familiarity of a proper scene.

OBSERVATION ERRORS

When the scene is not familiar one has to look hard to become aware of things. You've noticed tourists doing this. Yet the old resident "sees" far more than they do while walking straight ahead down the road.

22

It is easy to confuse the novel with the "important fact." "It was a warm day for winter" is a useful fact only when it turns out that actually everything froze up on that day or it indicated some other outpoint.

Most errors in observation are made because one has no ideal for the scene or no familiarity with it.

However there are other error sources.

"Being reasonable" is the chief offender. People dub-in a missing piece of a sequence, for instance, instead of seeing that it IS missing. A false datum is imagined to exist because a sequence is wrong or has a missing step.

It is horrifying to behold how easily people buy dub-in. This is because an illogical sequence is uncomfortable. To relieve the discomfort they distort their own observation by not-ising the outpoint and concluding something else.

I recall once seeing a Tammany Hall group (a New York political bunch whose symbol is a tiger) stop before the tiger's cage in a zoo. The cage was empty and they were much disappointed. I was there and said to them, "The tiger is out to lunch." They told those on the outer edge of the group, "The tiger is out to lunch." They all cheered up, accepted the empty cage

and went very happily on their way. Not one said "Lunch?" Or "Who are you?" Or laughed at the joke. Even though it was sunset! I pitied the government of New York!

ACCURATE OBSERVATION

There are certain conditions necessary for accurate observation.

First is a means of PERCEPTION whether by remote communication by various comm lines or by direct looking, feeling, experiencing.

Second is an IDEAL of how the scene or area should be.

Third is FAMILIARITY with how such scenes are when things are going well or poorly.

Fourth is understanding PLUSPOINTS or rightnesses when present.

Fifth is knowing OUTPOINTS (all 5 types) when they appear.

Sixth is rapid ability to ANALYZE DATA.

Seventh is the ability to ANALYZE the SITUATION.

Eighth is the willingness to INSPECT more closely the area of outness.

Then one has to have the knowledge and imagination necessary to HANDLE.

One could call the **above the CYCLE OF OBSERVATION**. If one calls HANDLE number 9 it would be the Cycle of Control.

If one is trained to conceive all variations of outpoints (illogics) and studies up to conceive an ideal and gains familiarity with the scene or type of area, his ability to observe and handle things would be considered almost supernatural.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dz.nf Founder

Copyright Q 1970

by L. Ron Hubbard

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

23

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 19 MAY 1970

Remimeo

Data Series 8

SANITY

An observer has to be sane to sanely observe.

This has been so far out in the society that the word "sane" itself has come to mean "conservative" or "cautious." Or something you can agree with. The 19th century psychologist decided he could not define "normal" and there weren't any normal people. The 14th century psychiatrist is the

20th century "authority" on sanity. Yet an examination of such shows them to be unable to demonstrate it personally or bring it about, much less define it.

Dictionaries say it is "health, soundness of body or mind; level-headedness, reasonableness."

Yet sanity is vital to accurate observation.

FIXED IDEAS

The "id6e fixe" is the bug in sanity.

Whenever an observer himself has fixed ideas he tends to look at them not at the information.

Prejudiced people are suffering mainly from an "id6e fixe."

The strange part of it is that the "id6e fixe" they think they have isn't the one they do have.

An example of this is the social "scientist" with a favorite theory. I have seen tons of these birds pushing a theory as though it was the last theory in the world and valuable as a ten-pound diamond. Such throw away any fact that does not agree with theory. That's how 19th century psychology went off the rails. All fixed ideas and no facts.

The physical sciences in Hegel's time did the same thing. There was no 8th planet in the solar system, even when found in a telescope, because "seven is a perfect number so there can only be seven planets."

History is full of idiocies-and idiots-with fixed ideas. They cannot observe beyond the idea.

A fixed idea is something accepted without personal inspection or agreement. It is the perfect "authority knows best." It is the "reliable source." A typical one was the intelligence report accepted by the whole US Navy right up to 7 Dec. 1941, the date of destruction of the US fleet by Jap planes. The pre-Pearl Harbor report, from unimpeachably reliable sources was "the Japanese cannot fly-they have no sense of balance." The report overlooked that the Japs were the world's greatest acrobats! It became a fixed idea that caused the neglect of all other reports.

A fixed idea is uninspected. It blocks the existence of any contrary observation.

Most reactionaries (people resisting all progress or action) are suffering from fixed ideas which they received from "authorities," which no actual experience alters.

That British red-coated infantry never took cover was another one. It took a score or two of wars and fantastic loss of life to finally break it down. If any single fixed idea destroyed the British Empire, this one is a candidate.

NORMAL SCENE

The reason a fixed idea can get so rooted and so overlooked is that it appears normal or reasonable.

24

And somebody or a lot of somebodies want to believe it.

Thus a fixed idea can become an *ideal*. It is probably a wrong ideal. Incapable Jap pilots would be a wish for a navy. It would be wonderful! Red-coated infantry were supposed to be brave and unflinching.

In both cases the ideal is irrational.

A rational ideal has this law:

THE PURPOSE OF THE ACTIVITY MUST BE PART OF THE IDEAL ONE HAS FOR THAT ACTIVITY.

A navy that has an ideal that the enemy can't fly is stupidly avoiding its own purpose which is to fight.

British infantry had the purpose of winning wars, not just looking brave.

Thus one can analyze for a sane ideal by simply asking, "What's the purpose of the activity?" If the ideal is one that forwards the purpose, it will pass for sane.

There are *many* factors which add up to an ideal scene. If the majority of these forward the purpose of the activity, it can be said to be a sane ideal.

If an ideal which does not forward the activity in any way is the ideal being stressed then a fixed idea is present and had better be inspected.

This could be said to be a very harsh utilitarian view of things. But it is not. The artistic plays its role in any ideal. Morale has its part in any ideal.

An ideal studio for an artist could be very beautiful or very ugly so long as it served him to produce his art. If it was very beautiful yet hindered his artistic activities it would be a very crazy ideal scene.

A handsome factory that produced would be a high ideal. But its nearness to raw materials, transport and worker housing are the more important factors in an ideal of a factory. And its location in a country where the government made an atmosphere in which production could occur could be an overriding part of an "ideal scene."

You have to look at what the area is for before you can say whether it is ideal or not.

And if its area is too limited to produce or too expensive for it to be solvent, then it isn't a sane scene.

URGESTOIMPROVE

Sometimes the urge to improve an activity is such that it injures or destroys the activity.

If one is familiar with the type of activity he must also realize that there is a law involved.

THE FACT THAT SOMETHING IS ACTUALLY OPERATING AND SOLVENT CAN OUTWEIGH THE UNTESTED ADVANTAGES OF CHANGING IT.

In other words, an *ideal* scene might be vastly different but the actual scene IS operating.

So the factor of OBSESSIVE CHANGE enters. Change can destroy with ferocity.

Whole areas of London, jammed with small but customer-filled shops, have been swept away to make room for chromium high-rent modern stores which stand empty of buyers.

Birmingham, where you could get anything made, had all its tiny craft shops swept away and replaced with high-rent huge new buildings all on some progress-crazy psychotic break.

Possibly the new stores and the huge new shops fitted somebody's "ideal" but they did not match an actual operating environment.

It is this difference between an ideal scene and a practical scene which brings down many old businesses and civilizations.

Therefore, to have an ideal, familiarity with what works is desirable.

25

It is quite possible without any familiarity, to imagine a successful ideal. BUT IT MUST NOT HAVE ANY FIXED IDEAS IN IT.

It is the fixed idea that knocks a practical operating living environment in the head.

Do-gooders are always at this. They see in a row of old shacks, not economic independence and a lazy life but P-0-V-E-R-T-Y. So they get a new housing project built, shoot taxes into the sky, put total control on a lot of people and cave in a society.

The do-gooder is pushing the 19th century fixed idea of the Comte de SaintSimon-to gear the whole economy down to the poorest man in it. In other words to reward only the downstat. Everyone becomes a slave of course but it sure sounds good.

Newspapermen are probably the world's worst observers. They observe through the fixed ideas of the publisher or the prevailing control group. Their stories are given them before they leave the office. Yet their observations advise the public and the government!

The outpoints to be found in any contemporary newspaper brand most stories as false before one proceeds more than a paragraph.

Yet this is what the world public is expected to run on.

Naturally it distorts the scene toward raving insanity. This conflicts with the native logic of people so the public thinks the world a lot madder than it really is.

In two cities all newspapers were suspended from publication for quite a period. In both, crime dropped to zero! And resumed again when newspapers were again published.

The ideal scene of the citizen in his workaday world is vastly different than the scene depicted in a newspaper.

The difference between the two can make one feel quite weird.

Thus there should not be too wide a difference between the ideal and the represented scene. And not too wide a difference between the ideal and the actual scene.

R (reality) consists of the is-ness of things. One can improve upon this is-ness to bring about an ideal and lead the R up to it. This is normal *improvement* and is accepted as sane.

One can also degrade the R by dropping the representation (description) of the scene well below the actual. In the black propaganda work traditionally carried on by many governments this latter trick of corrupting the R is the means used to foment internal revolt and war.

Both actions of upgrade and downgrade are outpoints when reported as *facts*. "We made E1000 in reserves this week" is as crazily outpoint as "the government went broke this week" when either one is not the truth.

When the report says, "we should plan a higher income," it is leading to a higher idea! and is not an outpoint mainly because it is not representing any fact but a hopeful and ambitious management.

5 POINTS

When none of the outpoints are present, yet you do have reports and the scene is functioning and fulfilling its purpose one would have what he could call a sane scene.

If all 5 points were absent yet the scene was not functioning well enough to live, it would be such a departure from the ideal that that itself would be outpoint in that importance was altered. What is out here is the whole situation! The situation analysis would be instantly visible.

But in practice this last happens only in theory, not in practice. A collapsing situation is forecast by outpoints in its data.

Organisms and organizations tend to survive.

A decline of survival is attended also by outpoints.

26

SANITY IS SURVIVAL

Anything not only survives better when sane but it is true that the insane doesn't survive.

Thus survival potential can be measured to a considerable degree by the absence of outpoints.

This does not mean that sane men can't be shot or sane organizations can't be destroyed. It means only that there is far less chance of them being shot and destroyed.

So long as men and organizations are connected to insane men and organizations, wild things can and do happen unexpectedly.

But usually such things can be predicted by outpoints in others.

When sane men and organizations exist in a broad scene that is convulsed with irrationality, it takes very keen observation and a good grip on logic and fast action to stay alive. This is known as "environmental challenge." It can be overdone! Too much challenge can overwhelm.

The difference between such happening to a sane man or organization and to the insane would be that the failure did not itself become a fixed idea.

INSANITY

The 5 primary illogics or outpoints as we call them are of course the anatomy of insanity.

In their many variations the insanity of any scene can be sounded and the nucleus of it located.

By locating and then closely inspecting, such a point of insanity can then be handled.

When you know what insanity really is you can then confront it and handle it. One is not driven into a huge generality of "everything is insane."

By detecting and eliminating small insane areas, taking care not to destroy the sane things around it, one can gradually lift any situation up to sanity and survival.

By seeing what is insane in a scene and seeing why it is insane, one has by comparison also found what is sane.

By locating and understanding outpoints one finds the pluspoints; for any given situation.

And that is often quite a relief.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 23 MAY 1970

Remimeo

Data Series 9

ERRORS

Many who begin to use "illogics," who have not drilled on them so they can rattle them off, choose errors instead of outpoints.

An error may show something else. It is nothing in itself.

An error obscures or alters a datum.

Example: Asking someone to spot the outpoints in a Russian passenger vacation cruise liner in a foreign port, the answers were, "The hammer and sickle are upside down." "The courtesy flag is not flying right side up." These aren't outpoints. The hammer and sickle weren't backwards so *saying* it was an outpoint. The actual outpoint was *passenger vacation cruise* liner. There is no Russian idle class. It was too big to be giving cruises to winning tractor drivers. Russian and vacation cruise liner just don't go together. Either the reports of Russian refusal to let Russians travel is false or it wasn't a vacation cruise liner but it was. Hence it's an outpoint. An omitted datum. Two contrary data means one is false. Investigation disclosed it was Russian all right and a vacation cruise liner all right. BUT IT WAS CHARTERED TO AN ITALIAN COMPANY THAT SOLD CRUISES TO ITALIANS!

But this leads to a new outpoint. How come the workers paradise is building huge ships for capitalist pleasures?

If anyone like a Martian was tracing down what's out on this planet, this one outpoint would lead to others.

A situation analysis would indicate an investigation of Russia where outpoints abound and the Martian would know a lot of what's wrong on the planet,

In doing so he would find a lot of capitalistic outpoints which would lead him to investigate the so-called West and he would have the basic "cold war" of communism versus capitalism.

This would lead him into new data the two have in common (economics) and a data analysis of economics would discover the screwiest bunch on the planet, the international banker playing off both sides.

He would have analyzed the planet.

Given that he knew or could translate languages, it might take him a week, starting with a Russian luxury cruise liner, to run down the planetary bad spot.

Now if he *reversed* his investigation and used PLUSPOINTS he would arrive with a situation analysis of what group would be strong enough to handle the down spot and by investigation possibly pinpoint what could tip over the bad spot.

If he just used "errors" he would get no place.

The ideal he would have to be working from would be a planet at peace where individuals could go about their affairs and be happy without threats of immediate

28

arrest or destruction. It would be a very simple ideal or it would be based only on how planetary populations and cultures survive and that is already laid down in an earlier rule in this series.

Ask somebody to look at a table used for meals at the end of a meal and indicate any outpoints. Usually he'll point out a dirty plate or crumbs or an ashtray not emptied. They are not outpoints. When people finish eating one expects dirty plates, crumbs and full ashtrays. If none of these things were present there might be several outpoints to note. The *end* of a meal with table and plates all clean would be a reversed sequence. *That* would be an outpoint. Evidentially the *dinner* has been omitted and that would be quite an outpoint! Obviously no meal has been served so there's a falsehood. So here are three outpoints.

It is best to get what outpoints are down pat. One does this first by thinking up examples and then by observing some body of data and then by looking at various scenes.

It will be found that outpoints are really few unless the activity is very irrational.

Simple errors on the other hand can be found in legions in any scene.

Child's games often include, "What's wrong with this picture?" Usually they are just errors like a road sign upside down. But if you had a *brown* rabbit in *winter* holding down a *man* with its front paws and a caption, "Japanese parasols attack ," you'd have some real outpoints.

A lot of people would try to figure it out and supply *new* outpoints (being reasonable). A learned professor could point out the symbolism. Some would laugh it off. Some would be annoyed by it. And the reason anybody would do anything about it is that it is sort of painful to confront the irrational so instead of seeing its is-ness of illogics an effort is made to make it logical or to throw it away.

The reason misunderstood words or typographical errors were not regarded as a barrier to study was that people converted them or not-ised them. In actual fact a word one does not understand made a missing datum. Reasonableness or nonconfront enter in and one drops the book.

Errors do not count in pluspoints either.

That a factory has a few errors is no real indicator. A factory has pluspoints to the degree it attains its ideal and fulfills its purpose. That some of its machinery needs repair might not even be an outpoint. If the general machinery of the place is good for enough years to easily work off its replacement value there is a pluspoint.

People applying fixed or wrong ideals to scene are only pointing up errors in their own ideals, not those of the scene!

A reformer who had a strict Dutch mother looks at a primitive Indian settlement and sees children playing in mud and adults going around unclothed. He forces them to live cleanly and cuts off **the sun by putting them** in clothes-they lose their immunities required to live and die off. He missed the pluspoint that these Indians had survived hundreds of years in this area that would kill a white man in a year!

Thus errors are usually a comparison to one's personal ideals. Outpoints compare to the ideal for that particular scene.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:nt.cc.nf Founder

Copyright c 1970

by L. Ron Hubbard

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

29

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 23 JUNE 1970

Remimeo

Data Series 10

THE MISSING SCENE

The biggest "omitted data" would be the whole scene.

A person who does not know how the scene should be can thereafter miss most of the outpoints in it.

An example is the continual rewrite of the International Code (signaling by flags between ships) by some "convention" composed of clerks who have never gone to sea. Not knowing the scene, the International Code of Signals now contains "How are your kidneys?" but nothing about lifeboats.

College education became rather discredited in Europe until students were required to work in areas of actual practice as part of their studies. Educated far from reality students had "no scene." Thus no data they had was related by them to an actual activity. There was even an era when the "practical man" or "practical engineer" was held in contempt. That was when the present culture started to go down.

On the other hand one of the most long-lived activities around is the wine industry of Portugal. It has almost no theory trained. It is total scene. Every job in it is by apprenticeship for years. It is very constant and very successful.

A good blend would be theory and practical in balance. That gives one data *and* activity. But it could be improved by stressing also the ideal scene.

BODIES OF DATA

Data classifies in similar connections or similar locations.

A body of data is associated by the subject to which it is applicable or by the geographical area to which it belongs.

A body of data can also be grouped as to time, like an historical period.

Illogic occurs when one or more data is misplaced into the wrong body of data for it.

An example would be "Los Angeles smog was growing worse so we fined New York." That is pretty obviously a misplace.

"Cars were no longer in use. Bacterial warfare had taken its toll."

"I am sorry madam but you cannot travel first class on a third class passport."

Humanoid response to such displacements is to be *reasonable*. A new false datum is dreamed up and put into the body of data to explain why that datum is included. (Reasonableness is often inserted as explanation of other outpoints also.)

In the smog one, it could be dreamed up that New York's exports or imports were causing LA smog.

30

In the car one, it could be imagined that bacteriological warfare had wiped out all the people.

In the train one, it could be inserted that in that country, passports were used instead of tickets.

The brain strains to correctly classify data into its own zones and is very rejective or imaginative when it is not.

Intelligence tests accidentally use this one very often.

It remains that an outpoint can occur when a datum belonging to one zone of data, location or time, is inserted into another zone where it doesn't.

Algebra is sometimes hard to learn for some because NUMBERS are invaded by LETTERS. $2x = 10$. X is of course 5. But part of a new student's mind says letters are letters and make words.

Primitive rejective responses to foreigners is a mental reaction to a body of people, in this case, being invaded by a person not of that tribe.

If the scene is wholly unknown, one doesn't know what data belongs to it. Thus a sense of confusion results. Recruits can be sent for ruddy rods for rifles and apprentice painters can be ordered to get cans of sky blue lampblack.

A sense of humor is in part an ability to spot outpoints that should be rejected from a body of data. In fact a sense of humor is based on both rejection and absurd outpoints of all types.

Reasonable people accept displacements with an amazing tranquility by imagining connecting links or assuming they do not know the ideal scene. A reasonable person would accept a pig in a parlor by imagining that there was a good reason for it. And leave the pig in **the parlor and revise their own ideal** scene!

Yet pigs belong to a body of data including barns, pens, farms, animals. And parlors belong to a body of data including teacups, knickknacks, conversation and humans.

Possibly Professor Wundt who "discovered" in 1879 that humans were animals had seen too many pigs in parlors! And based the whole of "psychology" on a confusion of bodies of data!

Murder in a hospital, as done by psychiatry, would be a confusion of bodies of *actions*. Actions belong to their own bodies of data.

One *drives* a car, *rides* a horse. One doesn't ride a car but one can drive a horse. But the *action*, the motions involved with, driving a horse are very different than those used in driving a car. This is a language breakdown called a "homonym." One word means two different things. Japanese is an easy language except for its use of the same word for several different things. Two Japanese talking

commonly have to draw Chinese characters (Japanese is written with Chinese characters) to each other to unravel what they mean. They are in a perpetual struggle to pry apart bodies of data.

" 1234 Red 789 P 987 Green 432 Apple" as a statement would probably tie up CIA codebreakers for weeks as they would *know* it was a code. The same statement would tie up a football coach as he would *know* it was a team play. A mathematician would *know* it fitted into some other activity than his. Hardly anyone would classify it as a totally meaningless series of symbols.

So there is a reverse compulsion-to try to fit any datum found into *some* body of data.

The mind operates toward logic, particularly in classes of things.

31

The sensible handling of data of course includes spotting a datum, terminal, item, action, grouped in with a body of data wrong for it. And in spotting that a datum does not have to belong anywhere at all.

Included in mental abilities is putting similar data into one type of action, items, or data. Car parts, traffic rules, communications, are each a *body* of data in which one can fit similar data.

When a person has some idea of the scene involved, he should be able to separate the data in it into similar groups.

An org board is an example of this. Sections are broad classes of action or items into which one can fit the related data. Departments are a broader body of related data, actions, items. Divisions are even broader but still cover related classes of data. The whole org is a very broad class of data, determined in part by the type of product being made.

If a person has trouble relating data to its proper body of data (if he were unaware or "reasonable") he would have an awful lot of trouble finding his way around an org or routing despatches or getting things or wearing his own hat.

Orders are a broad class of data. Orders from proper sources is a narrower body of data. If a person cannot tell the difference he will follow anyone's orders. And that will snarl him up most thoroughly.

I once knew a carpenter so obliging and so unable to classify orders that he built knickknacks, cabinets, shelves, for any staff member who asked and wasted all the time and materials and orders from his boss that were to have built a house! The house materials and money and the carpenter's time and pay were all expended without anything of value to show for it! Not only was he unable to relate orders to their own classes but also couldn't relate materials and plans to a house!

In most miscarriages of projects it will be found that someone on the line cannot relate data or actions to their own classes. Along with this goes other illogics.

So the ability to spot illogics in a known scene can directly relate to efficiency and even to success and survival.

A switch intended for a house put into an airplane electrical system cuts out at 30,000 feet due to the wrong metal to withstand cold and there goes the airplane. A part from one class of parts is included wrongly in another class of parts.

So there is an INCORRECTLY INCLUDED DATUM which is a companion to the OMITTED DATUM as an outpoint.

This most commonly occurs when, in the mind, the scene itself is missing and the first thing needed to classify data (scene) is not there.

An example is camera storage by someone who has no idea of types of cameras. Instead of classifying all the needful bits of a certain view camera in one box, one inevitably gets the lens hoods of all cameras jumbled into one box marked "lens hoods." To assemble or use the view camera one spends hours trying to find its parts in boxes neatly labeled "camera backs," "lenses," "tripods," etc.

Here, when the scene of what a set up view camera looks like and operates like, is missing, one gets a closer identification of data than exists. Lens hoods are lens hoods. Tripods are tripods. Thus a wrong system of classification occurs out of scene ignorance.

A traveler unable to distinguish one uniform from another "solves" it by classifying all uniforms as "porters." Hands his bag to an arrogant police captain and that's how he spent his vacation, in jail.

32

Lack of the scene brings about too tight an identification of one thing with another. This can also exclude a vital bit making a disassociation.

A newly called-up army lieutenant passes right on by an enemy spy dressed as one of his own soldiers. An experienced sergeant right behind him claps the spy in jail accurately because "he wasn't wearing 'is 'at the way we do in the Fusileers!"

Times change data classification. In 1920 anyone with a camera near a seaport was a spy. In 1960 anyone not carrying a camera couldn't be a tourist so was watched!

So the scene for one cultural period is not the scene for another.

Thus a class of data for a given time belongs broadly or narrowly to itself. Including a datum in it or from another time or excluding a datum from it, or forcing a datum to have a class can in any combination produce an illogical situation.

Some knowledge of the scene itself is vital to an accurate and logical assembly or review of data.

The scene therefore, knowledge of, is the basic "omitted data."

The remedy of course is to get more data on what the scene itself really should consist of. When the *scene* is missing one has to study what the *scene* is supposed to consist of, just not more random data about it.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sb.nf Copyright c 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

33

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 30 JUNE 1970

Remimeo

Data Series 11

THE SITUATION

Probably the hardest meaning to get across is the definition of "SITUATION."

One can say variously, "Isolate the actual situation" or "Work out what the situation is" and get the most remarkable results.

To some, a despatch is a situation. A small error to others is a situation.

Yet, if one wishes to know and use data and logic one must know exactly what is meant *in this* logic series by SITUATION.

English has several meanings for the one word. In the dictionary it's a "place," a "state or condition of affairs," "a momentous combination of circumstances," "a clash of passions or personalities," or "a job." One gets the feeling that people are fumbling around for a meaning they know must be there.

For our purposes we had better give an *exact* definition of what is meant by SITUATION. If we are going to do a situation analysis by doing an analysis of data, then WHAT is a *situation*?

We can therefore specifically define for our purposes in logic the word SITUATION.

A SITUATION IS A MAJOR DEPARTURE FROM THE IDEAL SCENE.

This means a wide and significant or dangerous or potentially damaging CIRCUMSTANCE or STATE OF AFFAIRS which means that the IDEAL SCENE has been departed from and doesn't fully exist in that area.

THE IDEAL SCENE

One has to work out or know what the ideal scene would be for an organization or department or social strata or an activity to know that a wide big flaw existed in it.

To be somewhat overly illustrative about it, let us take a town that has no one living in it.

One would have to figure out what was the ideal scene of a town. Any town. It would be a place where people lived, worked, ate, slept, survived. It could be pretty or historical or well designed or quaint. Each of these would possibly add purpose or color to the town.

BUT this town in question has NO people living in it.

That is a departure from the ideal scene of towns.

Therefore THE SITUATION would be NO PEOPLE LIVE IN THIS "TOWN."

Data analysis would lead us to this by noting outpoints.

34

6 P.M. - No smoke from house chimneys. (omitted item)

9 P.M. - No lights. (omitted item)

Dawn - No dogs. (omitted terminals)

1910 election poster. (wrong time)

That would be enough. We would then realize that a SITUATION existed because data analysis is also done against the ideal scene.

We would know enough about it to look more closely.

No people! That's *the* SITUATION.

HANDLING

Thus if one were responsible for the area one would now know what to handle.

How he handled it depends upon (a) the need, (b) *availability of resources*. and (c) *capability*.

Obviously if it's supposed to have people in it and if one needs a town there one would have to get a bright idea or a dozen and eventually get people to live there. How fast it could be done depends on the availability of resources-those there or what one has (even as little resource as a voice, paper, pen, comm lines).

One's own capability to get ideas or work or the capabilities of people are a major factor in *handling*.

But so far as *the* SITUATION is concerned, it exists whether it is handled or not.

HOW TO FIND A SITUATION

When you are called upon to find out if there IS a situation (as an inspector or official or soldier or cat or king, whatever) you can follow these steps and arrive with what the situation is every time-

1. Observe.
2. Notice an oddity of any kind or none.
3. Establish what the ideal scene would be for what is observed.
4. Count the outpoints now visible.
5. Following up the outpoints observe more closely.
6. Establish even more simply what the ideal scene would be.
7. *The situation will be* THE MOST MAJOR DEPARTURE FROM THE IDEAL SCENE.

HANDLING

Just as you proceed to the MOST MAJOR SITUATION-go big, when it comes to *handling* it usually occurs that reverse is true-go small!

It is seldom you can handle it all at one bang. (Of course that happens too.)

But just because the SITUATION is big is no real reason the solution must be.

Solutions work on gradient scales. Little by more by more.

35

When you really see a SITUATION it is often so big and so appalling one can feel incapable.

The *need* to handle comes first.

The resources available come next.

The capability comes third.

Estimate these and by getting a very bright workable (often very simple) idea, one can make a start.

An activity can get so wide of **the ideal scene the people in** it are just in a confusion. They do all sorts of odd irrelevant things, often hurt the activity further.

Follow the steps given 1-7 above and you will have grasped the SITUATION. You will then be able to do (a), (b), (c).

That begins to make things come right.

In that way most situations can be both defined and handled.

INTERFERENCE

Lots of people, often with lots of authority, get mired into situations. They do not know they are in anything that could be defined, isolated or stated. They bat madly at unimportant dust motes or each other and just mire in more deeply.

Whole civilizations uniformly go the route just that way.

So do orgs, important activities and individuals.

One can handle exactly as above, if one practices up so he can really do the drill on life.

The only danger is that the situation can be so far from any ideal that others with fixed ideas and madness can defy the most accurate and sensible solutions.

But that's part of the situation, isn't it?

Data analysis is done to make a more direct observation of exactly the right area possible. One can then establish the exact SITUATION.

It's a piece of freedom to be able to do this.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sb.cden.gm Copyright © 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

36

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 5 JULY 1970

Remimeo

Data Series 12

HOW TO FIND AND ESTABLISH AN IDEAL SCENE

In order to detect, handle or remedy situations one has to be able to understand and work out several things.

These are defining the ideal scene itself, detect without error or guess any departure on it, find out WHY a departure occurred and work out a means of reverting back to the ideal scene.

In order to resolve a situation fully one has to get the real reason WHY a departure from the ideal scene occurred.

"What was changed?" or "What changed?" is the same question.

That "change" is the root of departures comes from a series of plant experiments I conducted. (The type of experimentation was undertaken to study cellular life behavior and reaction to see if it was a different *type* of life-it isn't. The experiments themselves were later repeated in various universities and were the subject of much press for them over the world.)

In setting up conditions of growth I observed that plants on various occasions greatly declined suddenly. In each case I was able to trace the last major CHANGE that had occurred and correct it. Changes made in temperature, water volume, humidity, ventilation, greatly affected the plants in terms of wilt, decreased growth rate, increase in parasites, etc.

When THE change was isolated and the condition reverted to that occurring during the previous healthy period, a recovery would occur.

At first glance this may seem obvious. Yet in actual practice it was not easy to do.

Gardeners' records would omit vital data or alter importance or drop out time, etc. A gardener might seek to cover up for himself or a fellow worker. He tended to make himself right and would enter falsehoods or reassurance that was a falsehood into the analysis.

A new gardener would seem to affect the plants greatly and one could build a personality influence theory on this-until one found that, being untrained in the **procedure used, he would enter even** more outpoints than usual.

At such a juncture one would of course train the gardener. BUT that didn't locate WHAT had been changed. And one had to locate that to get the plants to recover. The conditions in use were extreme forcing conditions anyway and lapse of duty was very apparent. Sixteen-foot hothouse American corn from seeds usually furnishing 5-foot stocks, 43 tomatoes to the truss where 5 is more usual were the demands being met. So any change showed up at once.

The fact of change itself was a vital point as well. One discovery was that life does best in a near optimum constancy-meaning that change just as change is usually harmful to plant life.

The fact of isolating change in the environment as the sole harmful cause was one discovery.

37

That one had to isolate THE change in order to obtain full recovery was another discovery.

Change itself was not bad but in this experimental series conditions were set as optimum and the beneficial changes had already been made with remarkable results. Thus one was observing change from the optimum.

This would be the same thing as "departures from the ideal scene."

The action was always

1. Observe the decline.
2. Locate the exact change which had been made.
3. Revert THE change.

4. A return to the near ideal scene would occur if one were maintaining the ideal scene meanwhile.

THEIDEALSCENE

There are two scenes:

A. The ideal scene

B. The existing scene,

These of course can be wide apart.

How does one know the ideal scene?

At first thought it would be very difficult for a person not an expert to know the idealscene.

For years certain "authoritarian" people in the field of mental healing fought with lies and great guile to obscure the fact that the ideal scene in mental healing can be known to anyone. Such imprisoned and tortured and murdered human beings with the excuse that they themselves were the only experts. "It takes 12 years to make a psychiatrist." "Expert skill is required to kill a patient."

The existing scene these "experts" made was a slaughterhouse for asylums and the insanity and crime statistics soaring.

They fought like maniacs to obscure the ideal scene and hired and coerced an army of agents, "reporters," "officials," and such to smash anyone who sought to present the ideal scene or ways to attain it. Indeed it was a world gone mad with even the police and governments hoodwinked by these "experts."

Yet any citizen knew the ideal scene had he not been so propaganda frightened by the existing scene.

By constantly pounding in the "naturalness" of an existing scene consisting of madness, crime, torture, seizure and murder, these mad "experts" PUT THE IDEAL SCENE SO FAR FROM REACH THAT IT APPEARED INCREDIBLE. It was so bad a situation that anyone proposing the ideal scene was actively resisted!

Yet the ideal scene is so easy to state that any citizen could have stated it at any time. And often believed it was occurring!

The ideal scene of an asylum would be people recovering in a calm atmosphere, restored to any previous ability, emerging competent and confident.

The ideal scene in the society would be, probably, a safe environment wherein one could happily make his way through life.

38

Of course, the technology of the mind was the missing data. But the experts in charge of that sector of life paid out hard cash to hoods to prevent any such technology developing-a matter fully documented.

The gap between the ideal scene and the existing scene can be very wide and in any endeavor elements exist that tend to prevent a total closure between the two.

However, approached on a gradient with skill and determination, it can be done.

DEPARTURE

The mental awareness that something is wrong with a scene is the point at which one can begin reverting to the ideal scene.

Without this awareness on the part of a GROUP then an individual can be much impeded in handling a situation.

The mental processes of the person seeking to improve things toward an ideal scene or change them back to an ideal scene must include those who are also parts of the scene.

Seeing something wrong without seeking to correct it degenerates into mere faultfinding and natter. This is about as far as many people go. That something, real or imagined, is wrong with the scene is a not uncommon state of mind. Not knowing what's intended or being done, or the limitations of resource or the magnitude and complexity of opposition, the armchair critic can be dreadfully unreal. He therefore tends to be suppressed, particularly by reactionaries (who try to keep it all as it is regardless).

Unfortunately, the continual battle of life then is between the critic and the reactionary. As this often blows up in pointless destruction, it can be seen there could be something wrong with both of them.

Particularly the inactive carping critic is at fault on three counts.

- A. He isn't doing anything about it.
- B. He is not conceiving or broadcasting a real ideal scene.
- C. He is not providing any gradient approach to actually attain an ideal scene.

The reactionary of course simply resists any change regardless of who is suffering providing the reactionary can retain what position and possession he may have.

A revolutionary of course usually

- 1. Is doing something about it even if violent.
- 2. Is conceiving and broadcasting his version of the ideal scene, and
- 3. Is planning and acting upon some means of bringing about his own ideascene.

History and "progress" seem to be the revolutionary making his version of progress over the dead bodies of reactionaries.

And although it may be history and "progress" the cycle is usually intensely destructive and ends up without attaining an ideal scene and also destroying any scene existing.

The ancient world is filled with ruins over which one can wander in contemplative and philosophic reverie. These attempts to make and maintain an ideal scene certainly left enough bruised masonry around.

So it is really not enough to natter and it's rather too much to thrust violent change down on the heads of one and all including the objectors.

39

Violent revolution comes about when the actual ideal scene has not been properly stated and when it excludes significant parts of the group.

It's no good having a revolution if the end product will be a FURTHER departure from the ideal scene.

The pastoral nonsense of Jean Jacques Rousseau was about as wide from an ideal scene as you could get, and it and other efforts, also wide, brought on the French Revolution.

The Russian 1917 revolution had already been preceded by the democratic Kerensky revolt. But it failed because Russia being Russia was about a century and a half late.

Also the French Revolution was late.

And in both cases those who should have led didn't. Lesser ranks overthrew command.

These and countless other human upheavals mark the fluttering pages of history and history will be written in similar vein again and again to eternity unless some sense and logic gets into the scene.

Revolt is only an expression of too long unattended departures from the ideal scene of society.

Usually the stitches taken to mend the growing social order are too weak and too hastily improvised to prevent the cultural fabric from being torn to rags.

Street battles and angry infantry are the direct opposite of the ideal political scene.

What was needed in such a case was an awareness of departure from the ideal scene, the discovery of WHY a departure occurred and a gradient, real and determined program to return the scene closer to the ideal.

The elements of improved mechanical arts and progress in the humanities may be utilized to effect the recovery. **In any event (which is missed by the** reactionary and his "good old days") cultures do change and those changes are a part of any new ideal scene. So one does not achieve a reversion to the ideal by turning back the clock. One must be bright enough to include improvements in a *new* ideal scene.

IDEAL SCENE AND PURPOSE

Let us look this over, this concept of the ideal scene, and see that it is not a very complex thing.

One doesn't have to be much of an expert to see what an ideal scene would be.

The complex parts of the whole may not make up the whole, but they are not really vital to conceiving an ideal scene for any activity, as small as a family or as big as a planet.

The entire concept of an ideal scene for any activity is really a clean statement of its PURPOSE.

All one has to ask is "What's the purpose of this?" and one will be able to work out what the ideal scene of "this" is.

To give a pedestrian example let us take a shoe shop. Its purpose is obviously to sell or provide people with shoes. The ideal scene is almost as simple as "This activity sells or provides people with shoes."

Now no matter how complex may be the business or economics of shoe sales, the fact remains that that is almost the ideal scene.

Only one factor is now missing: TIME.

The complete ideal scene of the shoe shop is then, "This activity is intended to provide people with shoes for (time)." It can be always or for its owner's lifetime or for the duration of the owner's stay in the town or the duration of the state fair.

Now we can see departures from the ideal scene of this shoe store.

One has to work out fairly correctly what the purpose of an activity is and how long it is to endure before one can make a statement of the ideal scene.

From this one can work out the complexities which compose the activity in order to establish it in the first place including the speed of the gradient (how much shoe store how fast) and also how to spot *the fact of* departure from the ideal scene.

This process would also work on any portion *of* the shoe store if the main ideal is not also violated. The children's department, the cashier, the stock clerk also have their sub-ideal scenes. And departures from *their* ideal scenes can be noted.

It doesn't matter what the activity is, large or small, romantic or humdrum, its ideal scene and its sub-ideal scenes are arrived at in the same way.

METHODS OF AWARENESS

Statistics are the only sound measure of any production or any job or any activity.

The moment that one goes into any dependence on opinion, he goes into quicksand and will *see too late* the fatal flaw in restoring anything.

If the fact that anything can be given *production* statistics seems too far out, it is visible that even a guard, who would at first glance seem to be producing nothing but giving only security, is actually producing minutes, hours, weeks, years, of continued production TIME.

Probably the most thoughtful exercise is not conceiving the ideal scene but working out what the production statistic of it is. For here, the activity or subactivity must be very correctly staticized to exactly measure the ideal scene of any activity or the statistic will itself bring about a departure!

Just as the purpose from which the ideal scene is taken must be correct, so must the statistic be all the more thoughtfully correct.

As an example, if the ideal scene of the shoe store is given the total statistic of its income then three things can happen:

1. It may cease to provide people with shoes that persuade them to come back for more.
2. It may sell shoes without enough profit to cover overhead and cease to exist.
3. It may conduct itself with more interest in the cashier than the customer and lose its trade.

Probably its statistic is "percentage of citizens in the area profitably shod by this store."

Working out how long it takes to wear out an average pair of shoes, any ex-customer would be retired from the percentage after that time span had elapsed from buying his last pair.

Given a fairly accurate and realistically updated census figure, that statistic would probably tell the tale of the ideal scene, which has its element of continuance.

The sole fixation on making money can depart from the scene. Abandonment of making any money would certainly cause a departure of the shoe store.

A commando battalion would have just as serious an examination for its ideal scene and statistic as a shoe store! And it would give a very, very effective activity if

Mmlr~

fully worked out. You'd really have to work out, probably better than the generals who think they have, the real purpose of a commando battalion (which is probably "to disperse enemy preparations by unexpected actions and overinvolve enemy manpower in expensive guarding"). The statistic could be something like "our individual soldiers freed from opponents" and/or "casualties not occurring by reason of interrupted enemy preparations."

In effect the commando battalion would be "producing." The results would be an effective increase in men under arms for their own side.

WHY

Knowing, then, the ideal scene and its statistic, one, by keeping the statistic, can notice without "reasonableness" or somebody's report or some fifth column propaganda, an immediate departure from the ideal scene.

Remember, violent change only becomes seemingly vital when the departure from the ideal scene is noticed too late .

Opinion, reports, subject to outpoints as they almost always are, seldom tell one more than somebody else's prejudices or his efforts to cover or failures to observe.

Now that a departure is seen (because the statistic drops) one can quickly go about noticing when and so get at WHY.

When he has the WHY of the departure he can proceed to handle it.

The statistic, guarded against false reports, and verified, is a clean statement not as subject to outpoints as other types of statements.

Whole activities have been smashed by not having a statistic of success but taking an opinion of trouble, and reversely, by having a statistic indicating disaster but a broadcast opinion of "great success." Probably the latter is the more frequent.

It is not possible to locate WHY the departure soon enough to remedy unless one takes the most reliable datum available-which is the datum most easily kept clean of outpoints-which is a statistic.

You don't really even know there is a Why unless there has been a departure. And the departure may be very hard to spot without a statistic.

I have seen a group producing like mad, doing totally great, but which had no statistic, become the subject of wild outpoints and even contempt within itself.

If an activity lacks an ideal scene and a correct statistic for it, it has no stable datum with which to rebuff opinion and outpoints. To that extent the group goes a bit mad.

Group sanity depends. then. upon an ideal scene. correct sub-ideal scenes and statistics to match.

One of the calmest safest groups around had a bad reputation with fellow groups because it did not have or make known its ideal scene and did not have or release its statistics.

And it had a hard time of it for quite a while, meantime working exhaustedly but dedicatedly.

Planet, nation, social groups, businesses, all their parts and the individual have their ideal scene and their statistic, their departures and successes and failures. And none fall outside these data.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sb.cden.nf Copyright © 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

42

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 6 JULY 1970

Remimeo

Data Series 13

IRRATIONALITY

Any and all irrationality is connected to departures from an ideal scene.

Therefore outpoints indicate departures.

It must follow then that rationality is connected to an ideal scene.

These three assumptions should be studied, observed and fully grasped.

They are very adventurous assumptions at first glance for if they are true then one has not only the definition of sanity in an organization or individual but also of neurosis and psychosis. One also sees that organizations or social groups or companies or any third dynamic (the urge to survival as a group) activity can be neurotic or psychotic.

It therefore would follow that the technology of the ideal scene, existing scene, departures, outpoints and statistics would contain or indicate the means of establishing sane groups or individuals or measuring their relative sanity or re-establishing relative sanity in them.

THE PLAGUE OF MAN

Man has been harassed by irrationality in individual and group conduct since there has been Man.

The existing scene of Man's activities is so immersed in departures and outpoints that at first survey there would seem to be no possible handling of the situation.

Most people have accepted the existing conditions as "inevitable" and toss them off with a "that's life."

This is of course an overwhelmed attitude.

And it is true that the departure from any ideal is so distant as to obscure any feeling of reality about possibly achieving an ideal scene even in a limited area.

Philosophies exist to "prove" that chaos is needful to furnish challenge. That is like saying "Be glad you're crazy" (as 19th century psychologists *did* say). Or "Suffering refines one," as the playwrights of the early 20th century so fondly used in their plots.

One whole religious order preached the necessity to accept Man as he is.

Thus Man is plagued with defeatism, has lacked technology, and civilization after civilization has succumbed, either in a flash of flame and war or in the slow erosion of grinding distress.

Most men, it has been said, live lives of quiet desperation.

One doesn't have to live through several wars to learn that Man and his leaders are something less than sane.

Every sword-waving conqueror has exploited Man's seeming inability to avoid brotherly slaughter and no conqueror or army seems to have noticed that wars only rarely shift boundaries no matter how many are killed. Europe for centuries has

43

excelled in the development of marble orchards and failed remarkably to establish any lasting political scene at all.

In other lands government leaders, who should have at least a partial duty of preserving their citizenry have sat raptly listening to the advice of madmen for some centuries now. US leaders lately have taken to acting on the mental health guidance of many civilian committees, each one of which contains at least one member of an organization directly connected to Russia! The country most interested in fomenting US civil commotion! A former head of CIA once cracked for a joke, "What if there were a Russian KGB agent inside CIAT" The shudder of horror that went through US politicians was interesting to see. Yet every new employee of CIA was "vetted" before employment by members of two organizations connected to Russia! The "American" Psychological Association and the "American" Psychiatric Association are directed by the World Federation of Mental Health founded by Brock Chisholm, the companion of Alger Hiss and Whittaker Chambers, the famous US communist traitors. And the US government pays the WFMH to hold congresses which are attended by Russian KGB delegates. And all intelligence given the President on Vietnam, where the US was "fighting communism" was passed through the hands of a man whose parents are both Russian born communists. And the US Defense Department intelligence on the same war was led and "coordinated" by another communist-connected employee.

With that many outpoints showing up in their social welfare and intelligence scene, the US government seems something less than bright in wondering, "What riots?" "Why drugs?" "Why defeats?"

The statistics of the US welfare and social scene under the domination of the World Federation of Mental Health are soaring insanity, crime and riot graphs. It is so bad that Russia will never have to fight an atomic war. The US economic, political and social scene will deteriorate and is deteriorating so rapidly that the US will have lost any will to fight or any economic or social power to resist Russia.

(In case you wonder as to the factualness of data given above, it is all documented.)

I have given this existing scene so that you can see the outpoints. The deteriorated state of public safety in the US is well known. The fantastic sums it spends are well known.

I have given visible outpoints.

One glance at psychiatric and psychological statistics (which are all negative) would tell any sane person that they must be doing something else as they were given all the money, political power and authority ever needed to handle the scene. But it got worse! So, checking the scene for outpoints, one finds them directly connected to the No. 1 US enemy. Their data is marvellous for outpoints. Paid to serve the US, their literature discusses mainly abolishing boundaries and the Constitution.

The US official, so drowned in the chatter and confusion of double-talk and false intelligence and situation reports, apparently cannot see any solution. And heaps money on his traitors and finances their avid destruction of the country.

Yet, outpoints are so many and so visible that even the citizen sees them while the official remains apparently numb and inactive.

Very well, Man can and does get drowned in his own irrationality. And his civilizations rise and fall.

Man's primary plague is irrationality. He is not in the grip of a "death wish," nor is he having a love affair with destruction. He has just lacked any road out or the technology to put him on it.

RESOLVING THE SCENE

All the US would have to do is count up the outpoints, look at the statistics, drop their passionate affair with Russian psychiatry, conceive an ideal scene of a productive America, re-channel welfare monies into decent public works to give people jobs and

44

improve productivity per capita, knock off foreign funds and wars, give the money to increasing the value of American resources and even now the US would become all right. National production would catch up with destructive inflation, money would return to value and an ideal national scene would be approached. Even the military-industrial clique would be happy making bulldozers instead of tanks and youth would have a future in sight instead of a foreign-made grave. The odd part of it is, even the Senate and House would vote for such a program as their own statistic today is how much federal money can they bring home to their own states.

The only ones that would resist are the people who are the ones causing the above outpoints and who knowingly or unknowingly serve other masters than the US. And that's a simple security problem after all.

I have put the example on a large canvas just to show that the steps of handling departures are the same for all situations large or great.

When done this way, by the steps mentioned in the Data Series, big situations can be analyzed as well as little ones.

Available resources and all that play a part in getting the solution into effect. But the cost in time and action of the original effort to introduce the cycle of reversion to an ideal scene is not anywhere near as costly as *letting the departure continue*.

The EASIER thing to do in all cases is to work out the ideal scene, survey the existing scene for outpoints, work out statistics that *should* exist, find out WHY the departure, program a gradient solution back to the ideal, settle the practical aspects of it and go about it.

LOSING ONE'S WAY

One's direction is lost to the degree one fails to work out the ideal scene.

It is so easy to toss off an "ideal scene" that is not *the* ideal scene that one can begin with a false premise.

As he tries to work with an incorrect "ideal scene" for an activity he may fail and grow discouraged without recognizing that he is already working with an omitted datum—the *real* ideal scene for that activity.

This is a major reason one can lose one's way in handling a situation.

Also in trying to find a WHY of departure one may refuse to admit that something he himself did was the reason for the departure-or why the ideal scene never took place. It requires quite a bit of character to recognize one's own errors; it is much easier to find them in a neighbor. Thus one may choose the wrong WHY, for this and other reasons.

Failures to examine the scene, reasonableness which causes blindness to the obvious, errors of penetration and defensive reasons not to admit it all impede a proper analysis.

The existing scene may be missing in one's view because one doesn't really look at it or because one has no correct ideal scene for it.

Many would rather blame or justify than be honest. Others would rather criticize than work.

But this all adds up to outpoints in the examination itself.

If one keeps at it one will however arrive at the right answers with regard to any scene.

BUILDING THE IDEAL SCENE

To suppose one can instantly hit upon an ideal scene for any activity without further test is to be very fond of one's own prejudices.

45

There is however a test of whether you have the ideal scene or not.

Can you staticize it?

Strangely, but inevitably, since we live in the physical universe where there is both time and association of beings with beings and the physical universe and the physical universe with itself, there is a production-consumption factor in all living.

There seems to be a ratio between producing and consuming, and establishing it would probably resolve that strange subject, economics, as well as social welfare and other things.

It seems to be fatal to consume without producing. Many social observations teach us this.

Evidently one cannot, at the physical universe level, produce without consuming. And it seems that it is destructive to produce only and consume too little. One can produce far more than one consumes. apparently, but cannot consume far more than one produces.

This seems to be true of groups.

Some dreamers puffing on a hash pipe of unreality believe one can really be happy producing nothing and consuming everything. The idyllic ideal of a paradise where no one produces has been tried.

In interviewing secretaries in New York I found the larger percentage had the personal ideal scene of "marrying a millionaire." Aside from there not being that many millionaires, the dream of idle luxury forever was so far from any possible ideal scene that it was busy ruining their lives and giving their current male escorts a life of critical hell. One, having married a boy who was fast on the road to becoming a millionaire, was so dissatisfied with him not being one right now that she ruined his life and hers.

In short, it sounds nice, but having met a few who *did* marry millionaires, I can attest that they were either not producing and failing as beings or were working themselves half to death.

These no-production dreams, like the harp in heaven, lead at best to suicidal boredom. Yet Madison Avenue's ads would have one believe that one and all should own all manner of cloth, wood and metal just to be alive.

A whole civilization can break down, flop, on propaganda of no-production, total consumption. The sweat that flies off a "workers' paradise" would rival the Mississippi!

There is some sort of balanced ratio and it favors apparently, for pride and life and happiness, higher production of *something* than consumption. When it gets too unbalanced in *values*, something seems to happen.

The unhappiness and tumult in current society is oddly current with the Keynesian economic theory of creating want. It's a silly theory and has lately become to be abandoned. But it was in vogue forty years or more, as I recall. It produced the "welfare era" of the psychiatrist and the total slavery of the taxpayer!

So, whatever the economics of it, an ideal scene apparently *has* to have a statistic or the whole thing caves in, either from lack of continuity in time, from disinterest, or from plain lack of supply.

Death is possibly, could be in part, a cessation of interested production.

Hard pressed, a living being dreams of some free time. Give him too much and he begins to crave action and will go into production and if blocked from doing so will tend to cave in. Loss of a job depresses people way out of proportion and subsequent declines often trace back to it.

Destructive activities carry their own self-death. The state of veterans after wars is not always traced to wounds or privation. Destructive acts put a brand on a man.

46

Some of this is answered by the absence of production.

IDEAL SCENE AND STAT

Whatever the facts and economic rules may be about production and the ideal scene, it would seem to be the case, sufficient at least for our purposes, that this rule holds good:

THE CORRECTLY STATED IDEAL SCENE WILL HAVE A PRODUCTION STATISTIC.

The way one defines "production" in this is not necessarily so many things made on an assembly line. That's an easy one.

It isn't just pairs of shoes. Production can be defined as the regulation or safeguarding of it, the planning or the designing of it, a lot, lot, lot of things.

A stat is a positive numerical thing that can be accurately counted and graphed on a two-dimensional thing.

To test the correctness of an ideal scene, one should be able to assign it a correct statistic.

If one can't figure out a statistic for it, then it probably is an incorrectly stated ideal scene and will suffer from departures.

Wrong stats assigned the ideal scene will wreck it. A wrongly conceived ideal scene will derail the activity quickly.

To understand something it is necessary to have a datum of comparable magnitude. To understand logic one needs to be able to establish what is illogic. One then has two things for comparison.

The ideal scene can be compared to an existing scene. This is one way to establish the ideal scene. But both need a factor to keep them in reality.

To test the ideal scene for correctness one needs to be able to formulate its statistic.

The exercise of testing the statement of the ideal scene, to keep it real and not airy-fairy and unattainable, is to work out a realistic stat for it.

One can go back and forth between the statistic and the stated ideal scene, adjusting one, then the other until one gets an attainable statistic that really does measure the validity of the stated ideal scene.

A statistic is a tight reality, a stable point. which is to measure any departure from the ideal scene.

In setting a statistic one has to outguess all efforts to falsify it (predict possible outpoints in collecting it) and has to see if following the statistic would mislead anyone from the ideal scene.

So let's walk back to the shoe store.

Test statement of ideal scene: to make money.

Test statistic: pairs of shoes sold.

Now if you tried to marry up those two you'd get a prompt catastrophe. The potential departure would be immediate.

We sell shoes at no profit to raise the stat, we make no money. We try only to make money, we sell cheap shoes at high cost and our customers don't come back and we don't make money.

So those two are both no good.

47

Departure would occur, indeed it already exists right in the badly worked out ideal scene and the stat.

Test ideal scene: Cobblers are entitled to the shoes they make.

Test statistic: how many shoes cobbler makes.

So that's loopy!

Test ideal scene: all citizens furnished with shoes.

Test statistic: number of shoes given away.

Well, that's bonkers for a shoe *store* in any economic set-up. The citizens for sure would have no shoes once the shoe store was empty, for if everything is *given* away, who'd raise cows for hides or drive nails in soles unless he had a gun held on him so what workers' paradise is this? Slave state for sure. So that's no ideal scene for a shoe store no matter how "ideal" it looks to a do-gooder. Too airy-fairy. Since no shoes would exist to be given away.

Test ideal scene: shoes for any worker who has coupons.

Test statistic: number of coupons collected.

Well, maybe. In some society. But can the shoe store get shoes for the coupons? Maybe if there's enough economic police.

But then this would have to be a monopoly shoe store and the quality would not be a factor,

So this must be an army quartermaster depot or a state monopoly. If no incentive were needed it would work. Sure would be hard on the corns but it would barely work. Rather insecure though.

But this is a shoe *store* where people buy.

Test ideal scene: to provide workers with good shoes that can be replaced from suppliers.

Test statistic: ??? Number of shoes from suppliers given to workers Happy workers. . . . ??? Amount of control that can be exerted on suppliers ??? Ah. Number of shoes supplied well-shod workers.

Okay, that's a QM depot. Now what's a shoe *store*?

And we probably get what was given in an earlier example:

Ideal scene: to provide people with shoes and continue in business for owner's lifetime.

Statistic: percentage of citizens in area profitably shod by this store.

But even this would need to be played back and forth. And if this shoe store was in a socialist country both might require amendment. And if it was in a beach resort thronged with tourists who were also mostly foreigners the ideal scene and statistic would suffer an immediate **departure and the store would fail, crash if the ideal** scene were not correctly stated and the statistic real. The class of tourist would have a bearing on it.

Maybe the state has currency control demands on shopkeepers and requires them to get in foreign currency or no new stock!

Thus You could get:

Ideal scene: engendering acquisitiveness for novelty footwear made in this country.

Statistic: pairs of gift shoes bought by foreigners.

48

That sure would shift the whole atmosphere of the store!

Thus one plays the ideal scene against the statistic.

Maybe one can't find any ideal scene for the activity and no statistic of any significance to anyone. Could be that the activity is totally worthless even to oneself as a hobby. Although this opens the door to cynicism or a lazy way of not doing anything about anything, it just could be. Even a "reporter" who writes nothing could have an ideal scene and statistic. But it would have to be really real even then. Like,

Ideal scene: unsuspected as a spy while accepted as a "reporter."

Statistic: cash collected for reports undetectedly delivered to my government.

If that seems unreal as a scene the staff of *TIME* magazine recently held a mass meeting protesting the use of *TIME* credentials for government spying. "Nobody will talk to us anymore," the staff of that dying WFMH mouthpiece wept.

So anything could have an ideal scene, even a police state.

Idealism has nothing to do with it.

VIABLE

The word "viable" means capable of living, able to live in a particular climate or atmosphere.

Life over a period of time requires VIABILITY, or the ability to survive.

Any organism or any group or any part of a group must have a potential of survival. It must be viable-life-able.

This is true of any ideal scene. The statistic measures directly the relative survival potential of the organism or its part.

This tells you the plain fact that life contains the essential purpose of living, no matter how many misguided philosophers or generals may decree otherwise.

The planetary population is now not fully viable since weapons exist capable of making it a billiard ball at the whim of some madman.

The potential survival of the whole is of course an influence and limitation on its parts.

Men who live "only for self" don't live.

An organism or group can live a dangerous life in that it risks its survival. But is more of a threat than its enemies if it does not know or adjust its ideal scene.

A military company, told on posters the ideal scene is all brag in the bar with girls on each arm, who find in fact that their actual scene is military police outside every bar with clubs and a real short life under the orders of sadistically disinterested and inexpert government, is presented with an instantly visible departure.

The government believed such posters were needful to get recruits and did not realize that a truthfully stated scene and an effort to promote survival to commanders would also have recruited and conscription needn't be resorted to as the end product of lies.

Men will become part of the most onerous and dangerous groups imaginable providing the purpose is there and stated and they have a chance of survival.

The ideal scene of a nation worshipping death is that of a nation that will not survive anyway. At least not as that nation.

A group or an organism must be viable. The state is relative to the time the group needs to live to accomplish its purpose.

49

Each part of a group, in any ideal scene, should contribute viability to the whole group.

Production of something is mandatory on any part of a group if the group is to be fully viable.

Painting, writing, music, all have positive roles in a society. So productivity, as is viability, can be seen as a very broad inclusive term.

The sub purposes of any group make up the sub-ideal scene of its various parts.

In other words each part of a broad group has its own ideal scene and its own statistic.

These combined bring about the broad group's ideal scene.

The statistics each lead to viability of the part and then the whole group.

In reverse, with so many parts of a planet desirous of extinguishing so many other parts, the viability of the planet becomes questionable.

In an organization each part has its own ideal scene and its own statistic on up to the main ideal scene and the main statistic.

In practice one works back from the ideal scene of the group into its smallest part, so that all lesser ideal scenes and lesser statistics mount up to and bring about the main ideal scene and statistic.

Examining the lesser ideal scenes and statistics, one can find outpoints first in how the whole thing is organized and then the main ideal scene and the statistics and how the lesser ones bring it about.

Dominant is the viability of the whole. Where any part does not support total viability it is an outpoint. Contributive is the viability of each part and cohesive is the scheme in which the lesser ideal scenes and the lesser statistics bring about the BIG ideal scene and the BIG statistic. If this does not occur the nonsupportive lesser ideal scene or statistic is an outpoint.

Groups that falter have to have all this restudied. As departures *did* occur, the organization itself, as part of any action, must be reexamined against experience and new greater and lesser ideal scenes and statistics must be worked out for it and put into use.

Agreement of the group is a necessary ingredient as many reformers have learned, often too late, and as many groups have seen, also generally too late.

The trick is to correct the ideal scene and statistic and all lesser ones of the group while it is still alive.

After that one can have better dependence upon them and keep the statistics up and the purpose going forward.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sb.rd.nf Copyright c 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

50

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 JULY 1970

Remimeo

Data Series 14

WORKING AND MANAGING

By actual experience in working and managing in many activities I can state flatly that the most dangerous worker-manager thing to do is to work or manage from something else than statistics.

Interpersonal relations with many strata of many societies in many lands with many activities demonstrates plainly that Man's largest and most unjust fault consists wholly of acting on opinion.

Opinions can be as varied as the weather in Washington, all on the same subject. When one says "opinion" one is dealing with that morass of false reports and prejudices which make up the chaos of current social orders.

Some seek an answer in status. "If one has STATUS one is safe" is about as frail as a house of cards. Ask some recently deposed dictator or yesterday's idol what his status was worth. Yet many work exclusively for status. In Spain it is enough to have an executive *degree*. One doesn't have to do any executing. Work at it? Caramba no!

In capitalisms it is enough to be an heir and in communisms it is only necessary to be the son of a commissar. Work? Nyet.

Revolts are protests against idle status. Where are the kings of yesteryear?

Riding along on the last generation's statistics is as fatal as a diet of thin air.

Undeserved status is a false statistic. Nothing is more bitterly resented, unless it is a statistic earned without status by those who live by status alone!

William Stieber, the most skilled intelligence chief of the 19th century, who won the Franco-Prussian war for Bismarck, was hated by German officers because he was not a proper officer but a civilian!

When German officers took over German intelligence they lost two wars in a row and the caste is very unlamentedly dead.

So long as "character" can be reviled, so long as "opinion" is used, so long as governments run on rumors and false reports, the social scene will continue to be a mess.

You will not believe it but governments think newspaper stories are "public opinion." One US President was astounded to be given a wildly enthusiastic public reception at an airport. The press had been hammering him for a year and the poor fellow thought it was "public opinion." Texts on public relations remark this strange governmental fixation on believing the press.

That means all a nation's enemies have to do is bribe or hire some underpaid reporters or sernibankrupt publishers, and voila! it can steer the government any way it wishes!

Do a survey on any personality or subject and the conflicts in opinion are revealed as fantastic.

Seven witnesses to one street accident will even give seven conflicting accounts.

Thus this whole field of "opinion" and "reports" is a quicksand endangering both personal repute and management skill.

It is so bad that wars and revolutions stem directly from the use of opinion and the neglect of statistics.

In a chaos it is necessary to set up one point or terminal which is stable before one can really decide anything much less get anything done.

51

A statistic is such a stable point. One can proceed from it and use it to the degree that it is a correct statistic.

One can detect then, when things start to go wrong well before they crash.

Using opinion or random rumors or reports one can go very wrong indeed. In fact, using these without knowing the statistics one can smash a life or crash a group.

The US Navy operates on the social attainments and civilized behavior of their people.

- naval officer is promoted on the basis of his amiability and the social skill of his wife!
- clerk is promoted because he marries the boss's daughter.
- governor is elected because he could play a guitar!

This is a whirlwind of chaos because of the falseness of the statistics used.

So the stat used is itself an outpost in each case. PREDICTION

Outpoints are more than useful in prediction.

The whole reason one does a data analysis and a situation analysis is to predict.

The biggest outpost would be a missing ideal scene, the next biggest would be a correct statistic for it.

If these are missing then prediction can become a matter of telling fortunes with bamboo sticks.

One predicts in order to continue the viability of an organism, an individual, a group, an organization, a state or nation or planet, or to estimate the future of anything.

The more outpoints the less future.

A disaster could be said to be a totality of outpoints in final and sudden culmination.

This gives one a return to chaos.

The closer one approaches a disaster the more outpoints will turn up. Thus the more outpoints that turn up the closer one is approaching a disaster.

When the outpoints are overwhelming a condition of **death is approached**.

By being able to predict, the organism or individual **or group can correct the** outpoints before disaster occurs.

Each sphere of activity has its own prediction.

A group of different activities with a common goal can be predicted by the outpoints turning up in parts of the general activity.

In theory if all parts of a main group or organization had an ideal scene for each, a statistic and an intense interest in maintaining the ideal scene and statistic of each part, the survival would be infinite.

Any group or organism or individual is somewhat interdependent upon its neighbors, on other groups and individuals. It cannot however put them right unless it itself has reached some acceptable level of approach to its ideal scenes.

The conflict amongst organisms, individuals and groups does not necessarily add up to "the survival of the fittest," whatever that meant. It does however mean that in such conflict the

best chance of survival goes to the individual, organism or group that best approaches and maintains its ideal scene, lesser ideal scenes, statistic and lesser statistics.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sb.ntm.nf Copyright © 1970,1974 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

52

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 8 AUGUST 1970

Remimeo

Data Series 15

WRONG TARGET

There is an additional specific outpoint.

It is WRONG TARGET.

This means in effect AN INCORRECT SELECTION OF AN OBJECTIVE TO ATTEMPT OR ATTACK.

Example: Josie Ann has been sitting in the house reading. Her brother Oscar has been playing ball in the yard. A window breaks. Josie Ann's mother rushes into the room, sees Josie Ann and the ball on the floor, spans Josie Ann.

This outpoint contains the element, amongst other things of injustice.

There is another version of this:

Example: A firm has its premises flooded. The manager promptly insists on buying fire insurance.

Example: The people of Yangville are starving due to food scarcity in the land. The premier borrows 65 million pounds to build a new capital and palace.

Example: The government is under attack and riot and civil disorder spreads. The government officials campaign to put down all "rightists" for trying to establish law and order.

Example: A man is beaten and robbed on the main street of a town. The police demand to know why he was there and put him in jail for a long period of investigation.

Example: The multibillion dollar drug cartels push out 65 tons of habit-forming hard drugs. A government campaigns against cigarettes.

Example: A boy wants to be an accountant. His family forces him to join the army as a career.

It is noted that the very insane often attack anyone who seeks to help them.

This outpoint is **very fundamental** as an illogic and is very useful.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:rr.rd.nf Copyright © 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 19 SEPTEMBER 1970

Issue I

Remimeo

Executive Hats

Ethics Hats

Data Series 16

INVESTIGATORY PROCEDURE

Correction of things which are not wrong and neglecting things which are not right puts the tombstone on any org or civilization.

In auditing when one reviews or "corrects" a case that is running well, one has trouble. It *is made* trouble.

Similarly on the third dynamic, correcting situations which do not exist and neglecting situations which do exist can destroy a group.

All this boils down to CORRECT INVESTIGATION. It is not a slight skill. It is THE basic skill behind any intelligent action.

SUPPRESSIVE JUSTICE

When justice goes astray (as it usually does) the things that have occurred are

1. Use of justice for some other purpose than public safety (such as maintaining a privileged group or indulging a fixed idea) **or**

2. Investigatory procedure.

All suppressive use of the forces of justice can be traced back to one or the other of these.

Aberrations and hate very often find outlet by calling them "justice" or "law and order." This is why it can be said that Man cannot be trusted with justice.

This or just plain stupidity brings about a neglect of intelligent investigatory procedures. Yet all third dynamic sanity depends upon correct and unaberrated investigatory procedures. Only in that way can one establish causes of things. And only by establishing causes can one cease to be the effect of unwanted situations.

It is one thing to be able to observe. It is quite another to utilize observations so that one can get to the basis of things.

SEQUENCES

Investigations become necessary in the face of outpoints or pluspoints.

Investigations can occur out of idle curiosity or particular interest. They can also occur to locate the cause of pluspoints.

Whatever the motive for investigation the action itself is conducted by sequences.

If one is incapable mentally of tracing a series of events or actions, one cannot investigate.

Altered sequence is a primary block to investigation.

54

At first glance, omitted data would seem to be the block. On the contrary, it is the end product of an investigation and is what pulls an investigation along-one is looking for omitted data.

An altered sequence of actions defeats any investigation. Examples: We will hang him and then conduct a trial. We will assume who did it and then find evidence to prove it. A crime should be provoked to find who commits them.

Any time an investigation gets back to front, it will not succeed.

Thus if an investigator himself has any trouble with seeing or visualizing sequences of actions he will inevitably come up with the wrong answer.

Reversely, when one sees that someone has come up with a wrong or incomplete answer one can assume that the investigator has trouble with sequences of events or, of course, did not really investigate.

One can't really credit that Sherlock Holmes would say "I have here the fingerprint of Mr. Murgatroyd on the murder weapon. Have the police arrest him. Now, Watson, hand me a magnifying glass and ask Sgt. Doherty to let us look over his fingerprint files."

If one cannot visualize a series of actions, like a ball bouncing down a flight of stairs or if one cannot relate in proper order several different actions with one object into a proper sequence, he will not be able to investigate.

If one can, that's fine.

But any drilling with attention-shifting drills will improve one's ability to visualize sequences. Why? Stuck attention or attention that cannot confront alike will have trouble in visualizing sequences.

INVESTIGATIONS

In HCO Policy Letter I I May 1965 Ethics Officer Hat, HCO Policy Letter I Sept 1965 **Issue VII**, HCO Policy Letter I Feb 1966 Issue 11 and pages 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the *Manual of Justice*, the subject of investigation as applied to justice is given.

It will be noted that these are *sequences* of actions.

Neglect of these items or a failure to know and follow them led here and there to suppressive uses of justice or to permitting orgs to be suppressed by special interest groups in the society.

Indeed, had these been in and followed we would have had a great deal less trouble than we did.

But investigation is not monopolized by law and order.

All betterment of life depends on finding out pluspoints and why and reenforcing them, locating outpoints and why and eradicating them.

This is the successful survival pattern of living. A primitive who is going to survive does just that and a scientist who is worth anything does just that.

The fisherman sees seagulls clustering over a point on the sea. That's the beginning of a short sequence, point No. 1. He predicts a school of fish, point No. 2. He sails over as sequence point No. 3. He looks down as sequence point No. 4. He sees fish as point No. 5. He gets out a net as point No. 6.

He circles the school with the net, No. 7. He draws in the net, No. 8. He brings the fish on board, No. 9. He goes to port, No. 10.

55

He sells the fish, No. 11. That's following a pluspoint-cluster of seagulls.

A sequence from an outpoint might be: Housewife serves dinner. Nobody eats the cake, No. 1, she tastes it, No. 2, she recognizes soap in it, No. 3. She goes to kitchen, No. 4. She looks into cupboard, No. 5. She finds the soap box upset, No. 6. She sees the flour below it, No. 7. She sees cookie jar empty, No. 8. She grabs young son, No. 9. She shows him the set-up, No. 10. She gets a confession, No. 11. And No. 12 is too painful to describe.

Unsuccessful investigators think good fish catches are sent by God and that when cake tastes like soap it is fate. They live in unsuccessful worlds of deep mystery.

They also hang the wrong people

DISCOVERY

All discoveries are the end product of a sequence of investigatory actions that begin with either a pluspoint or an outpoint.

Thus all knowledge proceeds from pluspoints or outpoints observed.

And all knowledge depends on an ability to investigate.

And all investigation is done in correct sequence.

And all successes depend upon the ability to do these things.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sb.rd.nf Copyright c 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

56

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 19 SEPTEMBER 1970

Issue 11

Remimeo

Data Series 17

NARROWING THE TARGET

When you look at a broad field or area it is quite overwhelming to have to find a small sector that might be out.

The lazy and popular way is to generalize "They're all coniuised." "The organization is rickety." "They're doing great."

That's all very well but it doesn't get you much of anywhere.

The way to observe so as to find out what to observe is by discarding areas.

This in fact was the system I used to make the discoveries which became Dianetics and Scientology.

It was obvious to me that it would take a few million years to examine all of life to find out what made it what it was.

The first step was the tough one. I looked for a common denominator that was true for all life forms. I found they were attempting to survive.

With this datum I outlined all areas of wisdom or knowledge and discarded those which had not much assisted Man to survive.

This threw away all but scientific methodology, so I used that for investigatory procedure.

Then, working with that, found mental image pictures. And working with them, found the human spirit as different from them.

By following up the workable one arrived at the processing actions which, if applied, work, resulting in the increase of ability and freedom.

By following up the causes of destruction one arrived at the points which had to be eradicated.

This is of course short-handing the whole cycle enormously. But that is the general outline.

Survival has been isolated as a common denominator to successful actions and succumb has been found as the common denominator of unsuccessful actions. So one does not have to reestablish these.

From there, to discover anything bad or good, all one has to do is discard sterile areas to get a target necessary for investigation.

One looks broadly at the whole scene. Then discards sections of it that would seem unrewarding. He will then find himself left with the area that contains the key to it.

This is almost easier done than described.

Example: One has the statistics of a nine division org. Eight are normal. One isn't. So he investigates the area of that one. In investigating the one he discards all normal bits. He is left with the abnormal one that is the key.

This is true of something bad or something good.

A wise boy who wanted to get on in life would discard all the men who weren't getting on and study the one who was. He would come up with something he could use as a key.

57

A farmer who wanted to handle a crop menace would disregard all the plants doing all right and study the one that wasn't. Then, looking carefully he would disregard all the should be's in that plant and wind up with the shouldn't be. He'd have the key.

Sometimes in the final look one finds the key not right there but way over somewhere else.

The boy, studying the successful man, finds he owed his success to having worked in a certain bank seven states away from there.

The farmer may well find his hired man let the pigs out into the crop.

But both got the reason why by the same process of discarding wider zones.

Pluspoints or outpoints alike take one along a sequence of discoveries.

Once in a purple moon they mix or cross.

Example: Gross income is up. One discards all normal stats. Aside from gross income being up only one other stat is down-new names. Investigation shows that the public executives were off post all week on a tour and that was what raked in the money. Conclusion-send out tours as well as man the public divisions.

Example: Upset is coming from the camp kitchen. Obvious outpoints. Investigation discloses a 15-year-old cook holding the job solo for 39 field hands! Boy is he pluspoint. Get him some help!

DRAWN ATTENTION

Having attention dragged into an area is about the way most people "investigate." This puts them at effect throughout.

When a man is not predicting he is often subjected to outpoints that leap up at him. Conversely when outpoints leap up at one unexpectedly he knows he better do more than gape at them. He is already behindhand in investigating. Other signs earlier existed which were disregarded.

ERRORS

The usual error in viewing situations is not to view them widely enough to begin with.

One gets a despatch which says Central Files don't exist.

By now keeping one's attention narrowly on that, one can miss the whole scene.

To just order Central Files put back in may fail miserably. One has been given a single observation. It is merely an outpoint: Central Files omitted.

There is no WHY.

You follow up "no CF" and you may find the Registrar is in the Public Division and Letter Registrars never go near a file and the category of everyone in CF is just ---beentested." You really investigate and you find there's no HCO Exec Sec or Dissem Sec and there hasn't been one for a year.

The cycle of "outpoint, correct, outpoint, correct, outpoint, correct" will drown one rapidly and improve nothing! But it sure makes a lot of useless work and worry.

WISDOM

Wisdom is not a fixed idea.

It is knowing how to use your wits.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sb.rd.nf Copyright v 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

58

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 19 SEPTEMBER 1970

Issue III

Remimeo

Data Series 18

SUMMARY OF OUTPOINTS

OMITTED DATA

An omitted anything is an outpoint.

This can be an omitted person, terminal, object, energy, space, time, form, sequence, or even an omitted scene. Anything that *can* be omitted that *should* be there is an outpoint.

This is easily the most overlooked outpoint as it isn't there to directly attract attention.

On several occasions I have found situation analyses done which arrived at no WHY that would have made handling possible but which gave a false Why that would have upset things if used. In each case the outpoint that held the real clue was this one of an omitted something. In a dozen cases it was omitted personnel each time. One area to which orders were being issued had no one in it at all. Others were undermanned, meaning people were missing. In yet another case there were no study materials at all. In two other cases the whole of a subject was missing in the area. Yet no one in any of these cases had spotted the fact that it was an omitted something that had caused a whole activity to decay. **People were working frantically** to remedy the general situation. None of them noticed the omissions that were the true cause of the decay.

In crime it is as bad to omit as it is to commit. Yet no one seems to notice the omissions as actual crimes.

Man, trained up in the last century to be a stimulus-response animal, responds to the there-nesses and doesn't respond as uniformly to not-there-nesses.

This opens the door to a habit of deletion or shortening which can become quite compulsive.

In any analysis which fails to discover a WHY one can safely conclude the Why is an omission and look for things that *should* be there and aren't.

ALTERED SEQUENCE

Any things, events, objects, sizes, in a wrong sequence is an outpoint.

The number series 3, 7, 1, 2, 4, 6, 5 is an altered sequence, or an incorrect sequence.

Doing step two of a sequence of actions before doing step one can be counted on to tangle any sequence of actions.

The basic outness is no sequence at all. This leads into FIXED IDEAS. It also shows up in what is called disassociation, an insanity. Things connected to or similar to each other are not seen as consecutive. Such people also jump about subjectwise without relation to an obvious sequence. Disassociation is the extreme case where things that are related are not seen to be and things that have no relation are conceived to have.

Sequence means linear (in a line) travel either through space or time or both.

59

A sequence that should be one and isn't is an outpoint.

A "sequence" that isn't but is thought to be one is an outpoint.

A cart-before-the-horse out of sequence is an outpoint.

One's hardest task sometimes is indicating an inevitable sequence into the future that is invisible to another. This is a consequence. "If you saw off the limb you are sitting on you will of course fall." Police try to bring this home often to people who have no concept of sequence; so the threat of punishment works well on well-behaved citizens and not at all on criminals since they often are criminals because they can't think in sequence-they are simply fixated. "If you kill a man you will be hanged," is an indicated sequence. A murderer fixated on revenge cannot think in sequence. One has to think in sequences to have correct sequences.

Therefore it is far more common than one would at first imagine to see altered sequences since persons who do not think in sequence do not see altered sequences in their own actions or areas.

Visualizing sequences and drills in shifting attention can clean this up and restore it as a faculty.

Motion pictures and TV were spotted by a recent writer as fixating attention and not permitting it to travel. Where one had TV raised children, it would follow, one possibly would have people with a tendency to altered sequences or no sequences at all.

DROPPED TIME

Time that should be noted and isn't would be an outpoint of "dropped time."

It is a special case of an omitted datum.

Dropped time has a peculiarly ferocious effect that adds up to utter lunacy.

A news bulletin from 1814 and one from 1922 read consecutively without time assigned produces otherwise undetectable madness.

A summary report of a situation containing events strung over half a year without saying so can provoke a reaction not in keeping with the current scene.

In madmen the present is the dropped time, leaving them in the haunted past. Just telling a group of madmen to "come up to present time" will produce a few miraculous "cures." And getting the date of an ache or pain will often cause it to vanish.

Time aberrations are so strong that dropped time well qualifies as an outpoint.

FALSEHOOD

When you hear two facts that are contrary, one is a falsehood or both are.

Propaganda and other activities specialize in falsehoods and provoke great disturbance.

Willful or unintentional a falsehood is an outpoint. It may be a mistake or a calculated or defensive falsehood and it is still an outpoint.

A false anything qualifies for this outpoint. A false being, terminal, act, intention, anything that seeks to be what it isn't is a falsehood and an outpoint.

Fiction that does not pretend to be anything else is of course not a falsehood.

So the falsehood means "other than it appears" or "other than represented."

One does not have to concern oneself to define philosophic truth or reality to see that something stated or modeled to be one thing is in actual fact something else and therefore an outpoint.

ALTERED IMPORTANCE

An importance shifted from its actual relative importance, up or down, is an outpoint.

Something can be assigned an importance greater than it has.

Something can be assigned an importance less than it has.

A number of things of different importances can be assigned a monotone of importance.

These are all outpoints, three versions of the same thing.

All importances are relative to their actuality.

WRONG TARGET

Mistaken objective wherein one believes he is or should be reaching toward A and finds he is or should be reaching toward B is an outpoint.

This is commonly mistaken identity. It is also mistaken purposes or goals.

If we tear down X we will be okay often results in disclosure that it should have been Y.

" Removing the slums" to make way for modern shops kills the tourist industry. Killing the king to be free from taxation leaves the tax collector alive for the next regime.

Injustice is usually a wrong target outpoint.

Arrest the drug consumer, award the drug company would be an example.

Military tactics and strategy are almost always an effort to coax the selection of a wrong target by the enemy.

And most dislikes and spontaneous hates in human relations are based on mistaken associations of Bill for Pete.

A large sum of aberration is based on wrong targets, wrong sources, wrong causes.

Incorrectly tell a patient he has ulcers when he hasn't and he's hung with an outpoint which impedes recovery.

The industry spent on wrong objectives would light the world for a millennium.

SUMMARY

These are the fundamental outpoints required in data analysis and situation analysis.

They have one infinity of variation. They should be very well known to anyone seeking **third** dynamic sanity.

They are the basic illogics.

And while there may be others, these will serve.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sb.rd.nf Copyright © 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 13 OCTOBER 1970

Issue 11

Remimeo

Data Series 19

THE REAL WHY

"WHY" as used in logic is subject to noncomprehension.

WHY = that basic outness found which will lead to a recovery of stats.

WRONG WHY = the incorrectly identified outness which when applied does not lead to recovery.

A MERE EXPLANATION = a "Why" given as THE Why that does not open the door to any recovery.

Example: A mere explanation: "The stats went down because of rainy weather that week." So? So do we now turn off rain? Another mere explanation: "The staff became overwhelmed that week." An order saying "Don't overwhelm staff" would be the possible "solution" of some manager. BUT THE STATS WOULDN'T RECOVER.

The *real* WHY when found and corrected leads straight back to improved stats.

- wrong Why, corrected, will further depress stats.
- mere explanation does nothing at all and decay continues.

Here is a situation as it is followed up:

The stats of an area were down. Investigation disclosed there had been sickness 2 weeks before. The report came in: "The stats were down because people were sick." This was a mere explanation. Very reasonable. But it solved nothing. What do we do now? Maybe we accept this as the correct Why. And give an order, "All people in the area must get a medical exam and unhealthy workers will not be accepted and unhealthy ones will be fired." As it's a correction to a wrong Why, the stats *really* crash. So that's not it. Looking further we find the real WHY. In the area there is no trained-in org bd and a boss there gives orders to the wrong people which, when executed, then hurt their individual stats. We org board the place and groove in the boss and we get a stat recovery and even an improvement.

The correct WHY led to a stat recovery.

Here is another one. Stats are down in a school. An investigation comes up with a mere explanation: "The students were all busy with sports." So management says "No sports!" Stats go down again. A new investigation comes up with a wrong Why: "The students are being taught wrongly." Management sacks the dean. Stats really crash now. A further more competent investigation occurs. It turns out that there were 140 students and only the dean and one instructor! And the dean had other duties! We put the dean back on post and hire two more instructors making three. Stats soar. Because we got the right Why.

Management and organizational catastrophes and successes are ALL explained by these three types of Why. An arbitrary is probably just a wrong Why held in by law. And if so held in, it will crash the place.

One really has to understand logic to get to the correct WHY and must really be on his toes not to use and correct a wrong WHY.

In world banking, where inflation occurs, finance regulations or laws are probably just one long parade of wrong Whys. The value of the money and its usefulness to the citizen deteriorate to such an extent that a whole ideology can be built up (as in Sparta by Lycurgus who invented iron money nobody could lift in order to rid Sparta of money evils) that knocks money out entirely and puts nothing but nonsense in its place

Organizational troubles are greatly worsened by using mere explanations (which lead to no remedies) or wrong Whys (which further depress stats). Organizational recoveries come from finding the real WHY and correcting it.

The test of the real WHY is "When it is corrected, do stats recover?" If they do that was it. And any other remedial order given but based on a wrong Why would have to be cancelled quickly.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sb.rd.nf Copyright © 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

63

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 26 NOVEMBER 1970

Remimeo

Data Series 20

MORE OUTPOINTS

While there could be many many oddities classifiable as outpoints, those selected and named as such are major in importance whereas others are minor.

WRONG SOURCE

"Wrong Source" is the other side of the coin of wrong target.

Information taken from wrong source, orders taken from the wrong source, gifts or materiel taken from wrong source all add up to eventual confusion and possible trouble.

Unwittingly receiving from a wrong source can be very embarrassing or confusing, so much so that it is a favorite intelligence trick. Dept D in East Germany, the Dept of Disinformation, has very intricate methods of planting false information and disguising its source.

Technology can come from wrong source. For instance Leipzig University's school of psychology and psychiatry opened the door to death camps in Hitler's Germany. Using drugs these men apparently gave Hitler to the world as their puppet. They tortured, maimed and slaughtered over 12,000,000 Germans in death camps. At the end of World War 11 these extremists formed the "World Federation of Mental Health," which enlisted the American Psychiatric Association and the American Medical Association and established "National Associations for Mental Health" over the world, cowed

news media, smashed any new technology and became the sole advisors to the US government on "mental health, education and welfare" and the appointers of all health ministers through the civilized world and through their graduate Pavlov dominated Russian communist "mental health." This source is so wrong that it is destroying Man, having already destroyed scores of millions. (All statements given here are documented.)

Not only taking data from wrong source but officialdom from it can therefore be sufficiently aberrated as to result in planetary insanity.

In a lesser level, taking a report from a known bad hat and acting upon it is the usual reason for errors made in management.

CONTRARY FACTS

When two statements are made on one subject which are contrary to each other, we have "contrary facts."

Previously we classified this illogic as a falsehood, since one of them must be false.

But in doing data analysis one cannot offhand distinguish which is the false fact. Thus it becomes a special outpoint.

"They made a high of \$12,000 that week" and "They couldn't pay staff" occurring in the same time period gives us one or both as false. We may not know which is true but we do know they are contrary and can so label it.

64

In interrogation this point is so important that anyone giving two contrary facts becomes a prime suspect for further investigation. "I am a Swiss citizen" as a statement from someone who has had a German passport found in his baggage would be an example.

When two "facts" are contrary or contradictory we may not know which is true but we do know they can't both be true.

Issued by the same org, even from two different people in that org, two contradictory "facts" qualifies as an outpoint.

These two will be found useful in analysis.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sb.rd.nf Copyright © 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

iw

65

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 15 MARCH 1971 IRA

Remimeo Issue 11

Admin RE-REVISED 21 SEPTEMBER 1981

Students

Tech

Qual (Re-revised to return to original issue due

C/Ses to reinstatement of HCOB 28 Aug 70RB

HGCs HC OUTPOINT PLUSPOINT LISTS RB.

Cramming HCOB 24 July 70 DATA SERIES remains

Officerscancelled.)

(Revisions not in a different type style)

Data Series 21RA

DATA SERIES AUDITING

References:

HCOB 28 Aug 70RB HC OUTPOINT PLUSPOINT

Rev. & Reins. LISTS RB

27 Jan 81

HCO PL 30 Nov 76R ONLY SSO CAN TIP

Rev. 25 Apr 79

Whenever a student cannot grasp or retain the data of the DATA SERIES policy letters, he must be audited on the HC OUTPOINT PLUSPOINT LISTS.

The reason for this is that he himself has OUTPOINTS and it is necessary to *audit* him on this subject.

When the student has outpoints, it has been found that he has a terrible time grasping or retaining the Data Series material.

This does not mean the student is in any way crazy. It just means he is illogical and has outpoints in his thinking.

This will reflect as well in his other studies.

At the discretion of the SSO and C/S, the student may also be programmed for Method One Word Clearing, the PRD, the Study Green Form or any of the various student repairs, New Era Dianetics, etc. He can also be given Super Power when released.

An individual program is worked out for the student using the available tech so that he *can* master the Data Series material.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Updated by

Mission Issues Revision

Accepted by the

BOARD OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA

BDCSC:LRH:JM:bk.gm Copyright@ 1971, 1981 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

66

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 31 JANUARY 1972

Remimeo

Data Series 22

THE WHY IS GOD

When beings operate mainly on illogics, they are unable to conceive of valid reasons for things or to see that effects are directly caused by things they themselves can control.

The inability to observe and find an actual useable WHY is the downfall of beings and activities. This is factually the WHY of people not finding WHYS and using them.

The prevalence of historical Man's use of "fate," "kismet" (fatalism), superstition, fortune telling, astrology and mysticism confirms this.

Having forgotten to keep seed grain for the spring, the farmer starves the following year and when asked WHY he is starving says it is the Gods, that he has sinned or that he failed to make sacrifice. In short, unable to think, he says "The Why is God."

This condition does not just affect primitives or backward people.

All through the most modern organizations you can find "The WHY is God" in other forms.

By believing that it is the fault of other divisions or departments, a staff member does not look into his own scene. "The reason I cannot load the lumber is because the Personnel Section will not find and hire people." It does not seem to occur to this fellow that he is using a WHY which he can't control so it is not a WHY for his area. It does not move the existing to the ideal scene. Thus it is not a WHY for him. Yet he will use it and go on nattering about, it. And the lumber never gets loaded. The real WHY for him more likely would be, "I have no right to hire day laborers. I must obtain this right before my area breaks down totally," or "My department posts are too specialized. I need to operate on all-hands actions on peak loads."

A Course Supervisor who says, "I haven't got any students because Ethics keeps them for weeks and Cramming for months" is using a "The WHY is God." As he cannot control Ethics or Cramming from his post his WHY is illogical. The real WHY is probably "I am not mustering all my students daily and keeping them on course. If they are ordered to Ethics or Cramming they must be right here studying except for the actual minutes spent in Ethics and Cramming."

But this does not just apply on small activities. It applies to whole nations. "The reason we Germans cannot advance is because England is against us." This wrong WHY has killed many tens of millions in two world wars.

Intelligence organizations are often almost dedicated to "the Why is over there." It seldom is.

Most staffs of orgs, when pay is poor, are completely addicted to over-thereness. In one org, the Finance Banking Officer was continuously hammered to "give more money" by the people who were responsible for making the money and yet who were not raising a finger to do so. An actual survey of four org staffs showed that only 2% were aware that their pay depended upon the org gross income!

Thus survival is very closely tied to logic. If one finds he is sinking into apathy over his inability to get his job done, it *is certain* that he is operating on self-conceived wrong WHYs in areas that he cannot ever hope to control.

And in living any life, most major points of decline can be traced to the person's operating on Whys that do not allow him to improve his own scene.

The Greek cut open the guts of birds to find the WHY. He called this "divination" or "augury." Don't look now. but that civilization has long been dead!

Just as anyone will be whose illogic leads him to over-thereeness to find his Whys.

Strength and power in the individual consists of being logical enough to find WHYs *he* can use to advance his existing scene toward the ideal scene.

The Why is NOT God. It lies with YOU and your ability to be logical.

God helps those who help themselves.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:ne.rd.nf Copyright © 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

68

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 17 FEBRUARY 1972

Remimeo

Data Series 23

PROPER FORMAT AND CORRECT ACTION

When doing an evaluation, one can become far too fixated on outpoints and miss the real reason one is doing an evaluation in the first place.

To handle this, it is proper form to write up an evaluation so as to keep in view the reason one is doing one.

This is accomplished by using this form SITUATION:

DATA:

STATS: WHY: IDEAL SCENE:

HANDLING:

CONSISTENCY

The whole of it should concern itself with the same general scene, the same subject matter. This is known as CONSISTENCY. One does not have a situation about books, data about bicycles, stats of another person, a WHY about another area, a different subject for ideal scene and handling for another activity.

The situation, whether good or bad, must be about a certain subject, person or area, the data must be about the same, the stats are of that same thing, the WHY relates to that same thing, the ideal scene is about the scene of that same thing and the handling handles that thing and *especially is* regulated by that Why.

A proper evaluation is all of a piece.

SITUATION

First, to do an evaluation, some situation must have come to notice. There is a report or observation that is out of the ordinary.

This "coming to notice" occurs on any line. Usually it is fairly major, affecting a large portion of the area, but it can be minor.

So OBSERVATION in general must be continuous for situations to be noted.

To just note a situation and act on it is out of sequence as it omits evaluation. You can be elated or shocked uselessly by noting a situation and then not doing any evaluation,

It is the hallmark of a rank amateur or idiot to *act* on reports without any evaluation.

So, the first step is noting, from general alertness, a situation exists.

A situation is defined as a not expected state of affairs. It is either very good or it is very bad.

69

If it is very good it must be evaluated and a Why found so one can even upgrade an ideal scene.

If it is very bad, it must be evaluated and a Why found so that it can be handled to more closely approach the ideal scene.

DATA

Data is the information one has received that alerts one to the situation.

Intelligence systems use various (mainly faulty) methods of "evaluating" data so as to "confirm it." They do this uniformly from reports. No matter how many reports one may see there is always a question as to their truth. Intelligence chiefs have started most wars (US vs. Germany 1917) or failed to start them in time (US vs. Japan 1936) by depending on "authoritative sources," "skilled observers," "valid documents" and other confetti they class as "reports" or "documents."

As noted above, the "raw document" or "raw materials" as they are called have led, when accepted, to the most terrifying catastrophes. British Admiral Hall, without permission of the British government, leaked the famous "Zimmerman telegram" to US President Wilson and stampeded the US into World War 1. The alleged German "instructions" to their US Ambassador "intercepted" by Hall were passed on with confidence tricks and President Wilson, elected to keep the US out of the war, being no great evaluator, dived overboard on one flimsy questionable report and carried America into the disaster of two world wars and a communist supremacy.

The US was lulled by false Japanese assurances and false data on the smallness of Japanese armaments and considered the country no danger. The true situation would have led to a US declaration of war in 1936! Before Japan could sink the whole Pacific fleet in one raid and cause 41/2 years of war and open all of China to communist supremacy.

These are just a couple of the thousands of disasters in international affairs brought about by a pathetic reliance on reports or documents.

If you knew the game well, with a half a dozen agents and a document factory, you could have half the countries of the planet in turmoil. Because they rely on reports and "authoritative sources" and "expert opinion" instead of data as viewed in this Data Series.

If one does not court disaster and failures one does NOT rely on reports, but an absence of reports or a volume of reports carefully surveyed for outpoints and counted.

To do this one must be VERY skilled at spotting outpoints. Most people confuse simple errors with actual outpoints.

You can get so good at this you can recognize outpoints and pluspoints at a fast glance over reports.

Essentially, "data" regarded from the angle of outpoints is a lack of consistency. "Our Div 2 is doing very well" doesn't go with gross income \$2.

This gives you a guideline, the "string to pull" (see investigation checksheet on following down things you just don't understand, the first emergence of the Data Series).

So the DATA you give is not a lot of reports. It is a brief summary of the "strings pulled" on the outpoint or pluspoint route to finally get the Why.

Example: (from a situation where an org was going broke) "The sign-ups reported for service and new names to Central Files were both high yet gross income was down. An investigation of the service area showed no backlogs and no new customers with the staff idle. Tech Services was fully staffed. Examining complement showed no one in the Department of Income. People were signed up but there was no one to receive the money." The WHY of course was a wrong complement particularly NO CASHIER and an Executive Director neglecting his duties.

Example: (on a situation of a stat soaring) "The Promo Dept had very down stats with no promo going out. Bulk mail was low. Div 6 was idle, yet the GI was soaring. Nothing in the org could be found to account for it. Investigation of what promo incoming public had, showed that the promo was coming from a lower level org promoting itself as a route to **upper level services.**" The WHY of course was an **effective promo campaign being run OUTSIDE the org. And one could bolster that up and get the** org active too.

70

DATA, then, is the Sherlock Holming of the trail that gave the WHY. It at once reflects the command the evaluator has of the DATA SERIES. And his own cleverness.

Sometimes they come in a sudden blue flash a yard long, a piece of insight into what MUST be going on if these outpoints add up this way. Rapid investigation of further data on this trail proves or disproves the flash of insight. One does NOT run on insight alone (or crystal balls).

To one not trained and practiced in evaluation the finding of a REAL WHY may look as mysterious as an airplane to an aborigine.

It is a fact that people who do not understand evaluation can get the idea that management acts on personalities or whims or that management has spies everywhere to know that the Distribution Secretary never came to work.

To the expert it is easy. To the ignorant it looks very supernatural.

It is the TRAIL followed that counts.

This is what is required under "DATA."

STATS

Situations and DATA trails are supported by statistics.

Where statistics are not in numeral form this may be harder. Where they are outright lies, this is an outpoint itself.

A person or nation without any statistic may be a puzzle at first but statistical approximations can exist and be valid.

Statistics of CIA would be very hard to dig up. They don't even let the US Congress in on it. But the deteriorating overseas influence of the US would show that CIA was not batting any high average and that its data fed to policy-makers (its avowed purpose) might well be false or misleading causing policy errors that cause a deteriorating scene.

So statistics can be estimated by the scene itself even when absent in numerical form.

England has lost its whole empire in a quarter of a century, without a single defeat in war. This gives an adequate statistic for the government's good sense or lack of it. It is at this writing losing even parts of the homeland and is itself joining what might be called the Fourth Reich and so will soon cease to exist as a political sovereignty. This statistic can even be drawn as a dive-bombing down curve.

A deckhand's statistic may not exist on a chart but the areas he tends do exist for view.

One either has a numerical statistic or a direct observation. One can use both.

I once answered the question, "Why are paid completions high and gross income low?" by finding that the "paid" completions stats were false.

So one statistic can be compared to another.

Three or more stats can be compared to each other and often lead directly to a WHY.

The main point is DON'T ACT WITHOUT STATISTICAL DATA.

After a fine data analysis, one may well find the stats are quite normal and there is NO situation.

One may have a great PR PR PR data analysis and collide with statistics you'd need a submarine to read.

And one may have data that says the whole staff of Keokuk should be shot without waiting for dawn and then discover that, by stats, they're doing great.

And one can also do a data analysis that shows somebody should be commended and prove it by stats and then discover belatedly the stats are false and the guy should have been shot.

However, if one looks at all available stats after doing a data analysis one may find they look good at a glance but are sour as green apples. **One could see a high** lot of stats, GI, etc., and *then* see a cost stat that shows someone is making \$2 million at a **cost of \$4 million and that the place is going straight into the garbage can.**

DO NOT give a Why or recommend handling without inspecting the actual stats. And DO NOT be thrown off a situation you are sure exists without looking at ALL the stats. (Example: High hour interns' stats throw one off interfering until one sees NO interns graduating and NO programs completed by them.)

THE WHY

This is the jewel in the crown, the main dish at dinner, the gold mine in the towering mountains of mystery.

A real WHY must lead to a bettering of the existing scene or (in the case of a wonderful new scene) maintaining it as a new ideal scene.

Therefore the WHY must be something you can do something about. (See THE WHY IS GOD policy letter.)

Thus the Why is limited by what you can control. It is NEVER that other division or top management or the bumps on the moon.

Even if all this were true, the WHY must be something which

YOU CAN DO SOMETHING ABOUT YOURSELF FROM YOUR LEVEL OF AUTHORITY OR INITIATIVE that will lead to

THE IMPROVEMENT OF A POOR EXISTING SCENE TOWARD THE IDEAL SCENE.

The WHY is a special thing then. It is a key that opens the door to effective improvement.

It is not a prejudice or a good idea. It is where all the analysis led.

And a REAL Why when used and handled and acted upon is like a magic carpet. The scene at once becomes potentially better or gets maintained.

"Acting on a wrong Why" is the stuff of which coffins are made.

No matter how brilliant the program that follows, there it is, the same old mud.

Wrong Whys work people half to death handling a program which will lay ostrich eggs and rotten ones at that.

It will cost money and time that can't be afforded easily.

It will distract from the real tiger in the woods and let him roar and eat up the goats while everyone is off chasing the ghosts which "really were the cause of it all."

Wrong Whys are the tombstones of all great civilizations and unless someone gears up the think will be the mausoleum of this one.

Do not think you won't get them. It takes 28,000 casualties in battle, they say, to make a major general. Well it may take a few wrong Whys to make an evaluator.

The evaluator who has done the evaluation is of course responsible for it being correctly done and leading to the right conclusion and verified by stats to give the correct real WHY.

And the real ones are often too incredible to have been arrived at in any other way. Or they are so obvious no one noticed.

In one instance Whys were found by experts for six months on a certain course without improving the flagrantly bad situation but actually messing it up more until a huge real Why jumped out (the students had never been trained on earlier levels) and the situation began to improve.

Using one Why for all situations can also occur and fads of Whys are common. True, a Why often applies elsewhere. That's what gives us technology including policy. But in any area of operation where a situation is very abnormal the Why is likely to be very peculiar and too off the ordinary to be grasped at once.

There can be an infinity of wrongnesses around just one rightness. Thus there can be an infinity of wrong Whys possible with just one real Why that will open the door.

For the real Why *does* open the door. With it on a good situation one can maintain it and with a bad situation one can improve it.

Thus the REAL WHY is the vital arrival point to which evaluation leads.

72

THEIDEALSCENE

If a bad situation is a *departure* from the ideal scene and if a good situation is attaining it or exceeding it, then the crux of any evaluation is THE IDEAL SCENE for the area one is evaluating.

Viewpoint has a lot to do with the ideal scene.

To Russia a collapsed America is the ideal scene. To America a collapsed Russia is an ideal scene.

To some have-not nations both Russia and the US competing at vast expense for the favor of a coy petty ruler is the ideal scene to that ruler.

To most other parts of the world both these major countries interested only in their own affairs would be an ideal scene.

So, with viewpoint the ideal scene can be "bad" or "good."

The ideal scene is not necessarily big and broad. An intelligence evaluator that gave the ideal scene as "a defeated enemy" on every evaluation would be very inexpert.

By CONSISTENCY the ideal scene must be one for that portion of an activity for which one is trying to find the Why.

Example: (Situation: renewed activity on a front held by one platoon. Evaluation: No other points along the lines are active and a tank road leads toward the front where the activity is. WHY: area being prepared for a tank breakout.) IDEAL SCENE: an uninhabitable area in front of the platoon. (Which could be done with napalm as there is a wood there and a heavy crossfire maintained and a renewed supply of bazookas for the platoon if the napalm didn't work.)

Example: (Situation: a lot of silence from Plant 22. Evaluation: no trucks arriving with materials, no raw materials being sent by outside suppliers, suppliers irate. WHY: The accounting office forgot to pay the raw materials bill and the suppliers held up all further supplies.) THE IDEAL SCENE: high credit rating and good accounts PR established with all creditors. (And handling would include a recommendation for an evaluation of the accounting office as to why it forgot and why there is no high credit PR with a new ideal scene for that accounting office, which might be a wholly different thing: IDEAL SCENE: an accounting office that enforces income greater than outgo.)

By giving the IDEAL SCENE for every situation, the evaluator is not led into a fatal contempt for the competence of all work actually being done.

The ideal scene clarifies for one and all whither we are going.

But even more important, the evaluation that includes an ideal scene postulates a win from the viewpoint of those for whom it is being done or for one's activities.

Sometimes when one gets to the ideal scene and writes it down he finds his Why won't really lead to it, in which case he must get another Why or familiarize himself with the scene in general to find out what he is trying to send where.

In the case of an abnormally good situation one finds he has exceeded what was formerly thought to be the ideal scene and must state a new one entirely with the WHY concerned with how to maintain it.

Anyone reading a full evaluation in proper form can better estimate whether the WHY and handling are workable if the IDEAL SCENE is there. And sometimes it will be found that the evaluator is trying to do something else entirely than what everyone else thinks is a correct attainment.

Thus it is a very healthy thing to include the ideal scene. It serves as a discipline and incentive for the evaluator and those executing the program.

HANDLING

Handling must be CONSISTENT with the situation, the evaluation, the Why and the ideal scene.

Handling must be WITHIN THE CAPABILITIES of those who will do the actions.

Handling must be WITHIN THE RESOURCES AVAILABLE.

Handling quite often but not always requires a BRIGHT IDEA. It is peculiarly true that the less the resources available the brighter the idea required to attain effective handling.

73

Handling must be **SUPERVISED by one** person who acts as a coordinator of the program and a checker-offer and debug expert.

And last but most important handling must be EFFECTIVE AND FINAL.

The *steps* of handling are in program form. They are numbered 1-2-3, etc. Or A-B-C, etc.

They can be in the sequence they will be done but this is mostly important when one person or one team is going to do the whole thing step by step.

These steps are called TARGETS.

Each part of the program (each TARGET) is assigned to someone to do or to get done.

Care must be taken not to overload persons already loaded and where this occurs

one appoints a special personnel or mission for that specific target. t

The supervision must see that each target gets fully done and no targets not-done and no targets half-done.

It is up to supervision to keep track of all completions on a MASTER sheet.

Supervision debugs those targets that bog or lag by finding in them a Why, which may mean a rapid evaluation of that target to rephrase it or get it clarified without altering its intended accomplishment.

Supervision can reassign a target.

PROJECTS

It is expected that any complex or extensive target will have a PROJECT written for it by the person to whom it is assigned if not by the originator.

By completing this project the target is DONE.

Often these projects have to be passed upon by a senior before being begun.

COMPLIANCE

When the MASTER sheet shows all targets DONE (not not-done and not half-done and not falsely reported) full situation handling can be expected.

REVIEW

When the supervisor reports all targets done, it is in the hands of fate whether the situation will now be progressed toward or attain the ideal scene.

The accuracy of the data, the skill of the evaluator, the correctness of the WHY, the competence of the supervisor and the skill of those executing the targets and the willingness of those receiving the effects of all this activity (their human emotion and reaction) determine whether this evaluation approaches or attains the ideal scene.

All such evaluations should be REVIEWED as soon as the actions have had time to take effect.

An idiot optimism can suppose all is well and that it is needless to review.

But if this WHY was wrong *then the situation will deteriorate* and a worsening situation will be apparent.

Thus a sharp watch has to be set. No thirst for "always being right" or arrogance about never being wrong must prevent an honest review.

WAS the ideal scene approached or attained?

Or was it a wrong Why and now is all Hades breaking loose?

Now we *don't* have just renewed insistence that the WHY was right and that the program must go in in spite of all.

We have a wrong Why.

MAGIC

IT WILL BE FOUND THAT WHERE YOU HAVE A REAL WHY PEOPLE WILL COOPERATE ALL OVER THE SCENE.

74

The only **exception** is where there are traitors around. But this is an easy explanation, too often bought to excuse wrong Whys.

The Germans, when they found in World War II, how ineffective the Italian intelligence service was, couldn't believe it, tried to improve it, became convinced they were traitors, probably shot them in scores and took the service over themselves. And lost Italy even more rapidly. Whatever the right Why was, the Germans had the wrong one. And so does any executive who has to shoot everybody-he just can't find the right Whys.

It is NO disgrace to find a wrong Why. It is only a disgrace not to keep trying on and on until one does find it. Then the clouds open, the sun shines, the birds pour out their souls in purest melody and the ideal scene is approached or reached.

So REVIEW is damnably important.

Situations have to be handled very fast.

And reviews have to be as quick as possible after effect can occur.

WHOLE VIEW

So here you have the whole view.

The keynotes are OBSERVE, EVALUATE, PROGRAM, SUPERVISE and REVIEW.

The heart of Observe is accuracy.

The heart of Evaluate is a cool, cold knowledge of the Data Series.

The heart of Program is knowing the scene.

The heart of Supervise is getting it FULLY done.

The heart of Review is HUMILITY.

SUMMARY

If you cannot roll all this off rapidly then misunderstood words in this series are in the way. Or one is battling with some outpoint in his own life.

The Data Series is for USE.

It works because it has unlocked logic.

In management one is very fortunate since he can program and handle.

In intelligence one is less fortunate as his handling can only be suggested and many an intelligence officer has watched a useless Battle of the Bulge after he told them all about it and "they" had other ideas. But the Data Series works in intelligence as well.

Data analysis was not developed in a professorial out of a lost-to-the-world tower. It was evolved by attempting to explain logic, then was developed on one of the hottest cross-fire but successful evaluation posts on the planet against a background of blood, sweat and tears war intelligence experience.

So it is itself REAL.

The key to it is handling **DATA**.

So here it is.

I do sincerely hope it serves you in helping to attain your ideal scene.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:mes.rd.nf Copyright © 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 29 FEBRUARY 1972R

Issue 11

Remimeo REVISED 4 JULY 1977

(Revisions in this type style)

Data Series 24R

HANDLING

POLICY, PLANS, PROGRAMS

PROJECTS AND ORDERS DEFINED

The words "policy," "plans," "programs," "projects" and "orders" are often used interchangeably one for the other, incorrectly.

To handle any confusions on the words and substance of "policy," "plans," "programs," "projects" and "orders" the following DESCRIPTIVE DEFINITIONS (see Scn Logic No. 5) are laid down for our use.

POLICY.- By this is meant long-range truths or facts which are not subject to change expressed as operational rules or guides.

PLANS: Short-range broad intentions as to the contemplated actions envisaged for the handling of a broad area to remedy it or expand it or to obstruct or impede an opposition to expansion. A plan is usually based on observation of potentials (or resources) and expresses a bright idea of how to use them. It always proceeds from a REAL WHY if it is to be successful.

PROGRAM: A series of steps in sequence to carry out a plan. One usually sees a program following the discovery of a Why. But in actual fact a plan had to exist in the person's mind, whether written or not, before a program could be written. A program, thus, carries out the plan conceived to handle a found WHY. A plan and its program require authorization (or okay) from the central or coordinating authority of the general activities of a group before they can be invested in, activated or executed.

PROJECTS: The sequence of steps written to carry out ONE step of a program. Project orders often have to be written to execute a program step. These should be written but usually do not require any approval and often are not generally issued but go to the person or persons who will accomplish that step of a program. Under the category of PROJECT would come orders, work projects, etc. These are a series of GUIDING STEPS which if followed will result in a full and successful accomplishment of the program target.

ORDERS: The verbal or written direction from a lower or designated authority to carry out a program step or apply the general policy.

In short:

POLICY = the rules of the game, the facts of life, the discovered truths and the invariable procedures.

PLANS = the general bright idea one has to remedy the WHY found and get things up to the ideal scene or improve even that. (Approval.)

PROGRAM = the sequence of major actions needed to do the plan. (Approval.)

PROJECT = the sequence of steps necessary to carry out one step in a program. (No approval.)

ORDERS = some program steps are so simple that they are themselves an order or an order can simply be a roughly written project.

76

Thus, by these definitions a data analysis would look like this:

POLICK (What brings the evaluation into existence in the first place.)

SITUATION: (Departure from or improvement of the ideal scene expressed in *policy*.)

DATA: (Observations leading to INVESTIGATION.)

STATISTICS: (The independent continuing survey of production or lack of it.)

WHY- (The real reason found by the investigation.)

IDEAL SCENE: (The state of affairs envisioned by policy or the improvement of even that.)

HANDLING:

A *PLAN* whether written in full or not based on the *WHY* to use the resources available to move the existing scene toward the ideal scene.

A *PROGRAM*: A sequence of broad steps to get the plan executed.

PROJECTS: Any sequence of steps ordered or written to get a program step completed.

ORDERS: The program step itself or the verbal or written project to get the program step fully *done*.

Thus a handling could look like this:

HANDLING:

Plan: To use Bob Bartlett to replace the incompetent exec found in the *WHY*.

1. Find a replacement for Bartlett. PERSONNEL.
2. Program Bob Bartlett to get his incomplete cycles caught up. DIR OF PERSONNEL ENHANCEMENT.
3. Train Bob Bartlett. DIR OF TRAINING.
4. Write Garrison Mission Orders for Bartlett. ACTION MISSION WRITER.
5. Write recall orders for G. Zonk (the incompetent found in the *WHY*). PERSONNEL.
6. Send Bartlett to relieve Zonk. ACTION.
7. On Zonk's return assign to bilge cleaner. PERSONNEL.

This of course is a very simple plan and simple program.

The orders are seen as "PERSONNEL," "DIR OF PERSONNEL ENHANCEMENT," "ACTION MISSION WRITER," etc., at the paragraph ends. The program step itself is an ORDER to the person or unit named at program step end. But IT ALSO AUTHORIZES THAT PERSON OR UNIT TO DO THE STEP OR ISSUE ORDERS TO DO THE STEP OR EVEN WRITE A PROJECT AND GET IT DONE.

Emorm",

That final end word on the program step is an AUTHORITY as well as being an order to the person or unit named.

ROUND-UP

A copy of a full program marked MASTER is placed in a folder. The folder is marked on the edge with the program name and number. The program itself is stapled along its left edge to the inside left cover of the folder.

A "*Flag Rep*" is responsible for "LRH programs." A Deputy Executive Director or Deputy Commanding Officer is responsible for an ED's or C/O's programs.

The responsibility lies in seeing that *each* step is FULLY effectively DONE.

All related papers, copies of projects' orders, etc., are collected in that folder and as each done is reported and investigated as DONE it is marked off on the MASTER program sheet.

When *all* those projects or orders bred by the program steps are DONE then the PROGRAM is considered DONE.

One does not "report progress" but only DONES and when something is NOT done yet it is chased up by the "*Flag Rep*" or Deputy ED or C/O and "debugged."

DEBUGGING

The word "bugged" is slang for snarled up or halted.

DEBUG is to get the snarls or stops out of it.

This itself requires an evaluation. The evaluation may be done at a glance or it may take a full formal evaluation by form.

The ideal scene here is the program step DONE or even improved.

So the WHY here would be the REAL reason it was not being done or couldn't be done and that may require *hours* to locate and sometimes days to remedy.

When "debugging" one usually finds the persons assigned the target already have a "WHY" and it is usually a false Why for if it was the right one the program step would get done.

Thus debugging usually begins with finding "their Whys"-which is to say reasons, excuses, apologies, etc. Getting these into view is a main part of the program step evaluation.

A project, often written, comes out of this DEBUG EVALUATION.

In extreme cases it will be found that the whole program is based on a wrong WHY and rapidly needs redoing by the original authority. Example: The WHY found was that the **JINX OFFICE WAS NOT MAKING MONEY**. In doing one step of the program: "3. Survey past invoices to find where money is coming from and why they don't get it now. MISSION," the mission sent finds Jinx Office was making money by the ton but it was being wasted by their having bought a huge building whose rent is three times normal rental "in the hopes new subtenants would pay the rent but nobody wants the place." Rapid debug is needed because the target can't really be done. They ARE making money and they do get it now.

In such a case doing the program unearthed a new REAL WHY and scrubbed that program.

A super-frantic hysterical communication would be sent to the authority of the

78

program, "New WHY found by Pgm 891 target 3 observation. Jinx Office paying \$80,000 a quarter for skyscraper. Obvious real Why ED has delusions of grandeur, is a bad business head. Suggest Pgm 891 redone on new Why and suggest plan of mission here for instant offload of this skyscraper and office into proper quarters and replacement of ED." At which the '*Flag Rep*' or Deputy ED or Deputy C/O will approach the authority for the pgm to get immediate cancellation of 891 and all program targets and a new Program 891R based on the REAL REAL WHY.

Debug, however, is not always so dramatic. "We don't have anyone to put on it" is the usual excuse as they sit lazily chatting amongst their piled up dev-t.

So one evaluates the area against the program target and finds a WHY that, executed as a *project will* get that target done.

The PERFECT DEBUG EVALUATION (a) gets the target done (b) improves the area (c) leaves no dregs of human emotion and reaction behind it.

Just plain screaming often works. But if one has to, there is a real WHY there someplace that should be found, a project handed out and done.

HANDLING SUMMARY

You can find out all the SITUATIONS and WHYS in the world but if there isn't a PLAN and PROGRAM and if these are not DONE fully, then nothing beneficial will happen. Indeed the not-dones, half-dones and backlogs will mount up (per HCO P/L 26 Jan 72, Admin Know-How 29, Executive Series 5) and set the whole thing a step backwards.

Bad programs and clumsy projects develop useless traffic (dev-t) and tie people up all over the place, pull them off normal needful actions and send the existing scene even further from the ideal scene. They make people very busy but nothing beneficial is gained and as the useless actions distract from normal duties, the whole place is at risk.

Staffs subjected to programs that are not based on sound observation evaluation, a REAL WHY and the points in Data Series 23, become apathetic as they see no result.

So programs that are bad and programs that are right but don't get fully done are alike deadly. THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR CORRECTLY DONE DATA ANALYSIS.

THERE IS NO EXCUSE FOR NOT GETTING CORRECT PROGRAMS DONE.

In this way and only in this way can one raise the existing scene toward an ideal scene.

Data analysis is a powerful tool. YOU CAN USE IT.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Revision assisted by

Gelda Mithoff

LRH Comm Policy

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 19 MARCH 1972

Issue 11

Remimeo

Data Series 25

LEARNING TO USE DATA ANALYSIS

After one has studied data analysis he is expected to be able to use its principles easily and swiftly,

The barriers to being able to use data analysis are, in the order of frequency:

1. Misunderstood words. One has not gotten the definitions of the words used. This does not mean "new words." It is usually old common words. It is not just long words, it is more usually little ones. To handle this one takes each policy letter (or chapter) in turn and looks it over carefully to see what words he cannot rapidly define. To help in this one uses an E-Meter and "Method 4" Word Clearing which is the method of using a meter to see if-"Are there any words in this policy misunderstood?" Any upset or antagonism or boredom felt comes only from a misunderstood word or misunderstood words.

2. The person has himself an outpoint in his routine thinking. This is found and handled by what is called an "HC (Hubbard Consultant) List." This list assessed on a meter detects and handles this.

3. Lack of knowledge of an existing or an ideal scene. This is handled by observing the existing scene directly or indirectly by reports and for the ideal, study of the basic policy of the scene which gives one its ideal, its expected products and form of organization.

4. Not having studied the Data Series. Handled by studying it properly.

5. Not having studied data analysis from the viewpoint of needing to apply it.

6. Thinking one already knows all about analyzing and data. Handled by looking over some past failures and realizing they could have been prevented by a proper collection of data and analyzing it.

7. Tossing off "reasons" personally on one's own personal area which are usually just excuses or justifications and not Whys. "I was too tired," "I should have been tougher," "They were just bums anyway," which loads up one's own life with wrong Whys. Handled by being more alert to and more honest about the causes and motives of one's life and the scene, and doing a better analysis.

8. Confusing errors with outpoints. Handled by practice.

9. Confusing outpoints with Whys. Handled by learning to observe and better study of data analysis.

10. Too narrow a situation. Handled by getting more data and observing the scene more broadly.

11. Missing "omitted data" or particles or people as a frequent outpost. Handled by knowing the ideal scene better. What *should* be there and isn't.

THE BEGINNER

When one begins to apply data analysis he is often still trying to grasp the data

80

about data analysis rather than the outpoints in the data. Just become more familiar with the Data Series.

Further one may not realize the ease with which one can acquire the knowledge of an ideal scene. An outpost is simply an illogical departure from the ideal scene. By comparing the existing scene with the ideal scene one easily sees the outpoints.

To know the ideal scene one has only to work out the correct products for it. If these aren't getting out, then there is a departure. One can then find the outpoints of the various types and then locate a WHY and in that way open the door to handling. And by handling one is simply trying to get the scene to get out its products.

Unless one proceeds in this fashion (from product back to establishment), one can't analyze much of anything. One merely comes up with errors.

The definition and nature of products is covered in several P/Ls and especially in HCO P/L 13 Mar 72 Establishment Officer Series No. 5.

An existing scene is as good as it gets out its products, not as good as it is painted or carpeted or given public relations boosts.

So for ANY scene, manufacturing or fighting a war or being a hostess at a party, there are PRODUCTS.

People who lead pointless lives are very unhappy people. Even the idler or dilettante is happy only when he has a product!

There is always a product for any scene.

The analyst when he begins may get the wrong product. He may get a doingness instead of something one can have. And he may look upon a half completion or half-done thing as a completed product.

All this makes his data analysis faulty. As he can't figure out an ideal scene, he then has nothing to compare the existing scene to. It is simply a matter of the cost and time involved in not or half getting a product compared to the ideal scene of a really valuable product with exchange value and what it takes to get it. These two things can be worlds apart. The trail that leads to a WHY that will close the gap is plainly marked with one kind or another of outpoints. Where the most and biggest are, there is the WHY. Found, the real WHY and actual handling will move the existing toward ideal.

Hideously enough, what I say about products is true. Even a government could have a product. Like "a prosperous happy country." An intelligence agency often muffs its product such as, "a properly briefed head of state." But to do it the head of state would have to have a product concerning other nations like, "friendly, cooperative allies which are a help and no threat," or some other product. Otherwise the agency would wind up going straight out of the intelligence business and being required

to conduct its business by assassination of foreign notables or other actions to do handlings based on wrong Whys.

As there would be no product, there could not really be an ideal scene. If there is no ideal scene then there is no way to compare the existing scene. Thus, outpoints would expose situations but no WHY would really be possible as there's no ideal scene to approach. One has often heard some agency or activity say, "Where the hell are we going anyway?" Translated this would be, "We haven't had any ideal scene set up for us." And translated further, "The policy-makers have no product in view." So they aren't going any place really and lack of an objective would cause them to go down and lack of a product would cause them to be miserable.

That's the way life has been running.

Parents and others often ask children, "What will you do when you grow up?" Or "What are you going to *be*?" This is not baffling for a 5-year-old, perhaps, but it is a confuser for a child of 12. There are *BE*, *DO* and *HAVE* as three major conditions of

81

existence. One must *BE* in order to *DO* and *DO* in order to *HAVE*. A product is the *Have*. It is not the *DO*. Most people give "Do" as "product." A product is a completed thing that has exchange value within or outside the activity.

If one asked a 12-year-old, "What product are you going to make when you grow up?" he'd likely give you the exchange reward as the answer, like "money." He has omitted a step. He has to have a product to exchange for money.

To "make money" directly he'd have to be the Secretary of the Treasury, superintendent of the mint or a counterfeiter!

Only if you cleared up product and exchange with him could he begin to answer the question about what's what with growing up.

Let's say this is done and he says he is set on making photographs of buildings. The *DO* now falls into line-he'd have to photograph things well. The *BE* is obviousarchitectural photographer. The exchange of architectural photographs for salary or fee is feasible if he is good.

So now we find he is a poor boy and no chance of schooling or even a box camera. That's the existing scene.

The ideal scene is a successful architectural photographer making pictures of buildings.

You see the gap between the existing scene and the ideal scene.

Now you can follow back the outpoints and get a *WHY*.

It isn't just that he's poor. That's no *WHY* as it opens no doors to get from existing scene to ideal scene.

We investigate and find his "father" is very religious but an alcoholic and that the boy is illegitimate and his "father" hates his guts.

So we find a *WHY* that his "father," much less helping him, is not about to let him amount to anything whatever ever.

This opens a door.

Handling often requires a bright idea. And we find the local parson has often shown interest in the boy so an obvious handling is to get the parson to persuade the "father" to let the boy apprentice in the local photo store and tell the boy what he has to do to make good there.

Situations cannot be handled well unless a real WHY is found.

And a real WHY cannot be found unless *the* product is named and an ideal scene then stated. This compared to the existing scene gives us, really the first outpoint.

In going the other direction, to find a WHY of sudden improvement, one has to locate poor existing scenes that suddenly leap up toward ideal scenes. This is done by locating a high product period (by stats or other signs of production) and comparing IT as an ideal scene to the existing scenes before it (and just after if there was a slump) and looking into that for a WHY. But one is looking for *pluspoints*. And these lead to a real WHY for the prosperity or improvement.

A "Who" will often be found. Like "James Johnny was shop foreman then." Well, he's dead. So it's not a Why as it leads nowhere. What did James Johnny DO that was different? "He got out products" leads nowhere. We keep looking and we find he had a scheduling board and really kept it up-to-date and used it as a single difference. Aha "The WHY is a kept up scheduling board!" The handling is to put a clerk on doing just that and hatting the current foreman to use it or catch it. Result, up go the stats and morale. People can look at it and see what they're producing today and where they're at!

82

So not all WHYS are found by outpoints. The good situations are traced by pluspoints.

If the high peak is current, one has to find a Why, in the same way, to maintain it.

STANDARD ACTION

A beginner can juggle around and go badly adrift if he doesn't follow the pattern:

1. Work out exactly what the (person, unit, activity) should be producing.
2. Work out the ideal scene.
3. Investigate the existing scene.
4. Follow outpoints back from ideal to existing,
5. Locate the real WHY that will move the existing toward ideal.
6. Look over existing resources.
7. Get a bright idea of how to handle,
- 8 Handle or recommend handling so that it stays handled.

This is a very sure-fire approach.

If one just notes errors in a scene, with no product or ideal with which to compare the existing scene, he will not be doing data analysis and situations will deteriorate badly because he is finding wrong Whys.

THINKING

One has to be able to think with outpoints. A crude way of saying this is "learn to think like an idiot." One could also add "without abandoning any ability to think like a genius."

If one can't tolerate outpoints at all or confront them one can't *see* them.

A madman can't tolerate pluspoints and he doesn't see them either.

But there can be a lot of pluspoints around and no production. Thus one can be told how great it all is while the place edges over to the point of collapse.

An evaluator who listens to people on the scene and takes *their* WHYs runs a grave risk. If these *were* the Whys then things would be better.

A far safer way is to talk only insofar as finding what the product is concerned and investigating.

One should observe the existing scene through data or through observers or through direct observation.

An evaluator often has to guess what the WHY might be. It is doing that which brings up the phrase "Learn to think like an **idiot.**" **The WHY will be found** at the end of a trail of outpoints. Each one is an aberration when compared to the ideal scene. The biggest idiocy which then explains all the rest and which opens the door to improvement toward the ideal scene is the WHY.

One also has to learn to think like a genius with pluspoints.

Get the big peak period of production (now or in the past). Compare it to the existing scene just before.

Now find the pluspoints that were entered in. Trace these and you arrive at the WHY as the biggest pluspoint that opened the door to improvement.

83

But once more one considers resources available and has to get a bright idea.

So it is the same series of steps as above but with pluspoints.

VETERAN

A veteran evaluator can toss off evaluations in an hour or two, mainly based on how long it takes him to dig up data.

A big tough situation may require days and days.

Sometimes luck plays a role in it. The data that was the key to it was being sat on by someone not skilled in the subject and who had no idea of relative importances. Sometimes the datum pops up like toast from an electric toaster. Sometimes one has it all wrapped up and then suddenly a new outpoint or pluspoint appears that changes the whole view of the evaluator.

Example: A firm's blacklist has just been published in a newspaper or as a scandal. Evaluator: "They do *what?*" in a voice of incredulity. "They ship their security files to Memphis in open crates? Because they are saving on postage?" Wrath could dangerously shoot a wrong somebody. The idiocy is not believable. But a new datum leads to personnel who hired a reporter in disguise because it no longer requires or looks up references.

Example: Situation where stats soared. "They used schoolchildren to pass out literature?" That's just a point but a strange one. Turns out they also hired a cashier and had NEVER HAD ONE ON POST BEFORE! Why? Nobody to take money.

Man gets dedicated to his own pet theories very easily. A true scientist doesn't fixate on one idea. He keeps looking until he finds it, not until his pet theory is proven. That's the test of an evaluator.

STATISTICS

One always runs by statistics where these are valid.

Statistics must reflect actual desired PRODUCT. If they do not they are not valid. If they do they give an idea of ideal scene.

From a statistic reflecting the desired products one can work out the departure from the ideal scene.

A backlog of product production must reflect in a stat. As a backlog is *negative* production.

From such tools an evaluator can work.

The use of data analysis is relatively easy compared to learning a musical instrument.

You have the hang of how it is done.

So why not just be a veteran right now and DO IT.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.mes.rd.nf Copyright @ 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

84

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 12 JUNE 1972

Remimeo

Data Series 26

Establishment Officer Series 18

LENGTH OF TIME TO EVALUATE

It will be found that long times required to do an evaluation can be traced each time to AN INDIVIDUAL WHY FOR EACH EVALUATOR.

These, however, can be summarized into the following classes of Whys:

This list is assessed by a Scientology auditor on a meter. The handling directions given in each case are designations for auditing actions as done by a Scientology auditor and are given in the symbols he would use.

1. Misunderstood words.

(Handled with Word Clearing [Method I and Method 4 of the Word Clearing Series].)

2. Inability to study and an inability to learn the materials.

(Handled by a Study Correction List HCOB 4 Feb 72.)

3. Outpoints in own thinking.

(Handled by what is called an HC [Hubbard Consultant] List HCOB 28 August 70.)

4. Personal out-ethics.

(Use P/L 3 May 72 by an auditor. Has two listing and nulling type lists.)

5. Doing something else.

(2-way communication on P/L 3 May 72 or reorganization.)

6. Impatient or bored with reading.

(Achieve Super-Literacy. LRH Executive Directive 178 International.)

7. Doesn't know how to read statistics so doesn't know where to begin.

(Learn to read stats from Management by Stat P/Ls.)

8. Doesn't know the scene.

(Achieve familiarity by direct observation.)

9. Reads on and on as doesn't know how to handle and is stalling.

(Get drilled on actual handling and become Super- Literate.)

85

10. Afraid to take responsibility for the consequences if wrong.

(HCOB 10 May 72 Robotism. Apply it.)

11. Falsely reporting.

(Pull all withholds and harmful acts on the subject.)

12. Assumes the Why before starting.

(Level IV service facsimile triple auditing.)

13. Feels stupid about it.

(Get IQ raised by general processing.)

14. Has other intentions.

(Audit on L9S or Expanded Dianetics.)

15. Has other reasons not covered in above.

(Listing and nulling to blowdown F/N item on the list.)

16. Has withholds about it.

(Get them off.)

17. Has had wrong reasons found.

(C/S Series 78.)

18. Not interested in success.

(P/L 3 May 72 and follow as in 14 above.)

19. Some other reason.

(Find it by 2-way comm.)

20. No trouble in the first place.

(Indicate it to person.)

When this list is assessed one can easily spot why the person is having trouble with the Data Series or applying it. When these reasons are handled, one can then get the series restudied and word cleared and restudied and it will be found that evaluations are much easier to do and much more rapidly done.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:ne.rd.nf Copyright v 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

86

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 25 MAY 1973

Remimeo

Data Series 27

SUPPLEMENTARY EVALUATIONS

(Starrate all evaluators)

If one knows how to evaluate an existing scene correctly (which means by the purest and most exacting application of the Data Series) and still does not achieve an improvement toward the ideal scene, several things may be the reason.

First amongst these is of course poor evaluation. Second would be a considerable disagreement in the evaluated scene with the WHY, especially if it is interpreted as condemnatory. Third would be a failure to obtain actual compliance with the targets in the evaluation. Fourth would be interference points or areas which, although affecting the scene being evaluated, are not looked at in relationship to it.

In any scene being evaluated, there are two areas which are not likely to get much attention from the evaluator as they may not be remarked on in any of the reports or data being used in his evaluation. These two types of area are (1) LOCAL ENVIRONMENT and (2) RELAY POINTS AND LINES BETWEEN POLICY AND ORDER SOURCE AND THE SCENE ITSELF.

These two areas may be looked at as (1) the plane upon which the scene exists and (2) the upper stages of authority under which the scene reacts.

THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

The surrounding area to the scene being evaluated in the matter of a person would be the general third dynamic or other dynamic in which he or she lives his day-to-day life and which influences the person and therefore influences his hat or post. The search for the WHY which exactly causes Joe or Joanna to fail to hold post or wear a hat and which when handled will greatly better Joe or Joanna may well be their reactions to environments at their level and which may be or may not be there with them. Family or distant friends, not visible to an evaluator, or the work environment or on-the-job friends of Joe or Joanna may greatly influence Joe or Joanna.

This might prove too inviting for the evaluator to blame environment for the state of the existing scene and a caution would have to be introduced: that any WHY must lead to a bettered scene and must not just explain it.

EVAL BY RELAY PTs.

Thus, in such a problem it should be understood that one has TWO existing scenes, one, the person and two, his environment; that they interrelate does not make them just one scene. Thus two evaluations about Joe or Joanna are possible, each with its program. To go about it otherwise is likely to prove as unsuccessful as the original evaluation of the person. Life and orders are reaching Joe or Joanna through relay points which are not ordinarily taken into consideration. Thus those areas should be separately evaluated. Usually, in the case of a person, something would have to be done to those areas, on the same plane as the person, by the person himself. So the program might include what the person himself could do about them.

The local environment of a material object, such as a machine or an office or a vehicle, may also be evaluated as well as the machine or the office or vehicle itself.

In short, there are relay points of difficulties that produce situations, on the same plane as the person or thing being evaluated. And these make ADDITIONAL evaluations possible and often profitable to the evaluator in terms of bettered ideal scenes. Yet at first glance, or using only the usual reports, it may seem that there is only one situation such as the person himself.

87

Completely in the interests of justice, it is unfair to put down a target in some greater area situation like "Remove Joe." It may well be that stats did go down when Joe was appointed to a post. Well, that may be perfectly true. But by only then evaluating Joe and not the greater zone of Joe's *personal* scenes, one may very well come up with a very wrong and abrupt and unjust target. WHO in other words, when found, may not solve the scene at all even when one only targets it as "specially train" or "audit" without removal. There may be another scene that is having an effect on Joe which, if not evaluated properly with a proper program of its own, will make nonsense out of any program about Joe himself related only to his post or position. Another scene may be relaying fatality to Joe which if unhandled will unsuit him to any other post of any other kind.

Thus Joe and Joanna would have, each of them, TWO or more full evaluations possible. What the person is failing at or not doing on the job may have a plain enough WHY that can be corrected by programming and moved to an ideal scene or at least toward it. What is hitting the person at an environmental or familial or social level might be an entirely different situation, requiring its own evaluation, with a proper WHY and program for Joe or Joanna to carry out themselves or even with some help from others.

In a broader case, we have, let us say, an organization or division that is in a situation. One, of course, can evaluate it as itself, finding a proper WHY and a nice bright idea and a program'. And one can also do a second evaluation of the local environment. This might be the society or an adjacent division or even another organization. And this will require the location of a situation and finding its WHY and working out a program to handle that can be done by the org or the division itself or with help from outside.

The local environment outside the scene being evaluated is then a proper subject for another evaluation.

It is a serious error to only evaluate the local environment as all too often the person or org or division will insist that that is the ONLY situation and also that it is totally beyond any remedy by their own actions. Thus, if the evaluator is going to evaluate the local environment of a subject that is in a situation, he does it AFTER he has evaluated the subject on its own ground totally.

EVALUATION OF ECHELONS

On any command or communication channel there are always a certain number of points extending from source through relay points down to the final receipt or action point. These may be very numerous. Some may be beyond the authority of any evaluator. But each is capable of having ITS OWN SITUATION that will cause an evaluation of the receipt or action point to fail.

These can be called "echelons" or step-like formations. The receipt or action point that is to comply finally with the program may be the subject of hidden sources of effect in the relay points of any program or order.

Thus, as in the case of a dangerous decline of some activity somewhere, an evaluator has several evaluations possible and probably necessary.

It would be, by experience, a severe error to try to evaluate all these different scenes (such as many echelons each in a different area) in one evaluation and find a WHY for the lot as one is attempting to find a single WHY for several different scenes in different places which violates the strict purity of evaluation procedure.

One may find the exact and correct WHY for the point of action and do a splendid program only to find that somehow it didn't come off or didn't last. Yet it was the right WHY for that scene. Hidden from view is the influence on that scene from one or more upper echelons which have, themselves, an individual situation and need their own WHY and their own program. Only then can the influence on the action point be beneficial in its entirety.

There is a system by which this is done.

1. One recognizes that there is a situation in an area which has not responded well to previous evaluation or has not maintained any benefit received very long.

88

2. One realizes that there are several,echelons above the point being evaluated.

3. One draws these points without omission. This makes a sort of graph or command chart. It includes every command or comm relay point above the level of the point being evaluated.

4. The points, if any, BELOW the point under consideration as in I above are then added to the chart below it.

5. One now undertakes a brief study of EACH of these points above and below to see if any have a situation of its own that could influence the success or failure of the original point evaluated as in I above.

6. One does a full separate evaluation of each of these echelon points where any situation seems to exist. Each of the evaluations done must have its own local situation, WHY and program. Care is taken not to evaluate "n o- situations." Care is also taken to keep this SERIES of evaluations consistent with the main idea of remedying I above.

7. The evaluations are released as a series and executed as feasible.

In doing such a series, brand new data may leap out as to the interrelationship of all these relay points and this may bring about a recommendation for a change of organization requiring new policy. But this would be another evaluation entirely as it is in effect an evaluation of basic organizational policy and may even require that tech be issued or withdrawn.

Take a case where the area which has not bettered or sustained a betterment has in actual fact two echelons below it and six above. The area, let us say, is a continental management office of an international hotel chain. Below it are its state offices and below that the hotels on that continent. Above it is the international comm relay center, the international headquarters executive at international headquarters for that continent, above that the international management organization, above that the chief executive of the international management organization, above that the advisors to the board and above that the board itself.

By drawing these out as a series of echelons one sees that there is potentially a series of eight evaluations in addition to the main evaluation of that continental office which is where the situation originally was. By scanning over all these eight other influencing areas, one may find one or more of them which have situations of real influence on the original evaluation subject.

One then evaluates separately and handles separately WHILE STILL GOING ON HANDLING THE ORIGINAL SUBJECT.

One can then also do the local environment evaluation of the original subject if there seems to be a situation there.

No evaluation is done where there is no situation. But one should assert in a covering note to the series that there are no known situations in the remaining points.

Doing a series of evaluations and local environment evaluations can be extremely fruitful only so long as one realizes that they comprise separate situations which only by their influence are preventing an ideal scene from being achieved in the original area where betterment cannot be attained or maintained.

Supplementary evaluations, when necessary and when done, can rescue a long series of apparently fruitless evaluations of a subject and move the evaluator himself toward a more ideal and happier scene of success.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sr.rd.nf Copyright © 1973 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

89

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 19 SEPTEMBER 1973

Issue IR

Remimeo REVISED 22 JUNE 1975

Data Series 28R

(Data Series 28 is cancelled because it could be misinterpreted and I did not authorize its release. The data contained in it would have been written by me as a P/L had I considered them vital to evaluation.)

CHECKING EVALS

In checking over the evaluations of others, there is no substitute for following the hard and fast rule of insisting upon

- a. Purity of evaluation
- b. Consistency
- c. Workability
- d. Authenticity of the data.

There are no small rules. To quote one of these, "The situation is the direct opposite of the ideal scene." This is not necessarily true and is not a precise definition. A situation is the most major departure from the ideal scene. That's purity by definition.

A Why is not necessarily opposite to an ideal scene. But it is of the same order of thing.

Example: Stat of Income Divided by Staff sunk to 150.

Ideal scene: Staff producing under competent management.

Sit: Execs not coming to work.

Why: The ED has forbidden any exec to be paid.

If you look this over it is consistent. But it is not reversals or opposites.

The stat found the area, the ideal scene was easy. Search of data found the sit as the biggest departure. Further search found the Why. Further search and knowledge of the existing scene would get a bright idea (which would not be sacking the ED who is probably the only one coming to work, but more likely getting the ED and execs into a hello-okay session and resolve their hates and ordering execs be paid at once).

THE COMMON BUG

(Orders of Day Item 24 Feb 75)

"I found that getting the sit was a common bug. Evidently people don't do a real stat analysis and get an ideal scene, look for its furthest departure and get the sit and then look for data and find the Why.

"There are many ways to go about it but the above is easy, simple and foolproof.

"It would look like this on a worksheet:

90

"GDS analysis to find the area and a conditional guess.

"Ideal scene for that area.

"Biggest depart from it for the SITUATION.

"Stats Data Outpoint counts Why Ethics Why WHO Idealscene Handling Bright idea.

"If you're very good your GDS analysis will get confirmed by data.

"The real Why opens the door to handling.

"And you can handle.

"This doesn't change eval form. It's just a working model.

"All good evals are very consistent-all on same railroad track. Not pies, sea lions, space ships. But pies, apples, flour, sugar, stoves.

"I think evaluators get dispersed and Q and A with data, lacking any guideline. And so take a near forever.

"Last one I did, the GDS analysis gave the whole scene and then it got confirmed, all on the same outline as above. That org is still booming!

"It took 6 1/2 hours, *including* doing the majority of the targets!

"It doesn't take days or weeks, much less months!

"It takes hours."

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.nf Copyright © 1973, 1975 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

91

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East **Grinstead, Sussex**

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 19 SEPTEMBER 1973-1

Rernimeo ADDITION OF 20 MARCH 1977

Data Series 28R-1

CHECKING EVALUATIONS

ADDITION

(In January 1976 LRH began work on sorting out the fact that evaluators were not evaluating situations. What follows is taken from LRH notes.)

MULTIPLE SITUATIONS

"Somebody has evaluators on a 'whole org' kick where the evaluation must handle the whole org. Evidence of this is 'the Why' lately was defined as something that handled all outpoints. The initial step of the stat analysis to find the area and then find its situation and its Why is not being done. Hence individual org situations do not get spotted or evaluated and evaluations take forever."

(One of the org evaluations submitted to LRH was returned with the following note.) "This evaluation has almost no outpoints in it. Almost every paragraph is a situation requiring evaluation.

"A situation is something that affects stats or survival of the org.

"An outpoint is something that contributes to a situation and should not be in the situation area.

"A Why is the real basic reason for the situation which, being found, opens the door to handling.

"Evaluators who are trying to embrace the whole org of world in one evaluation are missing all the real situations or landing only in Division Seven."

(The following is a despatch written by LRH in May 1976 regarding an earlier evaluation done on an org which LRH was evaluating at the time.)

"That evaluation, that was to pull in the CO, had one of these 'philosophical Whys,' 'The CO and HCO have prevented execs from being made by omitting actions that would accomplish this (i.e. choosing suitable ones, hatting, training and apprenticing them) which has led to blows and 19th century solution of transfers and removals and eventually no execs at all.' That's all fine but you can ask of it, 'How come they're doing that?' so it couldn't be a bottom level Why. Anytime you can ask a 'How come?' you haven't got a Why, you have a situation.

"Just an off-the-cuff Why better than that would be 'Day and Foundation staff are the same, allowing no time to hat and train' or another, 'There is no HCO staff' or another 'Only a handful make the GI and the rest of the org is considered superfluous'-yet none of these are the Why either as you can also again ask 'How come?' And the org is delivering.

"So this is what I am working on now. The new type of evaluation would use telex

92

lines and FRs to ask a lot of questions AFTER one had found the real situation. It would go: Find the situation area from stats, find the situation from data files, get some sort of a Why (that will now become the situation) and burn the telex lines or send a mission from the FOLO to find out how come that situation. You would then get the real Why and could do a program. This would make evaluations pretty real!"

Compiled from LRH notes of January 1976 and May 1976

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Assisted by

Louise Kelly

Flag Mission 1710 I/C

LRH:LK:lf.nf Copyright 10 1973, 1976, 1977 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

93

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 19 SEPTEMBER 1973-2

Remimeo ADDITION OF 2 OCTOBER 1977

Data Series 28R-2

MULTIPLE SIT EVAL FORMAT

For multiple situation evaluations, the following is the correct format to use in the final evaluation write-up:

SITUATION ONE

POLICY.

SITUATION.

STAKEHOLDERS:

DATA:

OUTPOINT COUNT.

PLUSPOINT COUNT. (As applicable)

WHE.

ETHICS WHY. (As applicable)

WHO: (As applicable)

IDEAL SCENE:

HANDLING: (For a multiple sit eval, the plan is written here, e.g. "*HANDLING:* Find and train executives...." etc.)

SITUATION TWO

POLICY

(And so on, as per above)

The above format is repeated for as many situations as were evaluated.

Then:

PROGRAM

1. (First target)

2. (Second target)

And so on.

The program targets to specifically handle the Whys of each situation should be divided up as follows:

94

SITUATION ONE TARGETS

4. (Or whatever number, in sequence, after any beginning general targets) Make up a list....

5. Go through the org....

6. Go and see. .

(Etc.)

SITUATION TWO TARGETS

19. (Or whatever number, in sequence, following the Sit One targets) See that....

20. Call on

21. Get the

(Etc.)

One does this for as many situations as were evaluated.

When writing and issuing a set of program orders or mission orders separate to the eval itself, the usual program or mission order format is used, except the operating targets get divided up as shown above.

Compiled from AO 536-10 and FMO 1672 as the proper format per direction from LRH as given in ED 270 FB

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Assisted by

S. Hubbard

AVU Verifications Chief

LRH:SH:pat.nf Copyright © 1973, 1977 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

95

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 30 SEPTEMBER 1973

Issue I

Remimeo

Data Series 29

OUTPOINTS, MORE

1 recently surveyed a number of possible new outpoints. Almost all of them were simply the basic outpoints in a different guise and needed no special category.

However, two new outpoints did emerge that are in addition to the basic number.

The new outpoints are

ADDED TIME. In this outpoint we have the reverse of dropped time. In added time we have, as the most common example, something taking longer than it possibly could. To this degree it is a version of conflicting data = something takes three weeks to do but it is reported as taking six months. But added time must be called to attention as an outpoint in its own right for there is a tendency to be reasonable about it and not see that it IS an outpoint in itself.

In its most severe sense, added time becomes a very serious outpoint when, for example, two or more events occur at the same moment involving, let us say, the same person who could not have experienced both. Time had to be ADDED to the physical universe for the data to be true. Like this: "I left for Saigon at midnight on April 21st, 1962, by ship from San Francisco." "I took over my duties at San Francisco on April 30th, 1962." Here we have to add time to the physical universe for both events to occur as a ship would take two or three weeks to get from San Francisco to "Saigon."

Another instance, a true occurrence and better example of added time happened when I once sent a checklist of actions it would take a month to complete to a junior executive and received

compliance in full in the next return mail. The checklist was in her hands only one day! She would have had to add 29 days to the physical universe for the compliance report to be true. This is also dropped time on her part.

ADDED INAPPLICABLE DATA. Just plain added data does not necessarily constitute an outpoint. It may be someone being thorough. But when the data is in no way applicable to the scene or situation and is added it is a definite outpoint.

Example: Long, long reams of data on an eval write-up, none of which is giving any clue to the outpoints on the scene. By actual survey it was found that the person doing it did not know any Why (not having used outpoints to find it) and was just stalling.

Often added data is put there to cover up neglect of duty or mask a real situation. It certainly means the person is obscuring something.

Usually added data also contains other types of outpoints like wrong target or added time.

In using this outpoint be very sure you also understand the word *inapplicable* and see that it is only an outpoint if the data itself does not apply to the subject at hand.

There is more about another already named outpoint:

WRONG SOURCE. This is the opposite direction from *wrong target*.

96

An example would be a president of the United States in 1973 using the opinions and congratulations of Soviet leaders to make his point with American voters.

A more common version of this, not unknown in intelligence report grading for probability, would be a farmer in Iowa reporting a Mexican battleship on Mud Creek. The farmer would be a wrong source for accurate naval reports.

A private taking an order from a sergeant that countermands an order he had from a lieutenant would be an example of wrong source.

What is sometimes called a "Hey You" "organization" is one that takes orders from anyone = a repeating outpoint of wrong source.

There are many examples of this outpoint. It must be included as a very important outpoint on its own. It produces a chaos of illogical ideas and actions when present.

PLUSPOINTS

CORRECT TIME or the expected time period is a pluspoint.

ADEQUATE DATA is a pluspoint.

APPLICABLE DATA is a pluspoint.

CORRECT SOURCE is a pluspoint.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.jh.nf Copyright c 1973 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

97

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 30 SEPTEMBER 1973

Issue 11

Remimeo

Data Series 30

SITUATION FINDING

There is an ironbound rule in handling things:

WHERE YOU FIND OUTPOINTS YOU WILL

THERE ALSO FIND A SITUATION.

If several outpoints come to view in any scene (or even one), if you look further you will find a situation.

There is not any real art to finding situations if you can see outpoints.

The sequence is simple. (1) You see some outpoints in a scene, (2) you investigate and "pull a few strings" (meaning follow down a chain of outpoints) and (3) you will find a situation, and (4) then you can evaluate.

Statistics are leaders in pointing the way. They should be X, they are not X. That is conflicting data. Behind that you will find a situation.

If anyone has any trouble finding situations then one of three things is true (a) he cannot recognize outpoints when he sees them, (b) he does not have any concept of the ideal scene or want it, or (c) he does not know how to pull strings, which is to say ask for or look for data.

On the positive side, to find situations one has to (A) be able to recognize outpoints, (B) has to have some idea of an ideal scene and want it, and (C) has to be able to "pull strings."

Evaluation is very much simpler when you realize that the art lies in finding situations. To then find a Why is of course only a matter of counting outpoints and recognizing what (that can be handled) is retarding the achievement of a more ideal scene.

REASONABLENESS

One often wonders why people are so "reasonable" about intolerable and illogical situations.

The answer is very simple: they cannot recognize outpoints when they see them and so try to make everything seem logical.

The ability to actually see an outpoint for what it is, in itself is an ability to attain some peace of mind. For one can realize it is what it is, an outpoint. It is not a matter for human emotion and reaction. It is a pointer toward a situation.

The moment you can see this you will be able to handle life a lot better.

The human reaction is to REACT! to an outpoint. And then get "reasonable" and adopt some explanation for it, usually untrue.

You can safely say that "being reasonable" is a symptom of being unable to recognize outpoints for what they are and use them to discover actual situations.

NATIVE THINK

It may come as a surprise or no surprise at all that the ability to evaluate as given in this Data Series is not necessarily native to a being.

98

In a native state a being detests illogic and rejects it. He seldom uses it for any other purposes than humor or showing up a rival in debate as a fool or using it in justice or a court of law to prove the other side wrong or guilty.

A being is dedicated to being logical and he does, usually, a wonderful job of it.

But when he encounters illogic he often feels angry or frustrated or helpless.

He has not, so far as I know, ever used illogic as a systematic tool for thinking.

Certain obsolete efforts to describe Man's thinking processes stressed "associative thought" and various other mechanisms to prove Man a fully logical "animal." The moment they tried to deal with illogic they assigned it to aberration and sought drugs, tortures or executions that would "cure it." None of them ever thought of *using* illogic as a tool of rational thinking! Thus they did not advance anyone's intelligence and conceived intelligence as unchangeable and fixed.

The only Greek school of philosophy that dealt with illogic was the Sophist school. But even they had no real idea of the illogic. They were employed by politicians to make their political acts seem *reasonable!*

Even humorists have no real idea of illogic. Reading their ideas of the theory of humor shows them to be off the mark. They don't really know what is "funny."

Laughter is rejection, actually.

And humor you will find usually deals with one or another outpoint put in such a way that the reader or audience can reject it.

The groan of most humorists is that too often their hearers go reasonable on them. PAT: "Who was that hobo I saw you with last night?" MIKE: "That wasn't no oboe, that was my fife." LISTENER (puzzled): "But maybe it was a very slender hobo."

The tendency of a being is to try to keep it reasonable, logical, rational. And that is of course a very praiseworthy impulse or all life's endeavors might unhinge.

The fear of being illogical is a secret fear of being crazy or insane. (Not an idle fear when psychiatry was roaming around loose.) Or at the least being thought a fool or dullard or at the very very least, unworldly and uneducated.

To evaluate and be a fine evaluator is to be able to prevent a slump toward a painful collapse. And to be able to steer the way from the non-ideal present to the ideal future.

A person who feels queasy about his sanity really doesn't dare look at outpoints or confront and use illogic. Yet it is the way to full sanity itself.

The ability to evaluate puts one at cause over both the mad and ideal. It places a being at a height it is unlikely he has ever before enjoyed in the realm of commanding the situations of life.

Evaluation is a new way to think.

It is very worthwhile to acquire such an ability as it is doubtful if it ever before has been achieved.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:ntjh.nf Copyright © 1973 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

99

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 25 NOVEMBER 1973

Issue I

Remimeo CORRECTED AND REISSUED 17 MAY 1974

Data Series 31

FINAL TARGETS

The first, foremost and most usual reason evaluations fail is because the programs to handle are not done.

The evaluator, with all the study for an ideal scene, the exhaustive search for data and the collection and count of outpoints and pluspoints, with the discovery thereafter of the right Why and the brightest of ideas to handle may yet be totally defeated by the simple fact that no one ever chases up the target execution and gets the program really and honestly DONE.

He can even have someone who is responsible for getting his program executed only to find they are themselves issuing additional or even contrary orders. Or even issuing whole new programs which have no relation to evaluation at all.

Circumstances have been found where a person with the duty of getting targets done was so deficient in the ability to confront that he accepted any excuse at all and was even pushed over into other subjects. The remedy for this of course is HCOB 21 Nov 73, "The Cure of Q & A, Man's Deadliest Disease."

It can be so bad that persons entrusted with target execution *did not even speak to or approach any person who had a target to do* while not reporting at all or reporting marvelous progress with the program!

So, sad to have to relate, it is not enough to be a fantastic and able evaluator. If the program is never truly done, the evaluation is merely a mental exercise.

The ability to supervise and obtain cooperation and execution is mandatory for the skill of any evaluator.

HCO P/L I Sept 73, "Admin Know-How No. 30" and HCO P/L 15 Oct 73, Admin Know-How Series 31, "Administrative Skill," give the evaluator some of the additional data he needs to obtain execution of his programs.

One can say right here that the thought, "Oh well, I'm just a sort of technician here and it's really not up to me to RUN things. I just evaluate and it's up to 'them' to see that they carry it out," is very likely to occur.

But if one's repute as an evaluator is to be established, it will come about because

THE EXISTING SCENE MOVED UP MARKEDLY TOWARD OR BECAME THE IDEAL SCENE.

If that does not occur, then seniors or workers don't blame the supervisors or communicators. They blame the evaluator. "Oh him! He evaluated the building situation and look, the whole situation went to hell."

No justice at all. The data and Why and all the rest were quite right. The on-paper evaluation was perfect. It would have "handled the hell" out of it. But lamentably the program just was never done. Altered or falsely reported or untouched, the targets just weren't done.

So the test of an evaluation is

DID IT MOVE THE EXISTING SCENE TOWARD OR ATTAIN THE IDEAL SCENE?

100

mnlr~

And that *cannot occur* without the program being fully and totally and correctly *done*.

See also HCO P/L 26 Jan 72, "Not-dones, Half-dones and Backlogs" for more data on this.

Thus it is VITAL that four final targets exist on *every* evaluation,

These are

(Fourth from last number of the evaluation program.) Verify from personal *inspection of* the existing evidence or the scene itself that every target has been fully done without omission, alteration, falsehood or exaggerated reports. EVALUATOR.

(Third from last number of the evaluation program.) Look at current statistics and the results of the above *inspection and* the SITUATION of this evaluation as written above AND SEE IF THE SITUATION IS NO LONGER A THREAT. EVALUATOR.

(Second from last number of the evaluation program.) Look again at the IDEAL SCENE as written above. Then look at the above two targets and further investigate and SEE IF THE IDEAL SCENE HAS NOW BEEN APPROACHED MORE CLOSELY OR ATTAINED. EVALUATOR.

(Last numbered target of the evaluation program.) (A) If the above three targets do not show a favorable approach toward or *attainment of* the IDEAL SCENE, gather new data, investigate further and RE-EVALUATE or (B) If the IDEAL SCENE has been more closely approached or attained the following commendations or awards are assigned:

EVALUATOR.

This signifies the conclusion of the evaluation.

(Note: The last four targets may be made available on a mimeograph sheet for the use of an evaluator in ending off his evaluation.)

By using this program ending, it is abundantly clear to all those concerned with the evaluation *including the* evaluator that

THE PROGRAM AND ITS SUCCESSFUL EXECUTION ARE AN INTEGRAL PART OF AN EVALUATION.

Unless the program is fully, truthfully and successfully done, an evaluation alone *cannot remedy* any situation and the ideal scene will not be attained.

The reason for and the final objective of any evaluation is the approach toward or *attainment* of the IDEAL SCENE.

L. RON HUBBARD Founder LRH:clb.jh.nf Copyright 19 1973, 1974 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[Note: The 17 May 1974 reissue corrected a typographical error in the original mirneo.]

101

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 25 NOVEMBER 1973-1

Issue I

Rernimeo CORRECTED AND REISSUED 17 MAY 1974

Data Series 31 Addition

FINAL TARGET ATTACHMENT

To save the evaluator writing the final targets longhand this sheet is provided. It can be filled in with the proper numbers and data, inapplicable lines crossed out and this sheet stapled to the end of any eval.

(Fourth from last number of the evaluation program.) Verify from personal inspection of the existing evidence or the scene itself that every target has been fully done without omission, alteration, falsehood or exaggerated reports. EVALUATOR.

(Third from last number of the evaluation program.) Look at current statistics and the results of the above inspection and the SITUATION of this evaluation as written above AND SEE IF THE SITUATION IS NO LONGER A THREAT. EVALUATOR.

(Second from last number of the evaluation program.) Look again at the IDEAL SCENE as written above. Then look at the above two targets and further investigate and SEE IF THE IDEAL SCENE HAS NOW BEEN APPROACHED MORE CLOSELY OR ATTAINED. EVALUATOR.

(Last numbered target of the evaluation program.) (A) If the above three targets do not show a favorable approach toward or attainment of the IDEAL SCENE, gather new data, investigate further and RE-EVALUATE, or (B) If the IDEAL SCENE has been more closely approached or attained the following commendations or awards are assigned:

EVALUATOR.

LRH:ntmjh.nf

Copyright v 1973, 1974 **L. RON HUBBARD**

by L. Ron Hubbard Founder

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[Note: The 17 May 1974 reissue corrected a typographical error in the original mirneo.]

102

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 14 DECEMBER 1973

Remimeo

Data Series 32

TARGET TROUBLES

TARGETS JUNIOR TO POLICY

A target given on an evaluation may not set aside management policy or technical releases.

Where such a target is written or misused to supplant policy a great deal of trouble can follow.

Example: Org policy in authorized issues states that accounts for the week must be finalized at 2:00 P.M. Thursday. Someone writes an evaluation and puts a target in it to end the week on Sunday. People doing the target actions change to Sunday. This is out of phase with all other actions and chaos results.

People tend to take orders from anyone and anything in a poorly organized area.

When they use evaluation or project targets instead of policy the whole structure may begin to cave in.

NO EVAL TGT IS SENIOR TO OFFICIAL ISSUES AND WHERE THESE CONFLICT THE TARGET HAS THE JUNIOR POSITION.

The only way a target can change policy is to propose that such and such a policy be officially reviewed on proper channels or that a new policy be written and passed upon properly by those in actual authority.

Someone attempting to do a target who finds that it conflicts with policy or official technical releases and yet goes on and does the target is of course actionable.

TARGETS OUT OF CONTEXT

CONTEXT- "The interrelated conditions in which something exists or occurs."

OUT OF CONTEXT: Something written or done without relation to the principal meaning of a work.

Targets must be written within the meaning of the whole evaluation.

Example: The evaluation is about pie. There is a target that says to polish shoes just because the evaluator happened to think of it and squeezed it into the program. A program written to increase pies winds up with the ideal scene of polished shoes. No pies get increased so the evaluation fails.

Targets must be **DONE** within the *context* of the evaluation.

Example: An evaluation is done to increase central office collections. It calls for another evaluation to be done on a statistic. The person doing that target reduces the number of items collected upon and crashes central office collections.

The person **DID NOT READ OR UNDERSTAND THE WHOLE EVALUATION** before he did the target and so did it in a way that accidentally defeats the ideal scene.

Example: An evaluation is done to fill up a big hotel of 450 guest capacity. One of its targets calls for project orders sending a team to the hotel. The person who writes the project orders does not look at the evaluation or the hotel plans and specifies 30 guests must be gotten! The evaluation is defeated.

FALSELY EVALUATING

A person who evaluates a situation without chasing up all the data or even looking at the data in his files can bring about a false evaluation.

Example: A person has come back into an organization at a high level. The place crashes. The evaluator does not examine personnel changes at the time of the crash and comes up with "too many football games" as his Why and the evaluation fails.

FALSE DONES

False reports that a target has been done when it has not been touched or has been half done at best is actionable in that he is defeating not only the evaluation but the organization.

Example: The evaluator has an ideal scene of repaired machines that will increase production. The mechanic reports all machines repaired now when he has not even touched them. The evaluator sees production remains low, looks around for a new Why. But his Why is falsely reported dones on his accurate eval!

PERSONAL CONTACT

Targets seldom get done without personal contact.

Evaluations should carry the name or post of the person who is overall responsible for the completion of the program.

Sitting at a desk while one is trying to get people to do targets has yet to accomplish very much. One can have messengers or communicators or Flag Representatives getting the targets done but these in turn must depend upon personal contact.

A person assigned responsibility for getting a whole program done is not likely to accomplish much without personal contact being made.

This can be done on a via. Mr. A in location A remote from Mr. C in location C can get a target done reliably only if he has a Mr. B in that area whose sole duty it is to personally contact Mr. C and have Mr. C get on with it despite all reasons why not. That is how targets get done. That is also how they can be reviewed.

Target troubles are many unless the program is under direct contact supervision. Even then targets get "bugged" (stalled). But the evaluator can find out why if personal contact is made and the target can be pushed through.

SUCCESS

Therefore the success of an evaluation in attaining an ideal scene depends in no small measure on

1. Both evaluator and target executor realizing policy and technical materials are senior to targets in programs and that targets do not set senior policy aside. One of the best ways to prevent this is to know and refer to policy and technical issues in targets.

2. Targets must be written in context with the evaluation and done in context with the ideal scene. The best way to achieve this in writing an eval's targets is to make them consistent with the Why and ideal scene. The best way to be sure that targets will be DONE in context is to require that

anyone doing a target must first read the whole evaluation (and be word cleared on it) before he does his target so that he does his target in a way to improve the existing scene in the eval not some other scene.

104

3. To prevent false evaluation one may require that the evaluator attests that all **pertinent data and statistics have been examined and to discipline** such failures whenever an evaluation fails.

4. To prevent false donees one must review the evidence of donees and statistics after the program is complete and discipline all falsely reporting persons and reassign the targets or in any way possible get them actually done.

5. The way to get a whole program done, target by target, is through personal contact. Supervise it by personal contact with those assigned the targets. Or use a communicator or messenger. Where the people doing the targets are remote from the evaluator one must have someone there to do the personal contact. And be sure THAT person isn't just sitting at a desk but is actually doing personal contact on targets. Thus all evaluations, on the issue itself or by organizational pattern, should have someone who can personally contact people getting the targets done fully and completely.

If these points about evaluations and their programs are understood, one can and only then can move things toward the ideal scene.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.ts.nf Copyright v 1973 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

105

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 3 JULY 1974RB

Remimeo RE-REVISED 6 NOVEMBER 1978

RE-REVISED 29 JANUARY 1979

(Only revision is addition of items Y and Z)

(Revisions in this type style)

Data Series 33RB

EVALUATION, CRITICISM OF

There are six duties of a person who is responsible for passing evaluations:

1. To see that the evaluation is correct and that it can accomplish or approach the ideal scene,

2. That those doing evaluations, by the process of the criticism itself, become trained and better evaluators,

3. That persons doing evaluations become correctly and well-trained by the process of training, cramming and, as needed, ethics,

4. To see that evaluations do occur on existing situations,
5. To see that unevaluated situations do not exist and,
6. To make sure that the Data Series is used to its full potential.

When an evaluation is rejected, care must be taken that the criticism is correct and not capricious.

If one gives out-tech criticisms of evaluations, no evaluator will really ever learn evaluation. He will just become confused and desperate. The quality of evaluations will deteriorate and the Data Series potential will be defeated.

Therefore the only criteria that may be used in calling attention to outnesses in an eval, a requested rewrite or correction are

- A. Purity of form (all parts of an eval included).
- B. Verification of stats.
- C. Date coincidence correct and proven on graphs, using all graphs that have to do with the situation.
- D. GDS analysis supporting the eval (stat management P/Ls apply).
- E. Exactly offered data not borne out by an inspection of files.
- F. No situation.
- G. Insufficiently broad situation.
- H. Inconsistent - policy - situation - stats - data - Why - ideal scene -handling - tgts, not on same subject. The inconsistency must be precisely pointed out.

106

1. Outpoints in the eval itself-such as in bright idea or handling, etc. The outpoint must be precisely noted and named. This does not include outpoints in the data section which are the outpoints on which the eval is based.

J. Not all pertinent or available data applicable or needed was examined by the evaluator. The excluded data must be exactly stated as to what it is and where found. Not looking at all applicable or important data makes it a partial eval.

K. Wrong Why.

L. Weak handling.

M. Handling does not include targets to handle directly or indirectly the more serious outnesses found in the data mentioned.

N. Absence of ethics handling on serious ethics matters found in the data mentioned or of the ethics Why.

O. No method of implementing the evaluation or maintaining the scene and getting its targets done. Such as a broken line between evaluator and scene or omitted terminals or ethics Who(s) depended upon to do the targets.

P. Sequence of handling incorrect or omitted. A production target must come first. Errors of solid organize for many early consecutive targets without production in them, no organizing at all are flunks.

Q. Vague generalities in postings which do not name the new person or the person to replace the person being moved up.

R. Musical chairs-

S. No resources or ways to get them or nonutilization of known resources or excessive use of resources for no real gain.

T. Off-policy orders or orders that set policy.

U. No target or targets to get in the policies mentioned under "Policy."

V. Unreadable or illegible presentation of the eval for criticism or review.

W. Failure to return eval promptly with corrections.

X. Bright idea isn't bright enough.

Y *No eval.*

Z. *No data trail, incorrect data trail.*

If the reviewer, corrector or critic of evaluations does the above AND NOTHING ELSE he will be rewarded with better and better evaluations, less and less time spent correcting, more and more gain by use of the Data Series and a happier and more productive scene entirely.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.dr.clb.nf Copyright Q 1974, 1978, 1979 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

107

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 18 JULY 1974

Remimeo

Data Series 34

SITUATION CORRECTION

I have just reviewed a number of attempted evaluations and was struck by the similarity of errors in them. None of these evaluations would have reached any ideal scene or even improved the existing scene.

The real reason for this is that the majority of them had a highly generalized situation such as "Bidawee Biscuit Company failing" or "Stats down from last year." They then proceeded on a data trail and got a "Why."

In these cases the Why they found was actually the situation!

Each of them had failed to use the data trail to find the situation. They were using the data trail to find a Why!

The evals then had no Why.

The handling was just a bunch of orders that were in fact unevaluated orders since no real Why had been found,

Like in playing a game these evaluators had started 50 feet back of the starting line and when they got to the starting line (the situation) they assumed it was the finish.

If you look at an "evaluation" that has a generalized "situation" like "continental products getting fewer" you will find in a lot of cases (not always accurately) that what was put down as the "Why" was in fact the situation. This left the "eval" without a Why. Thus the ideal scene would be wrong and the handling ineffective.

Example: (not in form) "Situation: Gus Restaurant failing." "Data: Customers refusing food, etc., etc." "Why: The food isn't good." "Ideal scene: A successful Gus Restaurant." "Handling: Force Gus to serve better food, etc., etc." That isn't an eval. That is an observation that if Gus Restaurant is to survive it better get evaluated. It is being evalued because it *isn't* surviving. Now look at this: The data trail led to "the food isn't good." *That's* a situation. Why isn't it good enough? Well it turns out the cook got 15% commission from the store for buying bad food at high prices. And Gus didn't know this. So bang, we handle. Gus Restaurant achieves ideal scene of "Gus Restaurant serving magnificent chow."

In this example if you used the situation for a Why the Who would probably be Gus!

The data trail of outpoints from a highly general "situation" (that is only an observation like failing stats) will lead one to the situation and *then* a closer look (also by outpoints) will lead one to the real Why and permit fast handling.

DATA TRAIL

People can get too fixated on the history of something. They can call this a "data trail." Well, all right, if it's a trail of outpoints.

108

But significances of history have little to do with evaluation.

Let us say you see the machine division is failing.

Now if you simply take masses of data about it and just start turning over 10 or 12 sheets at a time looking for outpoints only and keep a tally of what they are and to whom they belong, you will wind up with your situation area and probably your situation without reading any significances at all.

Now that you have your area and situation in it You can start really reading all about it and get that existing scene's data and its outpoints. And your Why leaps at you.

SUBSTITUTION

You can't substitute stats for a situation or a situation for a Why.

But substitution of one part of an eval for another is a common fault.

Substituting a general hope for the ideal scene you really would and could achieve makes a sort of failed feeling in an eval. "Gus Restaurant being best in town" is nice but "Lots of

customers very well fed so Gus Restaurant survives" is what you are trying to achieve. That can occur and will be reached if you find the real Why.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:rhc.act.ts.nf Copyright c 1974 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

109

000C.-M

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 19 JULY 1974

Rernimeo

Data Series 35

EVAL CORRECTION

An evaluation submitted for an okay is only reviewed to the first major outness (see HCO P/L 3 July 74, Data Series 33) and is then returned for correction.

Only when no major correction is necessary does one then verify all data or go to an extensive review of the whole eval.

This makes the line very fast. It also saves a great deal of work by one and all.

If the stats are incorrectly given, that's it. Reject. If the Why is really the situation, that's it.

On the reject one gives the letter of Data Series 33 that is not correct and any reference to the Data Series that would seem helpful.

An evaluation corrector will see how well this rejection system works when you find that the eval, let us say, has no situation on it, but only some stats. Why verify anything as a whole new body of data may have to be found.

In correcting evals, if a situation is given, I usually call for the main stats of the unit being evaluated to see if these show any reason to handle it at all. I recently found an activity had had its chief removed when his stats were in Power. The activity then crashed. And that was the situation. It was made by an evaluator and an eval corrector not looking at the stats!

If no error exists in situation or stats I read the eval down to bright idea and look especially at the Why, ideal scene and handling to see if one would make the others.

If that's okay, I look at the targets of handling and the resources.

If those are okay, I look at data and outpoints. If these are all okay, I then verify the data.

But if at any of these steps I find an error, I then reject at once for immediate correction.

Often, by using only basic things to reject, the whole eval has to be redone as the basics are so far wrong.

If you try to correct the whole thing before rejecting or if you correct tiny little things instead of the big ones, the whole line slows.

Eval correction should be a fast, helpful line, strictly on-policy, no opinion.

That way the job of correction becomes easier and easier.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

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

110

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 11 AUGUST 1974

Remimeo

Data Series 36

ENVISIONING THE IDEAL SCENE

If one cannot envision the ideal scene, one is not likely to be able to *see* a situation or get one.

A SITUATION IS THE MOST MAJOR DEPARTURE FROM THE IDEAL SCENE.

Thus:

ONE MUST BE ABLE TO ENVISION AN IDEAL SCENE TO FIND A SITUATION.

A lot of "ideal scenes" you see are just glib. An afterthought.

Some people know the proper scene so well they at once recognize that a departure from it has occurred, which is fine. But such people do not realize, when they are teaching evaluation or correcting evals, that others may not know the proper scene well enough to get an idea of what *the* ideal scene should be. Thus, a wrong target occurs. The teacher or corrector keeps putting attention on the incorrectness of the situation given in the eval instead of noticing that the ideal scene is adrift.

An ideal scene is FUTURE.

When one is stuck on the time track it may seem pretty difficult to envision a *future*.

In politics this is called "reactionary" or "conservative." These mean any resistance to change even when it is an improvement. The bad old days seem to be the good old days to such people. Yet the old days will not come again. One has to make the new days good. \$

"Liberals," "socialists" and such make great propaganda out of this. They inveigh against (criticize) conservatives and say the future must be reckoned with. And they hold up some often incredible future scene and say the way to it is by "revolution" or destroying everything that was.

Both viewpoints could be severely criticized. The conservative tries to stick on the time track with no reality on the fact that today will be yesterday in 24 hours. The super-liberal skips tomorrow entirely and goes up the track 5 or 10 years to a perfect state which can never exist or is falsely represented as possible.

In between these two viewpoints we have the *attainable*.

And we come to an ideal scene that is possible and will occur if the Why is right and handling is correct and done.

Envisioning an attainable future requires some connection with reality.

There is no harm at all in dreaming wonderful dreams for the future. It's almost the bread of life.

But how about giving oneself a crashing failure by disconnecting from any reality?

Some laborers do this to themselves. Taking no steps to attain it, they daydream themselves as kings or some other grand identity. Well, all right. But that isn't an "ideal scene." That's a delusion engaged upon for self-gratification in a dream world.

One can not only dream a *possible* ideal scene but he *can* attain it.

So an ideal scene is SOMETHING THAT CAN BE ATTAINED.

It should be quite real.

Some people setting unreal quotas are really setting some impossible ideal scene. "Complete this work in I hour!" to someone working hard on a job that will take 4 days is delusory. It is setting, without saying so, the ideal scene of having a worker who is really a magician! Well, maybe if he were audited and hatted he would be. But that's sure some ideal scene! The here and now is a guy sweating it out and trying. And that's an ideal scene that is missed!

And so are many ideal scenes missed. The offices neat and orderly might not even be imagined by someone who has seen them in a mess for two years. He may think that's the way they're supposed to be! And be quite incapable of envisioning the offices in any other condition!

Thus, if one cannot see the offices should be clean, he does not see that they are dirty and messy as a *situation*. Thus when he is told the public won't come into the place, and even if he finds the place is full of old dirty junk, he can't evaluate it as a clean orderly place would not be envisioned by him. So he doesn't get "dirty place" as a valuable datum, doesn't get "a clean orderly place that is inviting to the public" as an ideal scene, doesn't get "office so dirty the public won't go near it" as a situation and so cannot find a Why to lack of public! And so as he didn't find Why it was so dirty and disorderly, it wouldn't handle. So there would be a failed eval.

Yet the teacher or evaluation corrector would not realize the person could not envision an ideal scene and so keep telling the person to find the situation whereas the ideal scene was what was out.

You can get some very beautiful ideal scenes AND attain them-if you can evaluate!

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.rd.nf Copyright e 1974 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

112

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 12 AUGUST 1974

Remimeo

Data Series 37

WHYS OPEN THE DOOR

You can really understand a real Why if you realize this:

A REAL WHY OPENS THE DOOR TO HANDLING.

If you write down a Why, ask this question of it: "Does this open the door to handling?"

If it does not, then it is a wrong Why.

Backtracking to find how it is wrong, one examines the ideal scene and the situation one already has.

The outpoints should be checked. The completeness of data should be checked. One may find he is in a wrong area of the scene.

Correct that, correct the ideal scene, correct the situation and look for more data.

With the outpoints of more data one can achieve the real Why that will open the door to handling.

Quite often an "evaluator" "knows" the Why before he begins. This is fatal. Why evaluate?

Some of the most workable Whys I've ever found surprised me! So usually I also ask, did I know this? Am I surprised? The chances are, if I "knew" it already (and the situation still exists) it is a wrong Why. And needs proper evaluation.

When you have a right Why, handling becomes simple. The more one has to beat his brains for a bright idea to handle, the more likely it is that he has a wrong Why.

So if you're not a bit surprised and if the handling doesn't leap out at you **THE WHY HAS NOT OPENED THE DOOR** and is probably wrong.

I have seen evaluators take weeks to do an evaluation. In such cases they went on and on reading as they did not know how to find a real Why. Actually they did not know what one was.

By going through the total current files of an activity looking for outpoints just by randomly glancing at data sheets from all sources, you can find the AREA. Outpoints lead you straight to it.

An ideal scene for that smaller AREA is fairly easy to envision.

The type of outpoint will generally give you how the departure is. One can then get the situation.

By looking over (in detail now) the data of that smaller area and counting the outpoints, one can find the Why.

113

nnmr~

The Why will be how come the situation is such a departure from the ideal scene and **WILL OPEN THE DOOR TO HANDLING.**

If it doesn't, then review the whole thing, do the steps again. Don't just sit and sag!

Let's say we find outpoints of added inapplicable data in all reports. And they lead to Reception. The ideal scene of Reception is easy: attractive pleasant atmosphere, welcoming in the public.

We find more detailed reports that the place is full of junk and filthy and we get our situation, "public repelled by filthy messy Reception."

Now why?

So back to the real data and we find the janitor never cleans it. Or anything else. The easy out is just sack the janitor (and leave the post empty). But that won't handle so we have no Why.

So we dig and dig and suddenly we find that the staff refer to the janitor in lowly and disrespectful terms: "Janitor has no status." Well, the outpoints all say so. And it opens the door to a handling.

So we handle by transferring the janitor org board position from treasury where it went as he "looks after assets" to the Office of the President with the president's secretary as his direct senior.

We write up a program for clean offices.

Magic!

The offices get clean!

The public again comes in.

The ideal scene is attained.

(You may think this example is pretty unreal. But actually it once happened and worked!)

So a right Why opens the door to handling.

If it doesn't, look harder.

THERE IS ALWAYS A REASON FOR THINGS.

And if your ideal scene and situation are correct, you can find the real Why that opens the door.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.rd.nf Copyright c 1974 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

114

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 3 OCTOBER 1974

Rernimeo

Data SerieN 38

PLUSPOINT LIST

The following is a list of PLUSPOINTS which are used in evaluation.

Needless to say, pluspoints are very important in evaluation as they show where LOGIC exists and where things are going right or likely to.

RELATED FACTS KNOWN. (All relevant facts known.)

EVENTS IN CORRECT SEQUENCE. (Events in actual sequence.) TIME NOTED. (Time is properly noted.)

DATA PROVEN FACTUAL. (Data must be factual, which is to say, true and valid.)

CORRECT RELATIVE IMPORTANCE. (The important and unimportant are correctly sorted out.)

EXPECTED TIME PERIOD. (Events occurring or done in the time one would reasonably expect them to be.)

ADEQUATE DATA. (No sectors of omitted data that would influence the situation.)

APPLICABLE DATA. (The data presented or available applies to the matter in hand and not something else.)

CORRECT SOURCE. (Not wrong source.)

CORRECT TARGET. (Not going in some direction that would be wrong for the situation.)

DATA IN SAME CLASSIFICATION. (Data from two or more different classes of material not introduced as the same class.)

IDENTITIES ARE IDENTICAL. (Not similar or different.)

SIMILARITIES ARE SIMILAR. (Not identical or different.)

DIFFERENCES ARE DIFFERENT. (Not made to be identical or similar.)

The use of the word "pluspoint" in an evaluation without saying what type of pluspoint it is, is a deficiency in recognizing the different pluspoints as above. It would be like saying each outpoint is simply an outpoint without saying what outpoint it was. In doing evaluations to find why things got better so they can be repeated, it is vital to use the actual pluspoints by name as above. They can then be counted and handled as in the case of outpoints.

Pluspoints are, after all, what make things go right.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

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

115

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 28 OCTOBER 1974

Remimeo

Data Series 39

WHO-WHERE FINDING

You may now and then see an eval that winds up with a *Who*. Very rarely you also find one that winds up in a *Where*. Sometimes you find an "evaluator" who only finds Whos or Wheres.

If this puzzles you when you see such "evals" or if you land in that situation yourself while evaluating, remember this:

AN "EVA12" THAT ONLY HAS A WHO OR A WHERE AS ITS WHY IS *INCOMPLETE*.

What has happened is this: The "evaluator" does an outpoint count only for Who or Where. He does not then really investigate or dig up the real data on that Who or Where but lets it go at that. He says-WHY: Dept I not functioning. WHO: Director of Personnel. IDEAL SCENE: A functioning Dept 1. HANDLING: Shoot the Dir Personnel.

Such evals do NOT raise statistics. They do *not* work. Because they are not complete!

In *any* eval you have to do an outpoint count to find where or who to investigate. This prior outpoint count does not appear, always, on the eval form. It's just where to look.

Having gotten the Who or Where you NOW do a full read out, lift the rocks, pry into the cracks and find the Why.

It can even get worse. Having seen something wrong, one puts down a situation. He does a preliminary outpoint count for a Where or Who and *then* discovers a more basic or even worse situation. In other words his situation can change!

Example: No personnel being hired leads one to Dept 1, Personnel. So one writes the situation: "No one being hired." Then one can easily dash off, "Why: Dept I inactive. Ideal scene: An active Dept I hiring personnel." And write up a handling: "Hire people."

Great, easy as pie. *But* somehow six months later there are *still* no personnel! The reason is simple: The "evaluator" never went beyond the Who-Where. He put down a Who-Where as his Why.

Real evaluation would go this way: First observed situation, "no personnel being hired." The Who-Where comes up as Dept 1. *Now* and only now do we have something to evaluate. So our *situation* has changed. It becomes, "Dept I inactive." And we investigate and lo and behold there is no one in that whole division! Again we could go off too early. It is tempting to say, "Why: No one in it!" And say, "Handling: Put somebody in it!"

But actually "no one in it" is just data! Certainly the execs who should be screaming for personnel know there is no one in Dept 1. After all, they get cobwebs on their faces every time they pass the door! So it is just an outpoint, not a Why as it does

116

not securely lead to solution. So we look further. We find seven previous orders to put on a Director of Personnel! The writers of these orders are not the Whos but who they were given to are elected. That's seven noncompliances by the executive in charge of organizing! And this turns out to be Joe Schmoe. Now we have a Who. So what's with this Joe Schmoe? So we go to anything connected with Schmoe and we locate board of directors minutes of meetings and herein he has been stating for 2 years repeatedly that "The organization only makes so much money anyway so if we hire anybody to deliver service we might go broke." As the organization has been going broke for those two years and the last Dir Personnel was fired two years ago we now also have our DATE COINCIDENCE. But this is still just an outpoint-contrary facts, as one has to deliver to stay solvent. So we look up Joe Schmoe even further and we find he is also the chief stockholder in a rival company! So here is our Why: "Organization being suppressed by the chief stockholder in the company's rival." "Who: Joe Schmoe. Ideal scene: Organization hiring personnel needed to deliver." Now for the handling. Well, Joe Schmoe could mess things up further if we just fired him. So we better

know what we're doing. We have found our organization controls the tin Joe Schmoie's company needs for its cans. So we shut off the tin supply and when Schmoie's stock falls we buy it up, merge the companies and fire Joe. Or so a businessman would do. THAT handles it!

Shallow evals that stop with a Who-Where on the first inspection don't succeed. Outpoints are usually aberrated and the people there around them usually handle things unless they have depth of mystery.

You have to have a Who-Where to *begin* your investigation. Once you find your Who or your area, now the outpoints begin to count.

Very few situations in actual fact are caused by active Whos. Usually it is inactive Whos, confronted with situations they have not grasped and don't see any way through.

A classic case was a situation that did not resolve for over a year until *very* close **investigation discovered a statistic was wrongly worked out and which targeted** an area in the wrong direction. One could have shot "Whos" by the dozen without ever solving it!

So when you see a Who-Where as a Why, you know one thing: The eval is incomplete.

You can cure someone doing this chronically by making him first list the outpoints that show Who-Where to look. And then make him go on with the evaluation outpoints that lead to a Why, giving two counts of outpoints. The light will dawn.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

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

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 12 MARCH 1975

Rernimeo Issue 11

Evaluators

DSEC Students *Data Series 40*

Execs

Flag Bureaux **THE IDEAL ORG**

FOLOs

(First appeared as LRH ED 102 INT,
20 May 70, referring to evaluation.)

The ideal org would be an activity where people came to achieve freedom and where they had confidence they would attain it.

It would have enough space in which to train, process and administrate without crowding.

It would be located where the public could identify and find it.

It would be busy looking, with staff in motion, not standing about.

It would be clean and attractive enough not to repel its public.

Its files and papers, baskets and lines would be in good order.

The org board would be up-to-date and where the public could see who and what was where and which the staff would use for routing and action.

A heavy outflow of letters and mailings would be pouring out.

Answers would be pouring in.

Auditors would be auditing in Div IV HGC and Qual would be rather empty.

Supervisors would be training students interestedly and 2-way comming all slows.

The HCO Area Sec would have hats for everyone. And checked out on everyone.

There would be a pool of people in training to take over new admin and tech posts.

The staff would be well-paid because they were productive.

The Public Divisions would be buzzing with effective action and new people and furnishing a torrent of new names to CE

The pcs would be getting full grades to ability attained for each, not 8 minutes from 0 to IV, but more like 30 processes. And they would be leaving with high praises.

The students would be graduating all on fire to audit.

One could look at this ideal org and know that this was the place a new civilization was being established for this planet.

The thousand or more actions that made it up would dovetail smoothly one with another.

And the PR Area Control would be such that no one would dream of threatening it.

Such an ideal org would be built by taking what one has and step by step building and smoothing, grooving in and handling each of its functions, with each of its divisions doing more and more of its full job better and better.

The business is always there-the skill with which it is handled and the results on pcs and students is the single important line which makes it possible to build the rest.

The ideal org is the image one builds toward. It is the product of the causative actions of many. Anything which is short of an ideal org is an outpost that can be put right. The end product is not just an ideal org but a new civilization already on its way.

L. RON HUBBARD Founder LRH:nt.nf Copyright © 1975 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

118

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 15 MARCH 1977R

Remimeo REVISED 17 SEPTEMBER 1977

Data Series 41R

EVALUATION:

THE SITUATION

(Later developments on situations are contained in Data Series 28R, 28R-1, 34 and 39. However the data following, compiled from an LRH taped conference in 1972, is of sufficient importance to include as part of the Data Series.)

There are bad situations, good situations and no situations. A situation is something that applies to survival and if you evaluate the word "situation" against survival, you've got it. A good situation is a high level of survival; a bad situation is a threatened survival and a no situation is something that won't affect survival.

We've gone ahead of the whole show of intelligence with the Data Series.

NOTE: We are using intelligence as an example solely and only because it is the most inclusive system Man has developed for collection and evaluation of data.

We have greatly refined this system. Espionage and other intelligence activities and skills have no part in our application. We are using intelligence as an example of data usage systems, that is all.

You are out in an area of greater simplification and far more use. This doesn't necessarily make anyone an intelligence officer, but a general or a head of something or a general manager or an executive who does not know how to evaluate a situation will make nothing but mistakes. The mistakes of history are made by people who can not evaluate, by which we mean determine the situation-which even more simplified would be find out the situation. From this given body of data, from that indicator we can find a good situation, or a bad situation or a no situation. And this is what one is trying to determine. The more skilled one becomes in doing it, the less work it is. It is a matter of skill.

To give you an idea: If you tried to play every note of a concerto separately by having to look up each note in the chord and then strike it on the piano, you wouldn't have much of a tune, right? But the longer you did that, the more likely you were to begin to approximate some sort of something that sounds like music. But it would take a lot of practice.

Now you can get so all-fired-good at evaluation that you can take an isolated indicator and know immediately where it fits into because you know it fits into the plan of things and because you know it is or isn't part of an ideal scene. It's better than the existing scene or it is too far from an ideal scene. You can pick up an indicator in this way-and it sometimes probably looks magical to you how I will suddenly pick up an isolated instance and look down the line and we find a roaring hot situation at the other end of it.

Now that is done out of an economy of data. It is done because one has not the time to investigate or read all of the data which might exist on this particular subject being investigated. So one learns to do something that looks absolutely intuitive and when you're terrifically hot at this it is called "flair."

Prediction from data is an essential part of evaluation. "This datum is an outpoint-it shouldn't be, peculiar." Now it will predict more data.

119

You have to be so hot that you will notice something is an outpoint-it's a wild outpoint of some kind or another-accept its magnitude, size of datum, how important is this datum. The evaluation of importance is one of the more difficult things people have to do. They have a tendency to consider things a monotone importance. You have to train yourself out of that.

What do we get here then as a qualification for an evaluator? You have to know all the outpoints in sight. You have to know what outpoints are. But that's rather thinking backwards because you should know that something shouldn't be. And as soon as you get a "shouldn't be" you can do a prediction. And that leads you into an investigation-by viewing other data. In other words you find this terrific outpoint or these outpoints and you find out where they exist, it leads you into, very directly, the point that you should be investigating.

DEFINITION OF EVALUATION

This is as close as the dictionary comes to the definition of evaluation: "to examine and judge concerning the worth, quality, significance, amount, degree or condition of." (The Third Webster's International Dictionary.) Now to edit that down, it's "to examine and judge the significance and condition of."

An evaluation: "the act or result of evaluating, judgement, appraisal, rating, interpretation." And an evaluator is "one that evaluates. An intelligence officer is supposed to be a professional evaluator." (The Third Webster's International Dictionary.)

This word is a technical word which isn't given in these dictionaries. It is an action which is basically an intelligence action.

The actual meaning which is supposed to be embraced in the word is "to examine the evidence in order to determine the situation" and that is the intelligence meaning and then it could have, further: "so as to formulate policy or planning related thereto. In other words 'What is the enemy going to do? So the general can say 'Therefore we should. . . .'"

WHAT IS EVALUATION

Here is an example of what evaluation is, the type of thing expected of an evaluator.

I was looking at an org's graphs, all of a sudden I see a drift down of reserves and a level of bills. The bills are level, level, level-drift down of reserves, until all of a sudden it's about to cross and this was an org where we just changed the CO, so I say "Hey whoa! Wait a minute, wait a minute! This organization is spending more than its income obviously by the looks of this graph. So let's look into this just a bit further." I looked further and got more data and I found out that the org was running insolvent. The Data Bureau already had a report on this; I picked it up on another line. I just picked it up off graphs.

Further investigation found out that the new CO had taken over from the old CO and had inherited an extremely backlogged org-included backlogged bills. And the new CO had been sent in there on a set of Garrison Mission Orders-and they just contained standard COing actions when they should have been MOs designed to handle the insolvency scene-forcing the org to promote and make income; then making an announcement that no POs will be signed except promotion, wages and utilities; then get in the date-line paying and forcing Accounts to dig it up out of all their mouseholes and all those bills that have been in there for a year or two and the stuff they didn't file and get a date-line paying system in. Then you start surveying like mad to find out what the organization can sell and then you start delivering, beef up your delivery lines and so on.

It wasn't any surprise to me to learn that that graph was a false report, of course. But this is no explanation. It doesn't mean the situation doesn't exist but the graph is a

false **report**. That is an outpoint all in itself. It's actually backed up by other data but you could have taken it this way: You could have seen the graph declining-that is reserves going down, bills staying the same and you find out it's a false report. At that moment, by Data Series, you charge in and investigate the heck out of it. Here's an indicator, then another indicator that's a false report.

Where did I count outpoints? I was counting them all the time. One is enough-a declining reserves graph and a holding debts graph-well that was enough. So the counting was "one," and as I looked a little further I got "two" and then as I looked a little further I got a "three" and a "four" and a "five" and a "six." We did a handling and more outpoints showed up. Right as you are handling the thing more and more outpoints show up so there is a point where you neglect any more outpoints, you can go on as a lifetime profession finding outpoints in one of these areas. It's enough. '

We have actually done something with the Data Series which has never before been done. Other data evaluation systems have to do with the reliability of the observer, which determines if the reported fact is a "proper datum." But all of their work is done on computers and those computers are built against logic systems developed by the Greeks. But it is data, data validity of, which monitors logic.

A black propaganda operation is almost totally concerned with feeding wrong data into the population and therefore the population cannot come to correct conclusions and their actions will be peculiar. There are experts in black propaganda and they're fully trained in it and they do it all the time.

Back of wrong data you will normally find an impure intent. So that somebody is giving you false reports is an evaluation in itself.

An evaluation first requires data. The absence of data you should have would give you an evaluation. We knew something was wrong with an area because all of a sudden somebody found out they weren't sending in their reports. The absence of data is an adequate evaluation that there is something wrong. And in one such case it actually took weeks to find out what was wrong.

If you find the outpoint, you're into evaluating a situation. You're just looking at data-you find an outpoint, you investigate that. You find more outpoints, you go along and say, "It's the thing that we're looking at now, what the heck. . ." because you're obviously traveling away from the ideal scene or you've found something that went much closer to the ideal scene or something that didn't change it. You then look it over and say, "It's this point," and at that moment you can figure out why this is occurring. "Now why is this occurring?" And that requires quite a bit of data. "Why is this occurring?" Therefore when you can say "Why," now you can handle.

What you want is the outpoint and an outpoint is a departure from the ideal scene. That tells you that there is an area to investigate and you can investigate it simply by going and finding more data and more outpoints and then as your data accumulates you can get why it's a departure. The accuracy of your Why then gives you the point which you will have to handle which is all very neat and there comes in your recommendation.

This is the trick on evaluation: You have to learn what is an outpoint, what is this outrageous thing and then that cones you down. Now you could find all kinds of little points.

REVIEW

Having handled the thing or having done something about it, don't be too surprised to now and then find a lot more data suddenly emerge. In fact it is almost usual now that you've started to handle something for more data to emerge. But you have to look it over. You have to say, "Well, have I handled it? Does this data confirm our Why or doesn't it confirm our Why?" And that's all you do with that data-it's confirmatory.

Sometimes you get data after the fact, after you've taken action. That is a review

121

of your evaluation. When the data comes in after the fact, there's another step involved here.

You review the situation and all of a sudden you find out you were looking at a heck of a wrong Why. One of the first things that will tell you you operated on a wrong Why is that the stats went down-because it departed further from the ideal scene.

You get injustices and that sort of thing coming out of wrong evaluations, so this is one of the reasons why you watch an evaluation in your line of country-you watch an evaluation after the fact. Was it true? So there's a confirmatory step which isn't mentioned in the Data Series-"Was that the right Why?" The Data Series does mention it's whether or not the stat goes up. But it's worse than that: "Did you have the right Why?" or "Did you shoot down the wrong man?"

FAMILIARITY

We have a considerable amount of technology which is administrative technology, which gives us an ideal scene, and with which we must be familiar in order to evaluate and handle. We would have to be as practiced in this as in the building of armament factories or running navies or building toy balloons or trying to get housing furnished to the great unhoused if that's what we were doing-you have to have some familiarity with the type of scene which you're handling.

If you're good at this you don't go on wasting your time and energy. You find the right Why, you set it up, you make sure that it does get set up-but there's nothing more you have to do with it and then that's that. Sometimes that takes quite a while but note that if you're immediately pressing down this Why all the rest of the way and you go on past the point where you corrected it-the thing is corrected-now you're handling a no-situation.

If you didn't have evaluation you would find yourself handling no-situations and neglecting tough situations and not taking advantage of good situations.

CLOUDING UP A SITUATION

Occasionally you'll find a scene wherein a person's or area's PR is greater to him than his production-PR, personal PR, means more than production. And that is a characteristic of a suppressive. He'll fog the situation up with big PR about how good it is so it can't be handled.

THE WHY

You have to know when you don't have a Why. It is very, very important to know you don't have a Why.

The end product of your evaluation could be said to be "What do we do about this?" In other words, your recommendation could be said to be the end product. Actually that's a short circuit. As far as your investigation and your data analysis is concerned your first target, the Why, if skipped will defeat the end product of your evaluation. If that Why is found then you can handle.

A Why is just this: It is the reason there has been a departure or closer approach to or an exceeding of the ideal scene.

What will defeat you continuously is trying to find Whys in no-situations. You won't find a Why. If you can't find a Why readily then you can possibly suspect that you have a no-situation.

A Why, by essence, is something you can do something about. You have to have a recommended action on top of the Why.

The Why is something which departed from, the reason it departed from or the reason why it bettered the ideal scene or got closer to it. It is a Why you can use and which will bring you a better scene.

122

Therefore the definition of a Why is: It must be something which will permit you to bring about a better scene-not necessarily bring about the ideal scene.

You might actually have a better scene than the ideal scene. We've described the ideal scene as so and so and all of a sudden a Why suddenly emerges which actually makes the ideal scene look pale. Taking the ideal scene of a moderately affluent org-we might all of a sudden move into a situation where the ideal scene was quite something else and we found out---Howcome all of a sudden Keokuk has made 8 million dollars in the last 13 days?" How come? We don't have an ideal scene anymore.

IMPORTANCE OF HAVING A WHY

We have a system of data handling which is superior to that of other data collection and evaluation organizations of today. I can say that because I know their systems. Systems? And they don't hold good. Imagine somebody saying "Well, we shouldn't pay any attention to Agent 622's reports from Kobongo because they're false." Oh? That'd mean one had a turned agent or an agent that wasn't working. In other words, it isn't meaningless, it's not something you discard into the wastebasket. Now a good data collection and evaluation officer doesn't always discard this. He says, "Well, it's false data so therefore it's probably been taken over by the enemy" and he does make some sort of hit at it.

But there are other outpoints that they would never have noticed. "A datum is OK. . . ." this is the general think-not just of the generals but this is general intelligence think. "Of the data we receive, a great deal of it is not useful because it doesn't come from reliable observers." Well that's a hell of an outpoint in itself. If an enemy battleship was seen on the coast it wouldn't matter who saw it-intelligence organizations would not pick it up unless it had been observed by a trained officer. ---Thetown could not have been shelled because no reliable observer put a report in-there was no artilleryman to tell us whether or not. . . ."

So our system doesn't begin with "The Slobovians are building 85,000 Panzer tanks, and that's by a reliable observer because Agent 462 has given us factual reports in the past and it's confirmed by aerial observation and satellite pictures. . . ." So what! The intelligence would be " Why are the Slobovians building this many Panzer tanks? Now, is this a lot more Panzer tanks than Slobovians normally build?" because maybe Slobovians go in for a lot of building Panzer tanks so they can call them T-something-or-other and say they were invented in Slobograv. Why? And we right away have a new brand of intelligence-Why? Why are they building these Panzer tanks? One is the fact that they're building these Panzer tanks, is that an outpoint? Well, is it a lot more Panzer tanks than they have built before? Is it a lot less? Did they build a million a year and are only building 200,000 a year now?

Now the officer evaluating this hasn't any Why, he hasn't anything so he makes the supposition that the Slobovians are now easing off. "Yeah, well general, the Slobovians are now easing off." "Yes, Mr. President, the Slobovians are now easing off and everything is going to be fine." The fool! What's the Why? Where's the Why? He assumed something-he didn't investigate further. He didn't look all over the place and find a whole lot of political or such ramifications and add it all up and so forth. Now, had he known about it he would have looked from that data to more outpoints and he would have found something or other-building the tanks for Bongoland so that they could knock

out their neighboring country. Why? Why? Because they have a contract with Bongoland to furnish them with tanks. He could've found something like that.

You get these unwarranted conclusions because they don't have the mechanism of asking "Why?" and they don't investigate it until they have an adequate Why that explains it. When you've got a Why you can handle.

THECHANGE

One more tip on this whole scene. If you can't find the Why, you revert. I learned this about life out of plant research. I found out that you went back to the point of major change in a greenhouse or a garden and corrected it the second you saw the

123

plants dying. You required, then, a logging of everything that was done. If you had a log of everything that was done you could get the date and the change. You knew the date they started to wilt so what change was around the vicinity of that date. And you inevitably and invariably found a huge change had taken place. Not a small one, and the tip is that if all else fails, why just go back to your major change and you can do that by stats, go to major change, and so on.

You won't always be right but you're operating on a general Why-there was a change. Every once in a while you'll be scattering around trying to find this.

This works in almost all situations to some degree, what change was there. It has a liability. It tends to wipe out improvements. If you go back to the point of high stuff all the time, all the time, all the time, you're pegging yourself into a pattern where, as a matter of fact, there might have been better patterns. There might have been a better Why in there than just a change of pattern.

NEW WHY

Once in a while you'll have found a Why and handled that, but find it keeps slipping out again. For example, an org having to be told to keep in its FP No. 1. FP No. I resulted from an evaluation of financial difficulties. That was a Why at one time and has since become a standard action-but where you keep having to say to an area "Get your FP No. I in"-now WHY do you have to keep getting in FP No. P The Why is not that FP No. I is out-we have gotten that in as a practiced action. Why does it keep sliding out in this area? There could be several things actually.

If you have to keep saying "Get in C/S Series 25 so that you do have a D of P so that people do come in and are invoiced and so forth," you are obviously running into a Why of why something keeps sliding out.

WHAT IS A RECOMMENDATION

What is a recommendation? Actually-usually-it would be recommended if somebody else were going to execute it. You have a recommended program and then from a recommended program you have an executed program, so at that moment you shifted your hat. You're no longer an evaluator, you're an executor or an executive.

If your evaluations, that wind up in Whys that wind up in recommendations, are going to autonomously function-that is to say, singly and by itself function-without regard to any other entity or activity, the next thing you know you're going to have fourteen or fifteen programs which are in direct collision which will produce sufficient confusion to reduce the stats. Then you, yourself, will wonder if you've found the right Why because it didn't work. Whereas the reason could be entirely different. The reason is your recommendation was in collision with other Whys and recommendations and so

operated to block other actions which were vital to the continuous operation of an activity. You can kill your own recommendation.

If you were in a position where you were going to independently of other evaluators execute all your actions, you might wind up with a mess-you've got your neck out as an evaluator.

The essence of a recommendation is "agreed-upon" and after there is a recommendation, there is an "agreed-upon" before there is execution.

An agreed-upon action means that you'd have to agree with other bodies of data which people had-not their personality-other bodies of data. If you have data which is contrary to an action which is being proposed, you could be put in a position of canceling or trying to cancel or recommending a cancellation of a senior's order. Therefore one has to have "agreed-upon" before execution.

When you are collecting data you have a torrent of data coming in. You are collecting data, collecting data, collecting data, collecting data. If that data is not evaluated, it is useless. It is just a useless expense. The only way that data is of any value at all is if evaluations are done on it.

124

Any independent order given without the benefit of the other evaluations would be a risk. It isn't agreed upon person to person, it's agreed upon data to data. The only agreement would be on whether there is a situation or a no-situation, a good situation or a bad situation or a no-situation. There'd have to be agreement on that point and there would have to be an agreement on the Why. Only then could you get a coordinated recommendation.

EVALUATE

You've got to do evaluations. If you don't do evaluations you'll be insufficiently informed to be a competent agreeer or disagreeer. You'll be insufficiently informed to be sufficiently efficient to get the show on the road.

Take advantage of the tremendous volumes of data which come in and, by doing evaluation, provide a sufficient running record of any and all existing situations in your line of country so that there is a general view of what is going on so that the data can be looked at, looked up and one is sufficiently informed so that he can make efficient judgments-and that will decrease the amount of work done on this and that, that doesn't really handle anything.

And it amounts to fewer orders which can then be enforced. It amounts to prosperity because one of the Whys we find on occasion is that there are too many orders drifting around which haven't been executed. One winds up operating on somewhat of a jammed communication line just jammed by volume. The guy that's reading all this stuff is out there and he's got noise and he's got this and they've got bill collectors and he's got something else and so on. He never has time to read it. He doesn't know what the situation is and so forth.

One could also, without proper evaluation, easily issue an order into an area with a hidden Why-which could destroy it.

And the speed of action determines the degree of loss-and that is a rule. The speed of action also determines the degree of gain. And speed has a price. An organization which is not doing well, its Why not accurately found for eight months is a loss for eight months each succeeding week. If an organization should be making fifteen thousand dollars and is only making two thousand dollars you're losing thirteen thousand a week every week that you don't handle it. It's speed of gain or loss.

Compiled from

LRH taped conference to
Staff Aides, "Evaluation"
720ITC02 SO

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Assisted by

Louise Kelly

FMO 1710 I/C

Revised and reissued by

AVU Aide

AVU Verif and

AVU Evals Chief

LRH: LK: M H:SH: M W:ifpat.nf Copyright © 1977 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

125

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 17 MARCH 1977R

Remimeo REVISED AND REISSUED 15 JULY 1977

Data Series 42R

DATE COINCIDENCE

STATS AS THE FIRST INDICATOR

The first indicator is usually stats. You can take a stat book of an org and look over its GDSes and know their interrelationship and find the outpoint, and then from that outpoint you will know what part of the org's folder to read. If you are doing evaluations by reading the whole folder, you're being silly. You're not interested in that. You're interested in this outpoint, because that's your first outpoint. Your first outpoint usually occurs in stats.

One outpoint, from stats, was tremendous quantities of bulk mail being mailed at vast cost after the stats had been brought up by regging, and then the stats collapse. That was the first oddity that was noticed from some Dissem stats. So it was a stat oddity. They were busy regging and they made a lot of money, and then they spent it on bulk mail and went broke. Because there was a stat oddity here. It meant the GI did not match the bulk mail. So it's an outpoint. It's inconsistent. Contradictory. Something's false. So right there, you're looking at a great big cracking outpoint. One or the other of those facts is a lie, or something's wrong. And we find out the real outpoint underlying it is wrong target. It's just number of pieces being sent out. They were mailing out fliers several times a week-sending scraps and calling it bulk mail.

Now just the fact that an org's stats are down is an outpoint.

Having found a downstat you look to see if the org ever did make money? If it was ever affluent. Just taking it from the standpoint of GI, was this org ever affluent? If the org was ever

affluent, it must have been doing something right so you've got something that approximates its ideal scene.

You haven't approached data files yet. That's why stats are separate from the data files.

LOCATING A COMPARATIVE

So here's two conditions: (1) the stats are down, and (2) you can't evaluate one thing, as you learn in the Data Series, unless you have a comparative thing. You have to compare it with something. So you can find a period when their stats were up.

You find out that in July of 1969 Kokomo was really booming. It had nice climbing stats and they went up and up and up and up and up. And that rise started on the 6th of June. What did they do? In May and June of 69? Those are the two folders you want. Anything you can find out about that org of May/June 69. That gives you something dimly resembling an ideal scene. It isn't *the* ideal scene, but it is certainly an upstat scene. That gives you a comparative.

If you were hot you would use your telex lines to fill in the missing holes. For instance, if you don't understand something, or if it looked like they moved in 1970 and you can't find out locally, and you don't seem to know whether or not they didlocation seems to be something important here-you could send a telex to somebody who might know and say, "Where were you located in June of 69? Where was this org located? Can you find out from anybody?" It might be important you see. This is just a

126

collection of a little bit more data. You know that the org was doing something, at that time, that it isn't doing now.

I did just this when I wrote the PL "Selling and Delivering Auditing." I looked back when HGCs were really making the money and wrote that PL. This PL is in use in one org and they're really going to town. They're using the same system. A guy comes in to sign up, they say, "No you can't sign up for one intensive, thank you, you'll have to buy seven," or something. So he does, he pays the money on the barrelhead. That PL comes out of a comparative-a comparative of HGCs not selling much auditing and having a hard time doing so, and what they were doing in an earlier period.

So, when doing an evaluation (1) look at your stats, (2) find your outpoint in the stats, (3) find some comparative-find some period of affluence for the org, if you can, to give you some ideal scene for that org. That requires something of a pluspoint evaluation. Now you can do your outpoint evaluation. Because you've already got the outpoint, you don't have to read 8,752 folders.

ETHICS SITUATION

A while back, I asked the Data Bureau for the folders of a particular downstat org. The first folder came up, that wasn't even a complete month's folder. I looked through the folder, read scraps of what I was reading, picked out the reports I wanted. Scanned them. Pulled the outpoints out of them. Counted up the outpoints as to where they were going. And the thing just fell apart. The CO was unaware of the fact that Personnel was letting him down. That was their admin Why. And obviously the CO had to take that person in there off. And obviously there was something wrong with this CO. Now every eval done on that org since is grooving on straight down that same Why. We've tried to make orders, and we've tried to do this and we've tried to do that. But now an ethics situation has developed out of the thing. We got the admin Why all right. But an ethics situation developed as we tried to get this in. And notice that THE ETHICS SITUATION DEVELOPS WHEN YOU TRY TO GET IN THE ADMIN OR TECH WHY.

In another area the ethics situation developed to such a degree that it then emerged-after an observation mission, after a handling was done and orders were issued-that they did not execute a single one of them. They were told to revert. They did not. Therefore an ethics Why was looked for.

Now I've just found out why people can't put in ethics. They don't know investigatory tech, and possibly in some cases their own ethics are out. If you put their own ethics in, they will get in ethics further. The reason they assign broad conditions and the reason there are so many Comm Evs is they don't know how to investigate.

WHO WHEN

Someone was given an evaluation to do and had been on that for five days. I kept asking all this time-where's this evaluation? People must think I'm rushing them. Evaluators are slow because the evaluation is not being done in this sequence: (1) stats, (2) who was on where.

I gave an order to an evaluator to find out exactly when did a CO of an org come to Flag, and when did this person go back, because that would give you a stat comparison. That was how I found this person was the man-of-all-work and the scooting genius of that org. Now you're talking about ethics. It's the police action called date coincidence. It's how you locate geniuses and murderers. Body found in swamp. Her cousin arrived in town on Tuesday. Body found on Wednesday. Guy departed on Thursday. That's all the police need. That's called date coincidence. That's old time investigatory tech. It's still with us.

So, when were they gone out of the org, and when did they arrive back in the org, and what happened during that period of time? Important!

127

In the case of this particular CO, I found out that two other execs could leave the org and return and nothing happened-but when the CO left, the roof fell in, the front steps collapsed under everybody, and the staff went on vacation. I traced this down and I found out that this CO would run around the org wearing hats in rotation. She dived into Tech and wore the Tech Sec hat for a while, and then she dived into another area, and she wore that hat for a while, and the stats would go up. In other words, she supported that area by punching one area at a time. That was the way she was operating. So if she was all over the org like that, her obvious post was D/CO. We put her on that post, and the org has done well ever since.

Now that's a sort of ethics action in reverse. That's looking for who really pushes it. You don't just **keep on looking for tigers**. Tigers are probably more numerous than geniuses. But you could find that certain people have a vast effect on stats. This is how you evaluate a personnel scene. In another org, a guy took over and the place has been crashed ever since and it was right square on the stats. There is your most obvious ethics investigation by stats.

When you don't know, you've got to send an investigatory mission and it's got to be run well. Otherwise they just wind up shooting all the people that the staff complain about.

If you don't operate on a comparison every time-comparison admin Why, comparison on the stats, ethics comparisons-if you're trying to operate on a single datum, that single datum won't buy you any pie. Because it has nothing to compare with.

SUMMARY

What the Data Bureau gives us is experience. And that is huge files full of experience, but you've got to recognize what you're reading. You don't read everything! If you do you're omitting an analysis of the GDSes and an analysis of who went on where. At a good time and a bad time.

What are you looking for? You're looking for the stat-look at your GDSes (this is for your admin Whys), tells you the big outpoint, tells you what information you're looking for in the files-and you're only interested in that information. You start counting up that type of information and see where it lands, and the Why will practically jump out at you out of the folder. It is so easy! It just leaps right out. But you have to know what you're looking at.

In writing up one eval, an evaluator verbally gave me more valuable data than she had put into the eval. She was quoting reports. All you want to do is quote the steps of your investigation.

The Why has got to be specific. If a Why is insufficiently specific, it just can't be operated.

There's an admin Why, which is the normal one that you're trying to handle. There'll be an admin or tech Why and below that there'll be an ethics Why and above that there'll be a bright idea.

You have a criterion when you've got your evaluation all done, your handling has got to be bright-it's got to be a bright idea, that will actually drive those stats up-and something which can be operated. And if you do an evaluation that cannot be operated at this stage of the game, you're just wasting your time. Look at your resources. What can you do with what you've got? While you improve what you've got. It will all have to be done by a gradient. So the worse off things are the brighter you have to be.

When you do evaluations, you've got to be able to operate the resulting actions. If you write something that can't be operated nothing will happen. That at once tells you whether you have a good evaluation or a bad evaluation.

128

Do your evaluations in such a way that they are dead on-bang! bang! bang!and then, that being the case, they have got to be something that can be operated. And the next thing you know your stats will go up.

Compiled from LRH taped conference to Staff Aides "Current and Future Operations Actions"
7205TC 18SO

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Assisted by

Louise Kelly

Flag Mission 1710 I/C

Revision assisted by

AVU Aide,

AVU Evals Chief,

AVU Verif

LRH:LK:MH:MW:SH:lf.pt.nf Copyright © 1972, 1977 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

129

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 18 MARCH 1977R

Remimeo REVISED 8 OCTOBER 1977

Data Series 43R

EVALUATION AND PROGRAMS

CAUSING STATS

I've learned this over the years: The entirety of our stats are internally caused. WE CAN CAUSE STATS AT WILL. External actions don't affect them.

A newspaper can write reams of entheta and it doesn't affect our stats at all. We get good publicity-it doesn't affect our stats. It's totally internal.

The public demand is apparently exactly as great as we put the wherewithal in their hands with which to demand-apparently exactly proportional. You get as great a response as you require.

Therefore, the more efficient your org is, the greater response you will get. It's that elementary.

The test of an evaluator or executive is: "Can you get your org to do a constructive thing at once without any flashback or any nonsense, and will it occur in such a way as to increase stats promptly? If so, you're a good administrator. If you can't do that, we have all kinds of paint to scrape."

It's just that: The guy can produce an effect or he can't.

And if you run a managing body that way, all of a sudden the staff will get happy and cheerful producing effects; everything will be fine-because they'll become at cause.

That is the essence of hatting. The person can then come up to cause and he'll get sane, productive and cheerful.

Actually, it takes a very able guy to do an administrative line. A ditchdigger has to have a solid line of his arm and a shovel, and that's as far as he can produce an effect. That's why he's a ditchdigger.

Now for a guy to produce an effect at 7,000 miles without any solid beam-he has to be right on the ball. He has to know his business.

SPEED OF EVALUATION

There was once a situation in an org which was very interesting. Apparently the ED was stopping the reports of the LRH Comm and Flag Rep, so no one was about to find out what was going on in that org. But if the manager had been on the ball, all he would have had to do was to look at that data file and find those reports missing and know that there was something wrong-and it would have been detected a long time before.

What you're up against is that most of your evaluation is on omission, and the toughest outpost for anybody who is not familiar with the scene to recognize is an omission.

THE SPEED OF RECOGNIZING OUTPOINTS DETERMINES THE SPEED WITH WHICH ONE CAN EVALUATE.

You wonder why it takes people so long to evaluate. It is simply that they are too slow in recognizing an outpoint.

THE INABILITY TO RECOGNIZE AN OUTPOINT IS REASONABLENESS.

It's that thing, reasonableness. We've been talking about it for years. That's just the inability to recognize an outpoint.

There was a fellow out in the field saying "I think we have done all right in the past"-meaning "without the Data Series"-in our thinking and planning." He didn't think he had to take a Data Series course or something. Whereas I was literally getting rivers of outpoints from him and his area. He didn't recognize them as such.

Well, what he didn't appreciate is that this is a brand new way of thinking. Man prides himself on being logical so that he has never based any system on illogic-except humor. You have to learn to think backwards-you learn to think backwards, and boy can you think forwards. It's like a dichotomy, positive-negative. If everybody omits the negative all the time, they never get to the positive.

A lot of people are on a stuck flow of being sensible and sane-and that winds up in stupidity. So they get reasonable. Their confront of evil isn't up to it-basically, their confront of outpoints.

THE ABILITY TO RECOGNIZE OUTPOINTS WILL EXACTLY MONITOR THE SPEED OF EVALUATION AND THE ABILITY TO HANDLE THE SCENE.

An evaluator cannot say, when he hasn't received any reports for 2 1/2 months, that he doesn't know what to do because he hasn't received any reports . . . he'd better be able to recognize an omitted report when he sees one and that there is a situation and he had better take action to remedy that situation NOW.

INACTIVITY

Now, nobody ever does nothing. They never do nothing. You have to look around to find out what he IS doing.

If it's an exec who can't get juniors to produce, he could probably be putting a stop on production lines. A Why is findable to such a situation. That's probably an ethics scene. But you still will find a Why. You always find a Why for the situation. In other words, he's in a personal situation of some kind or another. He might be able to function, himself, as a junior or he might not-but for a guy to sit there with completely idle staff members and not notice it, with their areas wrapped around a telegraph pole-quite reprehensible.

In investigating one inactive Esto, I found out she was operating under an order that she was not to Bait and Badger until she was trained on it-and there were probably many other things she "was not permitted to do." She accepted an illegal order not to do certain Esto actions. Found out one, probably if we had investigated further, why we would find more. In the first place, if anybody has read the Esto Series, he'd find out that you are an Esto (it says it right in the beginning) and that's it. It doesn't matter if the guy has studied it or not studied it, he's an Esto and he's supposed to do the job. So it was a violent policy violation as well as keeping someone from doing her job.

EXPANSION PROGRAM

An expansion program is for getting an org built. It's based on an evaluation for that org. There is a way you could go about this. Suppose you wrote Kokomo and said,

"What should be done about Kokomo?" You get a bunch of answers from the whole staff-compulsory answer, not a couple of guys. Evaluate from that what their level and tone and that sort of thing is. And you could then form up, based squarely on policy and forming the org, an expansion program.

The expansion program is actually a very basic org rudiment function, but which would be adapted to that org, and within the reality of that org. Highly specialized-and it's terminable. The person executing it, when he gets through with the thing-that's the end of that one. Now let's get another entirely new program.

You could actually do it on a blanket basis where each org was treated as an individual org. Then you'd know what policies to get in in this org. You just ask them, "What should be done about Kokomo?" "What should be done about Keokuk?"they'll tell you. Then you could go down to your Data Files and do an evaluation for the expansion program.

You can thus use knowledge of the org's troubles and the staff interviews as the basis for an evaluation.

There has to be an immediate organization for production, according to the Prod-Org system. However, long-range, long-term organization actions have got to be done by somebody because the Prod-Org system tears an org to ribbons. There's got to be somebody putting an org there who's not directly involved in that immediate scene. He's got to put it there adroitly enough so that what he puts there expands its production so as to pay for the additional organization.

It's quite neat, that type of program. As they get executed along the line, they wind up with an increased production. Every three or four targets that are done, why all of a sudden you've got more production. There could be some good long-range targets like "Get 30 auditors" -probably could take a year or more to exhaust such a target.

But note-such an expansion program wouldn't go on your *production* program execution lines at all. Your long-term organizational actions go on another line than your immediate production actions.

PRODUCTION PROGRAM

Such a program is something concerned with handling an immediate situation which had to do with immediate production. Right now. Such as:

WHY.- Division 6 doing all the sign-ups for Division 2.

HA NDLING: 1. Get a Registrar on post in Division 2, right now.

2. Then get an Advanced Scheduling Registrar on post immediately.

3. Then get three letter writing Registrars on post at once.

4. Get them functioning, production, immediately.

It's a "right now" scene.

A short-term production program ought to expire within 30 days-it becomes staledated within 30 days. Some of them become staledated within 10 or 15 days. So you need a very hot, very fast line of very quick compliance.

It already takes quite a while for the reports to get to the files through the mail so that you know what the situation is. You're already 10 days behind the gun-10 days, 2 weeks late. And then it's going to take maybe another week to get it assembled-to know that there is a situation and evaluate it

and get it through and ready. So you're operating on about a 3-week average comm lag. You have to make up for it at the other

132

end of the line-get this thing done now-now-now.

And you've got to have someone there to get it done.

The eval probably will not save the bacon of an org for the next two years. It will be lucky if it keeps the stats bolstered for six weeks-then something else will go out. By that time, why Div 6 will have become completely confused because it is not now being permitted to do all the registration of the org, so therefore it would have gone out of existence, and the Registrar would have left, so now we would have to evaluate and handle Division 6.

It goes tick-tock. From one situation to another.

There are different types of evaluation. There'd be a divisional evaluation. There could even be a departmental evaluation. There could be an org evaluation. An executive stratum evaluation. And so on.

You could have several evaluations going at the same time, but they would have to be different divisions or areas, otherwise you'd cross up like mad. Normally speaking and in theory, that would be possible. But in fact a competent evaluation would find the imbalance between divisions.

The operative word is current evaluation. You could push a current evaluation. How wide is present time? Well, that's a matter of judgment, but a year-old evaluation would be pretty much not current.

FIRST TARGET

Your first program target must always be a production target-but you can't, in actual fact, write a pure production target. It would be impossible to write a pure production target because somebody would have to do it, and the moment that you have somebody there to do it you have organization. So there is a certain amount of organization that comes into it.

If I were evaluating an org right now, say its Dept 7, I would have to include in it as its second target, beefing up Dept 7. First target would be for Dept 7 to do anything it could to handle its collections. And the second target would be to beef up that department forthwith, bang bang! Otherwise the production would not continue. It would break.

So, as mentioned earlier, there has to be immediate organization for production.

TERMINABLE TARGETS

Now how do you like a target like this: "Maintain friendly relations with the environment." How do you like that target? It is utterly completely not a doingness target. It isn't a target at all!

Now if it said: "Call on so and so, and so and so and make them aware of your presence . . ." and so forth, it could have a DONE on it.

Targets should be term inable-doable, finishable, completable.

REPEATING TARGETS

There is such a thing as a repeating target. You can accomplish it many times-it's like when you do org rudiments. Every time they do one of those targets a compliance is added to the compliance stat.

This is especially true of some targets in expansion programs.

FOUR-PRONGED ACTION

In operating orgs, you've got a four-pronged action. A division of duties.

133

- Somebody gunning these orgs up to expand. You have to get in certain structural functional actions for an org to expand. You have to have somebody working on founding and expanding the org against production, for real. You could do an evaluation for an expansion program, and have this person beat it in. This is your long-term organization.

- Somebody driving in the production programs that remedy the current situation and production actions. Those programs are based on evaluations of the current status of an org from the viewpoint of production. Not from a viewpoint of its organization. You do have to do a certain amount of organization to get any production, but it's short-term organization.

- You've got the general org being run on its day-to-day basis by what was once known as the Assoc Sec and is now the ED.

- You've got the Guardian Office handling the public and indispensibility of Scientology. Handling the public, handling legal and handling other things. They're outward facing.

There you have your four-pin structure of your org drive. Those lines go very sleek.

Compiled from

LRH taped conference

"Programs Bureau and

FB Lines and Functions"

7309TC27 SO

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Assisted by S. Hubbard

AVU Verifications Chief

LRH:SH:dr.nf Copyright © 1973, 1977 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

134

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIGNS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 18 MARCH 1977-IR

ADDITION OF 20 MARCH 1977

Remimeo REVISED 14 JUNE 1977

Data Series 43-IR

EVALUATION SUCCESS

To show that evals on individual orgs and getting programs done *DOES* raise stats the following brief review is published:

Around mid-July I got on the eval approval lines for about a week and had orgs of one continent evaluated by some Flag evaluators.

We got several evals through, severely according to the Data Series rules.

Here are the results of 7 of them.

1. Program was reported fully done. Stats went up.

2. 18 July eval. Pgm was almost fully done. Finance got bugged. Org crashed 22 August 74.

3. 22 July eval. By 15 Aug stats had gone UP.

4. 21 July 74 eval but not started on until 26 Sept 74 as Study Manuals were delayed on which eval depended. Org stats after eval began to be done went UP and by the end of Oct hit highest ever almost across the boards.

5. 20 July 74 eval. Started on 10 Aug 74. Half-done. By 24 Oct stats went UP.

6. 23 July 74 issue. Bugged. Not completed. Stats went up first couple weeks. Org crashed 24 Oct 74. (Eval was also cross-ordered by removal of CO.)

7. 23 July 74. Three-quarters done. Stats went UP.

Thus 5 out of 7 of the above evals were successful.

The two that failed were obviously insufficiently broad as other matters got in the way of them. The evaluator could not have had the real situation. Means not enough preliminary work to find the area that should have been evaluated.

VERBAL TECH

Verbal tech on a DSEC should be severely handled if found.

Note that the evals as above were very *purely* supervised referring only to departures from the Data Series P/Ls.

Pure eval per Data Series 33R was the push on getting the evals done. I was simply demanding full Data Series P/L application.

The reason for verbal tech is Mis-U words!

135

FAILING EVALS

-It is pretty easy to tell if an eval is getting done or if it is failing. The two poor evals in the 7 just weren't watched fast enough by the evaluators. You cancel a failing eval fast and do a better one.

Failing to cancel or redo a failing eval on an org would be the real reason for that org continuing to go down.

SUMMARY

If you got 5/7ths of all our orgs purely evaluated, no nonsense with verbal tech, you would have booming Int stats!

Just like pcs-unprogrammed pcs fail-and pcs audited with hearsay tech fail! Orgs without evaluated, pushed programs for that org tend to fail. And evaluations done on hearsay tech are a waste of paper.

How about it?

A boom or crash?

It's up to YOU.

Compiled from

ED 552 Flag, by LRH

4 November 1974

EVALUATION SUCCESS

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

As assisted by

AVU Flag

LRH:MH:MW:SH:lf.nf Copyright c 1974, 1977 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

136

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 20 MARCH 1977R

Remimeo REVISED 15 JUNE 1977

(Taken from LRH OODs item
of 15 October 1973)

(Revisions in this type style)

Data Series 44R

SUPER EVALUATION

I have examined four evaluations recently and have found in each case that the evaluator had not gone to the trouble of looking in obvious places for data.

In each of these cases, personnel whose personnel folders had not been looked into and whose ethics files had not been examined were concerned. In the last one, a person was being proposed for promotion to a high executive position in an org while the stats for the past week demonstrated that his area was seriously downstat, *the matter even being mentioned on the current battle plans.*

It is not how much you read, it is where you look. In the Data Files, if one is examining the statistics of a division, one does not read all manner of reports from other divisions and other personnel. One has to be selective and right target to get his data.

Statistics (as fully outlined in statistical management PLs) are the dominant factors in an evaluation, and most evaluations begin on the basis of statistics which are either sufficiently high to merit examination so as to be reinforced, or are too low to be viable. These read in conjunction with other statistics usually give you an org situation.

When one discovers a series of outpoints, there is generally a situation underlying them.

From the statistical trail, or the gross outpoint trail, one can locate a situation, The situation is then evaluated by looking for and finding the exact data which applies to that situation. From this one can find his Why, and once this is found he can get a bright idea.

A program can then ensue which terminatedly handles that situation.

Evaluations cannot be done in any other way. The moment that you apply humanoid think to the subject of evaluation, you lose.

In the last evaluation I looked over, the evaluator obviously had not gone to personnel files, data files or any other files but had simply read some PR despatches written by the guy himself and had taken single-source data and decided to promote the person to the control of an area. Statistics demonstrated at once that the person's stats were down, that practice evaluations done on that very org existed, and that the ethics and personnel files of that person would never have suggested any promotion and on the contrary would have suggested demotion. This would have made a very dangerous situation in the area, would have victimized a great many good people, and would have played hell with Flag statistics.

Persons "evaluating" without having looked at the vital data concerned

137

with their evaluation, are subject to a Court of Ethics on the charge of FALSE EVALUATION.

While this might be looked on some as a deterrent to evaluating at a// when evaluations are vital, remember that it is better to handle one person, the evaluator, than to tie up and maul a thousand people with a program based on a false Why

Evaluations not only can be done but are quite magical in handling things when the evaluator knows what he is doing and when he looks for the information he needs to evaluate in the places where that information exists.

It is out of correct and brilliant evaluation that high stats are made.

We have superlative tools, we must use them right.

Compiled from

LRH OODs item

15 October 1973

"Super Evaluation"

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Assisted by AVU Aide, Evals Officer and AVU Verif Off, Flag

LRH:MH:MW:SH:lf.dr.nf Copyright o 1973, 1977 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

EEWMM40

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 27 SEPTEMBER 1978

Remimeo

Data Series 45**EXAMINING RESOURCES**

One of the reasons evaluations fail is because the evaluator does not take stock of resources.

It is vital that you examine resources when evaluating before you plunge into any handling, and resources belongs just above handling on the evaluation form.

Resources sometimes turn out not what they seemed, so when I say "examine resources" I mean look into them searchingly. Were you ever sure that you had \$50.00 in the bank and \$20.00 in a teapot only to find on closer examination that you were overdrawn at the bank and the teapot contained an IOU whose signature you couldn't read?

Sometimes you think you have resources you don't have even when there is total agreement on every hand that you have resources. Take for instance clerk X. It is "common knowledge" that he has been around "Department 5" for years and is a "good clerk." So you make him head of the department without going down and inspecting his area. What will happen to your evaluation and "Department 511 if that undone inspection would have revealed unfiled backlogs 10 feet high, lost supplies and equipment and an office mainly used for plotting mutinies. This may be an extreme case but some shadow of it lies behind most failed evaluations. The evaluator just didn't examine his resources and thought he had what he didn't have.

There is one type of program you can always predict will fail, it begins "Hire a
 " or "Recruit a " When sending a mission out on such orders
 you know you won't hear from them for 6 months because the program has said, in
 effect, "acquire nonexistent resources."

If you do an evaluation on almost any subject and omit an examination of resources and the resources section, your evaluation may lay an ostrich egg. "Appoint Joe Blow, who is a trained Personnel Officer," may trip over the fact that he left the company 5 months ago and has not been heard from since. The eval will bug at this point. That is because the evaluator didn't examine resources.

You sometimes have to gear down your bright idea and handling from "Buy Wall Street" to "Set up a peanut vender stand on Bleaker Street." But the point is your evaluation will succeed where otherwise it will fail.

Almost all evaluations actually have the overall goal of preserving or acquiring resources. So don't omit an examination of the resources you do have to work with and their accurate and exact character from your evals.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 4 JANUARY 1979

Remimeo

Data Series 46

THE IDEAL IDEAL SCENE

Have you realized that if you have an incorrect ideal scene, your program will be wrong?

In using the Data Series, some evaluators tend to toss off the ideal scene as a sort of afterthought-possibly because it is part of the form of evals. To do so can be quite fatal to the success of the eval-and it can result in the wrong ideal scene!

So always work out the ideal scene with care. THAT is what you are trying to achieve with your eval.

HOMEWORK ON THE IDEAL SCENE

We know that homework may be necessary for the data section. But have you ever thought that the ideal scene may also require homework?

I recall a ship's galley once that couldn't get itself unscrambled. So the cooks and stewards were sent over on a tour of a posh cruise liner. They were amazed at what a real ship's galley could look like. They had seen an ideal scene. Until then they didn't know why they were being harrassed by the officers. They got it.

If you can imagine Sitting Bull, the famous Indian war chief, trying to evaluate "Queen Victoria's last grand ball failed" as a situation, you would see that his eval was likely to be rejected. For he wouldn't have had a clue what the ball SHOULD have looked like. But, as Sitting Bull was a pretty smart Indian, if he had done his homework on the ideal scene of a Queen's grand ball, I am sure the eval would not only have passed but the NEXT grand ball would have been a howling success!

So homework is often quite vital on the ideal scene.

Not only can a person establish what an ideal scene SHOULD be, he can also establish what it COULD be and that may be a long way ahead of old accepted ideal scenes.

EVALING FROM THE IDEAL SCENE

It is possible (and often very necessary) to "evaluate backwards"; that is to say, to START with the ideal scene.

If you have something you want to bring about-some ideal scene you desireand simply shuffle off toward it, don't be surprised if you never get there or achieve it. The realities and conflicts of life have a habit of intervening. What they call the "vanishing illusions of youth" occur simply because youth, thirsting to be a movie star or a great lover or a fireman, seldom sits down and does a thorough eval first that finds the barriers that will permit a program that will work.

If one sets up an ideal scene as an ambition-such as the org booming-it may just stay an ambition one remembers in his old age instead of a concrete occurrence UNLESS one does a backwards eval on it.

One does one of these "backwards evals" without any situation in mind. In other words, one does not have to have a sit in order to start the eval. (And you are aware of

140

course that most evals begin because a sit leaps up and has to be handled.) So, without a sit, one simply puts down the ideal scene one is hopeful of achieving. Then he finds the most glaring departure from the ideal scene. That is his sit. And he also may find as he works that he gets several sits and several versions of the principal ideal scene which in turn become THE ideal scene he had in mind in the first place.

There is a simple view of it: Just set the ideal scene, find the furthest departure from it, use that as the sit and then, gathering data and doing a regular eval, he will find WHY that ideal scene hasn't occurred or won't occur, then he can realistically program it to handle and the ideal scene WILL occur if the program is done.

One can take the more complex view of it: One sets the ideal scene, finds the furthest departure from it, follows a data trail, discovers there is more than one sit and so has a multiple-sit eval, each one with a different version of the ideal scene but these ideal scenes adding up to his original concept of the ideal scene.

Let us take a simple example. The major purpose of a directive to a salesman is "Sell the ballpark." Now if we simply told him to do that, we would be relying on his charm and luck and while these might be quite good we are likely to get a failed salesman. A more sensible approach would be to convert that major purpose to the ideal scene of "The ballpark sold at a profit." Then find and take the widest departure from that ideal scene which possibly is "We have been trying to sell the ballpark for two years with no takers." Then we employ the standard steps of the Data Series and find the real Why, which could be "Nobody ever compiled a list of the people who buy ballparks or approached them." And we do a program based on the Why and ideal scene and THEN we can give the salesman that program and that major target and BANG, we sell the ballpark at a profit. As it could have been any one of a thousand Whys we could have gotten a thousand different programs, all of which would probably have failed BECAUSE no evaluation was done.

So do not send to find why missions fail or projects collapse. Just notice that one didn't take what was desired and make it into an ideal scene and evaluate it backwards.

To always need a catastrophic sit in order to evaluate is to ask for more and more sits to occur as it is sort of an outpoint-correct but by evaluation. Of course, when sits exist, it is vital to evaluate them. But realize also that when you don't see what you consider an ideal scene, you can simply set it and evaluate back from it as above.

And realize, too, that this is a great way to make dreams come true.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:clb.nf Copyright 10 1979 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 19 JANUARY 1979

Issue 11

Rernimeo

Data Series 47

CANCELLATION

BTB 2 Sept 72R Issue II, WHY FINDING DRILL-TWO, is CANCELLED.

The Personal Office of Evaluation and Execution, Cramming Officers, AVC and any other evaluating activity are not permitted to use this BTB.

This BTB contains false tech and invites verbal tech by the coach who may or may not already have MUs on the subject of evaluation.

Any entry of this BTB on a checksheet is to be deleted and students informed of such.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:clb.nf Copyright © 1979 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

142

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

,10

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 JUNE 1979R

Issue I

Rernimeo REVISED 14 JUNE 1979

(Revisions in this type style)

Data Series 48

DATA SERIES PLs, USE OF

It is hereby illegal to randomly place Data Series PLs on a checksheet of any kind.

The Data Series PLs must be studied in sequence.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Assisted by

LRH Pers Comm

for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:JM:dr.kim.nf Copyright © 1979 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

143

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 26 DECEMBER 1979

Remimeo DSEC Evaluators

Data Series 49

EXECUTION OF EVALUATIONS

It is hereafter mandatory that every eval must carry in the policy section the following statement:

NOTHING IN THIS EVAL MAY BE INTERPRETED TO VIOLATE OR ALTER OR CHANGE HCO PLs OR HCOBs. ANYONE EXECUTING A TARGET IN THIS EVAL IN SUCH A WAY AS TO VIOLATE OR ALTER ANY HCO PL OR HCOB WILL BE ACTIONABLE BY COMM EV. ANY RECOMMENDATION IN THIS EVAL OR CHANGE OF POLICY OR TECH MUST BE CLEARED BY THE WATCHDOG COMMITTEE (WDC) BEFORE BEING PLACED IN THE EVAL AS A TARGET AND RESULTING PL OR BULLETIN MUST BE REVIEWED BY THE FOUNDER PERSONALLY. ALL DATA OR HANDLINGS WHERE THEY REFER TO POLICY OR BULLETINS MUST GIVE THE POLICY OR BULLETIN NUMBER AND ITS LOCATION AND TEXT VERBATIM.

Any violation of this policy will be actionable by Comm Ev. This policy is retroactive to all published evals whether they are remimeoed or not.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:dr.nf Copyright © 1979 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

144

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 3 SEPTEMBER 1980

Issue I

Remitneo

(The contents of this policy have been taken from an LRH OODs item of 15 May 71 and are now being issued in policy form to bring forth the wealth of data formerly issued in the Flag "Orders of the Day.")

Admin Know-How Series 38

Data Series 50

Esto Series 42

Org Series 42

OUT OF SEQUENCE

Out of sequence is the most common outpost according to a survey of despatches and projects a couple months ago.

The thing which gets most commonly out of sequence is the pattern of the Key Ingredients as covered in HCO PL 14 Sept 69.

The correct sequence for a piece of work would be to plan, obtain materials, and then work.

If this is made into work-plan-materials, everyone works hard but no product will result.

As production is what morale depends upon, a smash of morale would occur if the Key Ingredients were thrown out of sequence.

Omitted data runs a close second to out of sequence as the most common outpost.

When the sequence of a work project is thrown out and then data like technology of how to do it is omitted, a group could work itself half to death and have down morale as well from no product.

The right way to go about it is to have the tech of a job, plan it, get the materials, and then do it. This we call *organizing*.

When this sequence is not followed, we have what we call cope. Too much cope will eventually break morale. One copes while he organizes. If he copes too long without organizing he will get a dwindling or no product. If he organizes only he will get no product.

Coping while organizing will bit by bit get the line and action straighter and straighter and with less work you get more product.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS

of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY BDCS:LRH:SA:bk.nf Copyright c 1971, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[Note: The original mitneo copies of this policy letter incorrectly labeled it as "Admin Know-How 36" which has been corrected above.]

145

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 2 SEPTEMBER 1980

Remitneo

(Originally LRH OODs item)

of 6 June 1970)

Data Series 51

PERPETUATING AN ORDER

Several recent instances of abuse of orders or misuse have appeared lately.

Giving an order for a given TIME does not make a perpetual order of it.

Example: "Put the box on the deck." Interpretation, "This box can't be stowed away because it was ordered to be put on the deck last year. So we always put boxes on the deck and that's why you can't walk across the deck."

An order given to fit one situation that is extended to all situations is an outpoint of magnitude and is the source of arbitrariness.

Judgment is actually the ability to reach a conclusion without entering outpoints into it.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

BDCS:LRH:SA:bk.nf for the

Copyright © 1970, 1980 BOARDS OF DIRECTORS

by L. Ron Hubbard of the

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 23 SEPTEMBER 1980

Issue 11

Remimeo

(Originally LRH OODs item

of 30 October 1973)

Data Series 52

FACTS

There is a world of difference between hopeful opinions and facts.

One can only operate on facts.

It is better to have real situations in clear view and being handled than hidden and left to blow one's head off unexpectedly. One can confront real facts and real situations far better than imaginary fantasies. In facts and real situations there is at least something to confront, not a vague unease of blind hope.

Things only go sane when facts and situations are in view.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

BDCS:LRH:SA:dr.nf Accepted and approved by the

Copyright © 1973, 1980 BOARDS OF DIRECTORS

by L. Ron Hubbard of the

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

146

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 6 OCTOBER 1980

Issue IV

Remimeo

(Originally LRH OODs item

of 4 December 1971)

Data Series 53

OUTNESSES

How far off policy can a course get?

Why, not to gather up the students at all! Just let them be all over the place and no classroom.

When you try to find the WHY of some situations that won't resolve, remember the outness is usually so HUGE that it isn't easily imagined.

Like: I wonder why Division 6 in that org doesn't function. So you order checksheets and projects and almost everything else you can think of with no improvement. And *then you* find out there is not a single person in the division!

Like: A big org was having income and delivery trouble a couple years back and after all sorts of work on it, it was found there was only 1 person in the whole Tech Division! But 89 on staff!

The outnesses that won't resolve are usually big ones and are omissions. And not being there they aren't seen as there's nothing to see.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

Approved and accepted by the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:SA:dr.nf Copyright c 1971, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

147

CANCELLED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE See footnote

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 DECEMBER 1981

Remimeo

Data Series 54

EVALUATION

(LRH OODs item from 27 June 1974)

Evaluation is a solid brand new technology. It is contained in the Data Series. It is a high skill. An evaluator takes very hard training and lots of practice and a purity of view that has not previously existed.

At this writing it is doubtful if there are half a dozen truly skilled evaluators on the planet. There are a few hundred who know of the system and can use it to some degree. There are a few thousand who know the title of it and use some of its words loosely. More are being made. For the direct observed results in using the system are incredibly improved over and above any past effort to resolve organizational, social or any other type of problem.

A good evaluation gives the magic key to open the road to betterment in any endeavor. From it alone comes the diamond-valued program which, done step by step, will take one forward to certain result.

While evaluation is as yet so little known that it can be looked on by the uninitiated as just another program, or something you write up because "you know the Why" of the situation, respect is growing as evidence of its magic increases and awe has begun to appear here and there where black night was turned to broadest day.

So where there were half a dozen, there will be many dozen. And any planner, command or policy-making personnel who cannot use the Data Series are very likely to fail in this organization.

Based on the works of

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Accepted and issued by

WATCHDOG COMMITTEE

for the

BDCSI:LRH:WDC:bk.gm **BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

Copyright © 1974, 1981 of the

by L. Ron Hubbard **CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY**

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED INTERNATIONAL

[Note: This policy letter has been cancelled by HCO PL 7 Dec. 1981, DATA SERIES 54 EVALUATION CANCELLED which reads as follows:

"HCO PL 7 December 1981, Data Series 54, EVALUATION, is hereby cancelled as it was erroneously issued as the wrong issue type per HCO PL 24 Sept. 70 RA, ISSUES, TYPES OF and HCO PL 5 Mar. 65, Iss II, POLICY, SOURCE OF.

It is being reissued as a C130, C130 731 INT, EVALUATION."]

148

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 MARCH 1972

Remimeo (*Revised 13 Apr 72*)

(Cancels HCO P/L 8 Feb 72 of same title which was only an ASHO pilot and original HCO PIL 7 Mar 72).

Establishment 0 er Series IR

Vic

THE ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER

PURPOSE

The Establishment Officer system evolved from the Product-Org system where it was found the HAS alone could not establish the org. ***The Product-Org Officer system is entirely valid and is not changed, Tapes up to and including No. 7 of the Prod-Org system (also called the FEBC tapes) are correct From No. 8 onward, the Prod-Org tapes are replaced by the Esto Series tapes. It is important to know that when the Org Officer is removed from a unit "because it now has an Esto" it will practically destroy the unit and crash its stats. Taking the Org Officer out of a division or org and making him the Esto is a guarantee of a crash. The Esto is an extension of the original HCO system as an Esto performs a// the functions of HCO for the activity to which he is assigned PLUS his own tech of being an Esto.***

The purpose of Establishment Officers is to ESTABLISH and MAINTAIN the establishment of the org and each division therein.

The term "Esto" is used for abbreviation as "EO" means Ethics Officer.

It has been found that the whole reason for any lack of prosperity of an org is INTERNAL. ***The surrounding area of the public has very little to do with whether stats are up or down. An org, by "delivering" out-tech and its own conduct, upsets its area but it can also straighten it out PROVIDING IT DOES ITS JOB. So this too is an internal cause.***

Thus if an org is well established so that each staff member is doing his exact function, stats will go up and the org will prosper because it has been handled internally

All booms and depressions of an org are due to its being expertly built up and then, having a peak period, is not maintained in that well-established condition and disintegrates.

In the vital flurry of getting the product and expanding, the org becomes disestablished.

In the Product-Org Officer system of 1971 it was found uniformly that as soon as the org began to boom, the HAS was wholly unable to establish rapidly enough and the boom collapsed. HCO was too few to keep an org established even when the HCO was manned because THEY WERE NOT WORKING INSIDE EACH DIVISION.

The answer to these shortcomings is the Establishment Officer system. This preserves the best in the Product-Org system and keeps pace with product and expansion.

A well-trained, hard-working Esto in a division has proven to be the miracle of org prosperity.

The system has already been tested and is in successful operation.

Establishment consists of quarters, personnel, training, hatting, files, lines, supplies and materiel and all things necessary to establishment.

149

Commanding Officer or Executive Director (coordinates)

Product Officer (operates org)

Org Officer (organizes for Prod Off) o

oq

Executive Establishment Officer (operates Estos) cr

cr.

Exec Esto Org Officer combined 2)

Esto Establishment Officer M

hat w

(Esto Course Supervisor) ..

in

(Div Secs are in charge of Div and are Product Officers)

EI

CD

7 2 3 4 5 6

Dissem Treas Tech Qual Dist 0

LRH Comm HAS Sec Sec Sec Sec Sec - R - 0

DIV 7 ESTO HCO ESTO DEO Tr EO TEO QEO PEO 0

0

CIO or ED Foundation

Org Off Fnd

Dissem Treas Tech Qual Dist

LRH Comm HAS Sec Sec Sec Sec Sec

Fnd Fnd Fnd Fnd Fnd Fnd Fnd

Fnd Div Fnd HCO Fnd Fnd Fnd Fnd Fnd

7 Dissem Treas Tech Qual Dist

(Same Esto covers same Div Day & Fnd.)

PRODUCTS

To understand what the Esto system is, you have to understand first and foremost the meaning of the word "PRODUCT " (The whole system breaks down where this one word is not understood and not understanding this one word and failing to get it understood has been found to be the barrier in most cases.)

PRODUCE (verb) = To bring into existence, make; to bring about; cause.

PRODUCT (noun) = Someone or something that HAS BEEN brought into existence,, the end result of a creation; something or someone who has been brought into existence.

If you really know that definition you can then look over HCO PIL 29 Oct 1970 Org Series 10. In this we have (1) establishing something that produces (Product 1), (2) operating that which produces in order to get a product (Product 2), (3) repairing or correcting that which produces (Product 3), (4) repairing or correcting that which is produced (Product 4).

Now in order to get an org there and make money and eat and get paid and things like that, these things like products have to be understood and the knowledge USED.

If we try to operate an org that isn't there, or repair it, nothing happens. No stats. No money The Product Officer and Org Officer have nothing to run. They're like a pilot and copilot with no airplane. They don't fly.

So an Establishment Officer is there to put the airplane there AND get the pilot and copilot to fly it well, without wrecking it, to everyone~3 benefit

So, the Establishment Officers put the org there to be run and put the people there to run it so they run it well, without wrecking it, to everyone's benefit

POSTS AND TITLES

The org is commanded by the Commanding Officer (SO orgs) or the Executive Director (non-SO orgs). In the triangular system of the Flag Executive Briefing Course (FEBC) (Product-Org Officer system) the C/O or ED COORDINATES the work of the Product Officer, Org Officer and Executive Esto.

In most orgs the C/O or ED is also the PRODUCT OFFICER of the org which is a double hat with C/O.

The Product Officer controls and operates the org and its staff to get production. Production is represented by the gross divisional statistics and valuable final products of the org.

The ORG OFFICER assists the Product Officer. He gets production lined up, grooves in staff on what they should be getting out and makes sure the Product Officer~3 plans are executed.

(The duties of C/O or ED, Product Officer and Org Officer are covered in the FEBC tapes 1 to 7.)

THE EXECUTIVE ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER is the one who puts the org there to be run. He does this by having Establishment Officers establishing the divisions, org staff and the materiel of the division. He is like a coach using athletes to win games. He sends them in and they put their divisions there and maintain them. They also put there somebody to WORK them.

The EXECUTIVE ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER ORG OFFICER (Esto Org Officer) is the E Esto~3 deputy and handles his programs and the personal side of Estos.

*The ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER'S ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER (the **Estot** Esto) is the one who trains and hats and checks out Estos and establishes the Esto*

system. He also runs the Esto course that makes Estos and is the Esto's Course Supervisor. In practice, the hats of Esto Org Officer (above) and Estot Est Officer are held as one hat until an org is very large. The person who holds this post has to be a very good Course Supervisor who uses study tech like a master as his flubs would carry through the whole Esto system.

An ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER IN-CHARGE is an Esto who has Establishment Officers under him in an activity that has 5 or less Estos and does duties comparable to an Executive Esto for that activity.

A CHIEF ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER + DIVISION is an Esto who, in a division, has Establishment Officers under him due to the numerousness of the division.

A LEADING ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER + DEPARTMENT is a departmental Establishment Officer who has Section Estos under him due to the numerousness of the section.

An ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER + SECTION is an Establishment Officer of a section where there is a departmental and divisional Esto.

The divisional Establishment Officers are as follows. If they have other Estos under them in the division the title CHIEF is put in front of the title.

THE DIV 7 ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER (Div 7 Esto) for Division 7, the Executive Division. He is not "The Executive Esto." He carries out all the Esto duties for this division.

THE HCO ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER (HCO Esto) establishes and maintains HCO.

THE DISSEMINATION ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER (DEO) establishes and maintains the Dissem Division.

THE TREASURY ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER (Tr EO) establishes and maintains the Treasury Division.

THE TECHNICAL DIVISION ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER (TEO) establishes and maintains the Tech Division. This division amongst all the rest is most likely to have other Estos in the division.

THE QUALIFICATIONS ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER (QEO) establishes and maintains the Qual Division.

THE DISTRIBUTION ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER (PEO for Public Division) establishes and maintains the Distribution Division.

The Exec Esto and Esto Org Officer and the Estols Esto and Esto course are org boarded as in Dept 2 1.

The Estos themselves are in their own assigned divisions.

The C/O or ED, Product and Org Officer are org boarded in Dept 19.

HEAD OF ORG

The head of the org is the Commanding Officer or Executive Director. He is *usually also the PRODUCT OFFICER*. He is senior to the Exec Esto.

DEPUTY C/O OR ED

The C/O's or ED's DEPUTY handles the *program* functions of the C/O or ED and is *the orgt Org Officer*.

He ranks with the Exec Esto.

152

HEAD OF DIVISION

The head of a division is the DIVISIONAL SECRETARY. He is the PRODUCT OFFICER of his division. *His boss is the C/O or ED.*

He is senior to the divisional Esto or Chief Esto.

He is NOT the divisional Esto~3 boss. The E Esto is.

DEPUTY DIVISION HEAD

The DEPUTY SECRETARY of a division is the *Org Officer* of that division.

He handles the programs of the division for the secretary.

He ranks with the divisional Esto or Chief Esto.

DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR

He is the PRODUCT OFFICER OF HIS DEPARTMENT.

The divisional Esto is senior to him.

The departmental director is senior to an Esto posted to his specific department.

SECTION OFFICER

The officer in charge of a section is the PRODUCT OFFICER of that section.

He is junior to all Estos except an Esto posted directly to his specific department.

STAFF

Staff members other than those who are Estos are all considered PRODUCT 2 and 4 PERSONNEL from the viewpoint of the Esto *whose products are 1 and 3 (see above or Org Series 10 HCO PIL 29 Oct 70).*

TEST

The test of the successful Esto is whether he increases QUANTITY and QUALITY of **PRODUCT TWO PER STAFF MEMBER AND AN ABSENCE OF DEV-T** (developed or unnecessary traffic).

SMALL ORGS

An Esto In-Charge in a small org (2 to 5 staff not counting Estos) would be one of two Estos. He would handle the Esto system for that org and Divisions 7, 1 and 2 and the other Esto Divisions 3, 4, 5 and 6. *He would also run the Esto course as well as work the Estos.*

With trained Estos actually functioning the production of this small org would increase and one would have an evolution leading to an Esto I/C, one Esto for 7, 1 and 2 and another for 3, 4, 5 and 6.

Further evolving there would be an Esto I/C, one for 7, 1 and 2, one for 3, 4 and 5 and another Esto for Div 6.

With additional expansion there would be an Esto I/C, one for 7, 1 and 2, one for 3 and 5, one for 4 and one for 6.

Additional expansion would have an Esto I/C, one for 7 and 1, one for 2, one for 3 and 5, one for 4 and one for 6. This reaches the stage of five Estos for one Esto I/C.

We now upgrade the system to an Exec Esto and a deputy and one Esto per division.

153

Almost at once Tech will need a Chief TEO and a TEO. Then a Chief TEO and three Leading Estos for 4.

The system goes on evolving. One Esto to ten staff is the maximum allowed at this stage.

BUREAUX

Where bureaux are combined with the service org the divisional Esto also has the duties of the bureau establishment.

In such a case there is an OPERATIONS ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER in charge of the four operations bureaux which combined make up the Operations Bureau. He, as expansion occurs, will shortly become a Chief Esto for Operations (or Chief Operations Esto) with an Esto in each bureau-the Action Leading Esto; the Data Leading Esto; the Management Leading Esto; and the Ext Comm Leading Esto.

RULE OF EXPANSION

The Esto system may not be expanded nor may the org be expanded without comparable expansion of GI, delivery, completions and success statistics.

The quality and skill of Estos in acquiring personnel, training, hatting, supplying, FP conduct and other duties is directly reflected in statistical increase of GI, delivery, success and VIABILITY.

ESTO TRAINING

The EXEC ESTO (or Esto I/C) is responsible for the *quantity of establishment done and the quality and performance of all his Estos*. EXEC ESTOs or ESTO I/Cs are trained on Flag or as designated by Flag.

Exec Estos or Esto I/Cs are usually granted the right to train Estos. For this they must have the packs and equipment. *The actual training is done by their Esto Org Officer or when one exists, the Esto~3 Esto.*

The actual hatting and training of Estos comes under the *Esto~3 Esto, the Esto Org Officer generally wearing this hat*

In a crush emergency in any one of the mentioned divisions the EXEC ESTO goes in on Divs 7, 1 or 2 and the Deputy Exec Esto goes in on Divisions 3, 4, 5 and 6.

An Esto usually works the full day less conference time and studies an additional 5 hours minimum.

Where there is a Foundation, the same Estos as the Day org cover the Foundation as well until both Day and Foundation are too large to be so handled, at which time a Foundation begins a separate Esto function under its own Esto //C. When a// Foundation divs are separately covered, the Foundation has its own Exec Esto.

TRAINING OUTLINE

A full training outline of the skills required in an Esto follows:

An Exec Esto should be ideally a full FEBC. This covers the OEC and the Product-Org Officer system.

An Esto //C would have to know the OEC.

In addition to the above would be added these specific requirements:

Primary CORRECTION Rundown (HCOB 30 Mar 72).

Word Clearer-able to handle a meter and do Method 2 and Method 4, assess prepared lists and do good TRs.

Vol 0 OEC (if not done on the OEC).

154

Vol 1 OEC (if not done on the OEC). Org Series PILs Personnel Series PILs Data Series PILs PR Becomes a Subject (FEBC tapes) Mini Course Super Hat. (Full HPCSC for the Esto~s Esto.) ARC triangle materials Dianetics 55! FP policy (finance pack) PTS phenomena HCOBs DB and SP HCOBs and PILs Psychosis HCOBs HCO investigatory tech Establishment Officer Tape Series Establishment Officer Series PILs LRH ED 174 INT (1972) HCO PIL 9 April 72

There is a difference in what the Esto himself has to know to be hatted and what he must teach in his division. These are TWO different bodies of knowledge.

The Esto must know all the hats and valuable final products of any division he is hatting.

He should know the Product-Org Series tapes.

He should know quarters and housing materials.

He should know the operating manuals and how to operate any machine in the division he is establishing.

On ships he should know the FOs.

Any FOs, FSOs and CBOs that may apply in a bureau.

The Esto becomes ***totally*** proficient in his own hat and makes others proficient in theirs. ***He has to be able to read and pick up data on another~s hat very rapidly.***

CASE REQUIREMENTS

(Not necessarily in pgm order)

TRs the Hard Way

Admin TRs

OCA not below center line

Physically well

Case gain

C/S 53 to F/N on list

If drugs full Drug RD

GF 40RR to F/N on list

The HAS Rundown

F/N on White Form

Study Corr List

WC No. I

HATTING CYCLE

The cycle of hatting of Estos and of staff members is HAT some and get production, hat more and get production, hat more and get production. Hat to total specialization, get production. Hat to more generalized skill and get production. Hat an activity until it can do own and everyone else's hat in the activity and get production.

Quarters, supply, equipment, space all follow this same gradient. Get it in, get it producing, get more in, get it producing.

155

ESTO TRAINING

An Esto has 2 hats: (A) his own hat as an Esto in which he must be expert, (B) the hats and skills he is grooving in on others.

The most skilled Esto learns his own job and that of the other fellow rapidly and thoroughly.

These two hats are separate and must be kept separate.

INVOLVEMENT

The Esto may not involve himself in the production cycles of a post or division except to learn it himself so he can hat expertly or get the HCO P/Ls or tech applied to it understood by himself so he can hat and debug the post.

The Esto *must* be an *expert* on Word Clearing Method 3 tapes and then WC Method 4ing them.

He, in Europe, **MUST KNOW FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRANSLATED TAPE HCOBs, P/Ls AND EXPERTISE.**

HCO

HCO performs its normal duties per policy. It is not called on to establish the whole org, however, but is to back up Estos.

Personnel is obtained through Department I by Estos but these do not have to depend only on that but must clear personnel and changes through it.

EXEC ESTO's MAA

The Executive Esto has a MASTER-AT-ARMS in a large org.

The MAA musters the crew, conducts any exercises, does ethics investigations as needful especially by the Exec Esto and helps hat the Ethics Officers of the org. He does not replace these. He does other duties assigned.

PRODUCT CONFERENCE

The PRODUCT CONFERENCE is conducted by the C/O or ED (or his deputy). It consists of the divisional heads of the org as each of these is a PRODUCT OFFICER.

It sets and reports on targets.

As the C/O or ED as PRODUCT OFFICER investigates and does evaluations and writes programs, some of the actions of the Product Conference are furnishing data to debug. The Data Series and the OEC and FOs are the tech used. (The primary reason for failures of such a conference will be found to be [A] operating on wrong WHYs, [B] lack of knowledge of conference tech which is mainly do homework for the conference [CSW1 before it begins, not during it and do not monopolize conference time.)

Therefore Product Conference success depends upon

1. Finding and operating on correct WHYs.
2. Getting targets for valuable final products of each div or department that exchange with the society around them in return for income.
3. Ensuring adequate preparation (intelligent programs).

156

4. Debugging production programs.
5. Getting DONES, not not-dones or half-dones as they will become hidden backlogs in the org.
6. Coming to conference prepared.
7. Not monopolizing conference.
8. Actually punctually holding them.

IT IS UP TO THE EXEC ESTO TO HATAND GET THE PRODUCT CONFERENCE OPERATING AND COMPETENT

ESTO CONFERENCE

The ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER CONFERENCE is held by the Exec Esto (or his deputy).

This conference handles Esto matters, debugs Esto targets worked out by the C/O-ED or Esto's projects, gets in reports of divisions and their personnel, hatting, supply, spaces, quarters, etc.

The Esto Conference handles financial planning using FP policy in which the Esto must be proficient. (FP must be approved by the Treasury Sec, Finance Banking Officer and Assistant Guardian. The org has to be run on FBO-A/G allocations and these are the check signers of the org.)

This conference is governed by similar guide rules as a conference to the Product Conference,

The PRODUCT Conference is senior to the Esto Conference but cannot overrule its FP.

PROGRAMS

Estos as well as PRODUCT OFFICERS run on programs.

These are in accordance always with Data Series 23 and 24.

AIDES COUNCIL

An Aides Council or A/Aides (*or International Secretary or Assistant International Secretary*) Council is held as

1. A Product Conference or
2. A Program Conference or

3. An Establishment Conference

but never 2 or 3 of these at the same time.

SUMMARY

The Esto system has already proven a success.

It will be successful in direct ratio to its

1. Staying on policy
2. Setting no independent policy

157

3. Operating only toward production

4. Its Estos continuing to train and be well trained

5. Consistently staying in the division and actively working in it to establish and maintain, better establish and maintain

6. Setting an excellent example to staff as competent helpful executives and staff members.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:ne.nt.mes.rd.grn Copyright © 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

158

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 9 MARCH 1972

Issue 11

Remimeo

Establishment Officer Series 2

HATTING THE ESTO

It will be found that hatting rules and procedures apply to the Esto himself.

In orgs while under training he himself is hatted and produces alternately, doing better and better.

He must NOT be let off hatting until he is fully hatted.

And he shouldn't, especially when being trained in an org by an Esto I/C, be let off establishing on the excuse he is not yet fully hatted.

IMPORTANCE OF ESTO HAT

It will be found that some Estos back off from an area because "they do not know all the tech lines and hats in that area."

The reason they give for this back-off is the wrong Why. They back off or fumble when they are not hatted as Estos! Not because they are not hatted on the area's hats.

Just like the housewife who criticizes her neighbor for a cluttered back yard while standing in a more cluttered one of her own, hatting begins at home.

If an Esto knows his business he could straighten up a huge corporation using the Esto system with never a whisper of their business!

It would be tough. But it shows where the importance lies.

There is Esto tech. When it is not known or used, then an Esto can just sink down into a division puzzled and apathetic, thinking its tech is what is bogging him.

He daily sees and talks to people swamped in dev-t, unsure, nervous and wide-eyed with problems and questions.

If an Esto does not at all times KNOW HE IS AN ESTO and ACT LIKE AN ESTO he can easily slide into these confusions and try to handle productionperformance problems that are outside the Esto's line of duty.

FIRST, LAST AND ALWAYS IT IS THE ESTO HAT THAT MUST BE WORN IN ANY GIVEN SITUATION.

Thus the A (own hat) and B (div tech and hats) differences of hats is important to know.

It's great to know and one should know a division's tech and hats. But this is something one learns as he goes along.

It's a matter of THE MOST VITAL IMPORTANCE that the Esto wears his Esto hat.

That's the hat he has to have down cold.

Then he will find that org and division confusion is nothing to him.

HE HANDLES THINGS LIKE THAT!

HE IS AN ESTO!

LRH:ne.rd.gm L. RON HUBBARD

Copyright © 1972 Founder

by L. Ron Hubbard

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

159

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 9 MARCH 1972

Issue III

Remimeo

Estabfishment Officer Series 3

DEV-T AND UNHATTEDNESS

The first thing an Esto runs into in an area that is not hatted is DEV-T (developed unnecessary traffic).

People in an org can be working frantically, totally exhausted and yet produce nothing of value. The reason is that their actions are almost totally dev-t.

The WHY of this is UNHATTEDNESS.

The people on the posts do not know their own hats or even if some do they are dealing in the "NOISE" of other people who don't know their own hats.

Few if any of these people know the other hats or duties of the org and so don't know where to go for service or who to approach or despatch for what.

So it's not an org or a division. It's a nonproductive chaos.

The answers are three:

1. Get dev-t understood and
2. Get the staff at least instant hatted at once.
3. Chinese school (staff or div staff all together in front of a big org board chanting together the hats, duties and products of the org as visible on the org board).

In order to get anything done at all or even begin this an Esto Ethics Officer function has to be in.

A schedule has to be posted including exercise, post time and study and staff has to be mustered and handled at these periods. This gets some awareness of the org group as a team of people with similar purposes.

DEV-T

Dev-t packs are made up. These consist of

HCO P/L 2 Jul 59 "Dev-t-The Delirium Tremens of

Issue 11 Central Orgs"

HCO P/L 29 May 63 "How to Handle Work"

HCO P/L 21 Nov 62 "Completed Staff Work"

HCO P/L 17 Nov 64 "Off-line and Off-policy, Your Full In-basket"

HCO P/L 31 Jan 65 "Dev-t"

HCO P/L 8 Feb 65 "Dev-t Analysis"

160

HCO P/L 13 Oct 65 "Dev-t Data"

HCO P/L 5 Jan 68 "Dev-t Series, Part of-Overfilled In-basket"

HCO P/L 27 Jan 69 "Dev-t Summary List"

HCO P/L 30 Jan 69 "Dev-t Summary List Additions"

Issue 11

HCO P/L 27 Oct 69 "Admin Know-How No. 23-Dev-t"

HCO P/L 4 Nov 69 "Dev-t Graphed"

HCO P/L 23 Jul 71 "Telex Comm Clarity-Dev-t Series"

HCO P/L 25 Oct 71 "Comm Routing"

Issue I

HCO P/L 27 Feb 72 "Exec Series 9-Routing"

HCO P/L 29 Feb 72 "Exec Series 10-Correct Comm"

These packs are issued to staff members and they are required to check out on them.

Each staff member keeps a dev-t log and writes down the name of anyone he is getting dev-t from and also issues dev-t chits.

HATTING

The staff at the least are instant hatted at once-place on the org board, work space, supplies, what his title is and what it means, org comm system, what he is supposed to produce on his post.

He is gotten producing what he is supposed to produce in some volume at once.

Hat checklists and packs are verified as there or are gotten ready.

A full hat checkout can then begin.

Courses he needs are done in staff study time.

Actually hat study and checkout is done on the post a bit each day.

This is in fact "on-the-job training" as he is expected to go on producing while he is being hatted.

ORG BD

Org bds are rapidly gotten up or up-to-date in the org (in HCO) and (full org bd) in each division.

Each division is Chinese schooled first on its own org bd, then on the org as a whole, in such a way that they know the duties of divisions, departments and posts and the flow lines of the org.

Wherever an org or even a division falls apart or slows up, this campaign is repeated.

161

SAMPLE ORG ED

This is a sample Executive Directive (ED) giving a program written for an actual org where the above was done to cure dev-t and get the org hatted and producing:

ED- Date-

TOP PRIORITY

Takes priority over all other EDs

(as they can then be gotten done!).

CORRECT COMM PGM

SITUATION:

It has been very difficult to handle the org.

DATA:

A long and intensive collection of data has finally culminated in discovering, through reports on comm and inspections by showing why the org appears fantastically busy and overworked while producing very little even when it was found the org was insolvent.

Ethics has been very heavy for some time and has not led to any spectacular recovery.

But the comm line reviews and analysis reveal

INVESTIGATION:

The org and all its units are drowning in DEV-T. HCO is even generating it. This makes an appearance of frantic action and overload while little is produced.

And an analysis has produced a

WHY:

The org is almost totally unhatted and untrained.

DEV-T comes only from AN UNHATTED UNTRAINED ORG.

S T A T S:

Out the bottom and below the briny bedrock of the sea so far as finished products per man-hours and as far as GI by reason of the org are concerned.

IDEAL SCENE:

A whole staff and the org fully hatted and producing only correct comm without dev-t and at work actually producing things of real value which will *exchange* for value.

HANDLING:

THE ESTO SYSTEM AND DEV-T P/Ls HANDLE THIS.

I . Admin Cramming and each ESTO to be furnished with packs of dev-t policies at once including last Exec Series P/L Routing and new dev-t P/L Correct Comm. ALL HANDS DISSEM.

162

2. FULL Esto setup to be gotten on post at once. They go on duty and part-time train. HAS.
3. Existing Estos and those to be put on at once to hammer, hammer, hammer all posts on off-line, off-origin and other points of dev-t so they are UNDERSTOOD. EXEC ESTO.
4. Big paper org bd with new complement to be gotten up at once in HCO. HCO ESTO.
5. Big paper org bds from it to be gotten up in each div and the div Chinese schooled on it. Specializing in the div but also covering the whole org so people know where they are and what each handles and where other terminals in the org are so they can properly route to or go to them for the exact service of that exact post. DIV ESTOs under EXEC ESTO.
6. Straighten out the comm lines of each post. EXEC ESTO. DIV ESTOs.

7. Report to his div Esto (see org bd) or Ethics Officer any person originating off-line, off-origin traffic or failing to originate from his post paper or body or remark. Report by "Dev-t Chit." EVERYONE IN THE ORG.

8. Send flagrant offenders to Admin Cramming. EXECUTIVES.

9. Put in

1. Instruct, and if no improvement,

2. Cram, and if no improvement,

3. Retrain and if no improvement,

4. Offload

where hatting continues to fail to produce rapid comprehension of dev-t and/or persistent inability to actually DO his hat. Court of Ethics or Comm Ev on request to remedy any injustice. ESTOs.

10. Excuses concerning hatting and arbitraries like "only study hat in hatting college" to be wiped out and any barriers to getting on-policy, on-FO-FSO wiped out by ethics action or cramming. ESTOs.

11. Instant hat every staff member. DIV ESTOs.

12. Chinese school every division. DIV ESTOs.

LETS MAKE THIS A CRACK ORG WE CAN BE PROUD OF!

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

The above program can be completed in a few days.

It is followed by further programs to get in lines of the org, full hatting, and proper comm setups for each staff member, etc.

If the program falls out or dev-t flares again, (A) REHAT Estos, and (B) do the program once more.

The org will come right and begin producing PRODUCTS WHICH EXCHANGE FOR VALUABLES.

163

The org will become solvent.

Only the Esto system makes such a program possible.

We have long had the tech as you can see by the P/L dates. Dev-t tech has existed since the mid-1950s. But it could not be gotten in swiftly enough to make a startling change in the org morale or stats until ESTOs were on post in an org.

If it does not go in rapidly even with Estos then some of the Estos are not well enough or firmly enough hatted as ESTOs and the answer of an EXEC ESTO or Esto I/C is to very rapidly cram his Estos or following the (1) instruct, (2) cram, (3) retread, (4) offload pattern, improve his Esto team.

Fully done the program works like a beautiful breeze bringing peace and a cheerful staff.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:ne.gm Copyright cl 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

164

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 10 MARCH 1972

Remimeo

Establishment Officer Series 4

EXEC ESTO HATTING DUTIES

An Esto I/C or Exec Esto has as his primary duty *the hatting and handling of ESTOs*.

It will be found that an Esto tends to get pulled into operating the division when (a) he is too new at it and (b) he fails to establish.

Such hatting actions usually require a repeat checkout or harder assertion of the P/Ls relating to HCO such as "musical chairs don't unmock a working installation." Such P/Ls cover the host of errors that HCOs and HASes have made.

Usually the Esto In-Training just doesn't know the material or even believes it's all "old" because it came before the Esto system. The prime cause of alter-is is just not knowing or understanding the material.

The system of (1) instruct, (2) cram, (3) retread, applies to Estos In-Training.

WHYs

Like in auditing the situation may look so desperate that unusual remedies are thought to be needed.

The skill of an Esto in rapidly finding a WHY (as in investigation tech and the Data Series) and quickly handling is what makes a real Esto.

Dreaming up new solutions not in policy usually comes from not really investigating and finding a WHY.

Finding WHYs is like seeing real gold for the first time. Until a person really finds a REAL Why that promptly unravels the whole knot he is like the tourist in the gold field who can be sold any yellow glitter as being gold. But when he sees real GOLD for the first time he never after can be fooled-

Usually first WHYs an Esto I/T finds about a post or a class or a line are usually so shallow and so narrow that they are just dev-t. They would resolve nothing.

The Exec Esto will have to keep an Esto I/T at it, looking again, looking again, looking again.

An Esto I/T will first think of removals. Then he will think of doing musical chairs. Then he will think of having only the BEST people. He's going along the old worn ruts of human prejudice and impatience. He is not really looking for a WHY there in front of him but at his or another's dreams.

An Esto I/T usually buys whatever WHY the person on the post gives him. He mistakenly believes "but he has more experience with the scene" and "I am so green on this scene that. . . ."

This piece of tech applies IF THE WHY THE PERSON OR AREA HAS WERE THE RIGHT WHY THERE WOULD BE NO TROUBLE THERE.

165

This comes from "the problem a pc thinks he has isn't the problem he has. If it were it would as-is and he wouldn't have it."

WHYs are obtained by observing the obvious (obnosis) closely enough to find the biggest OUTPOINT that explains all the nearby outpoints (always a lack of production or low production per high man-hours).

WHYs are traced back from the PRODUCT, its absence or lack of volume or quality.

So an Esto I/T has to be sent in again and again and again until he finds THE Why. And then the post unsnarls rapidly.

Example: TR Course product horrible, slow and upsetting the inflow of new people. Esto I/T was ordered to hat the TR Supervisor. After much blowoff, apathy, TR Super in tears, the Esto I/T said HE would take over the course. Wrong answer. It couldn't be more wrong. Esto I/T bypassed, an experienced Esto investigated students, Super and area and within about 3 hours found it. The Super was so unhatted that What Is a Course? P/L was wholly out. The TR students had no packs of their own, could not read those and weren't being supervised either and just struggled on with the unhatted Super falsely reporting how great the students were doing (while they didn't finish and wanted to blow).

Now what did this Esto I/T do wrong?

He didn't work out the product: successfully completed exultant students.

He didn't then start hating the Super with just standard HCOBs about TRs and supervising.

He didn't check the course as a COURSE against What Is a Course? P/L to know what was missing on it.

Had he just done his job as an Esto **he would have found** the WHY.

The course, of course, resolved at once and got the product.

BEWARE

A person training to be an Esto himself can be very guilty of dev-t to his senior Esto.

By *bringing a problem* to a senior without having resolved it, HE CAN GET HIS SENIOR UPSET, ALARMED, DESPERATE AND PULLED INTO THE DIVISION!

These solutions of "transfer this one or that," "Comm Ev this one or that," "this situation is so ghastly that" (and there follows some wild solution that sounds like "stand the pc on his head") are simply abandonment of standard actions.

As the observation is bad, the Why is not found. Then the situation looks unusual. So unusual remedies are urged.

And a senior can be dragged right in!

CORRECT ACTION

Anyone handling Estos In-Training has to use the standard action of

1. Get the packs of that post! (or area or div) he's trying to handle or proposes the unusual solution for.

2. Look over the policy materials! (May include discard of "former occupant hat

166

write-ups" and looking into P/L or FO or files for the real materials about it. May include Word Clearing 4 or a clay demo or a WHY as to why the Esto can't dig them.)

3. Work out the product of that post! (or course or section or dept or div or even the org). (May require getting the word PRODUCT understood or Wd Clearing Method 4 on the Esto I/T, or even the "Management Power Rundown" or cram on products or any other standard action such as even finding WHY he can't dig *products*.) (And it may require "detective" work on the materials of the post to find out what is continually talked ABOUT so one can figure out from *that* what the product would have to be.)

4. Be sure it is the major EXCHANGE product of that post! (or dept or div or area). (May require reviewing the Esto I/T on EXCHANGE, its P/Ls and the Esto tapes.)

5. Check it with the Product Officer! (the head of the dept or div or org). (And don't be startled if he has a cognition on it or if he violently disagrees with it while having his own product wildly nonexchangeable! which opens up a whole new situation! Or he may simply suggest a revision of the wording. BUT THIS POINT HAS TO BE CLEARED or the Estos will find themselves going east while the Product Officers go west!)

6. Go to your area! (This may include making the Esto I/T do TR 0 on the area or running him on bodily reaching and withdrawing from it and other drills or even a 3rd party investigation.)

7. Observe the scene! (which may mean having to wait until it has traffic or action in progress). (It may mean a microphone plant as on an auditor or a tape of an interview with a voice start-stop operated recorder to catch the traffic, but it generally means just looking and comparing what one sees to the key P/L about it or an ideal scene as would have to be in order for a product to occur in it.)

8. Find the WHY! (And that means investigation tech and the Data Series. It can be formally written up or just there it is!)

9. Get it accepted! (which can mean argument or H, E and R or violence or blows off post if it isn't the right WHY or the person is just plain SP). (The right Why brings in GIs almost always. It's usually as obvious as a bass drum in the middle of the floor once *seen*.)

10. Have (him, her or them) GET IT IN! (which can mean a project written per Data Series 23 & 24 or it can be just "do it").

11. Straighten up the (spaces, lines, materiel, personnel) indicated by the WHY.

12. Hat the person (personnel) to get production! (Could mean begin to hat, wholly hat, could mean train further, could mean find the WHY that stops him or them from being hatted, but it means get better hatting DONE.)

13. Review to find if production increased! (Means look it over again to be sure it was the right Why found as a Why must lead to a nearer approach to ideal scene. Usually means INCREASED STATS for the area.)

14. Train the Esto I/T better.

DOGGEDNESS

The protection of an Esto I/C or Exec Esto is his own insistence along the lines of the above.

The moment he comes off of holding this line of hating his Estos and keeping them at it, the less successful he will be.

167

If he doesn't do this, the next thing he knows he will be in total exasperation with the *org* and will be pulled right into it himself.

AUDITORS

We've been through all this before training auditors in '55-'58-Ds of P and 1.

They often had unusual solutions. They also would say they had "already done that" so we had a trick-" *What did you do?*" And we'd hear some *other thing* than what was ordered.

We know all about that.

And today when we apprentice them in orgs, boy they really come out as real auditors!

So we know all about getting standard actions really done.

And there IS a thing called standard tech.

And there is a thing called STANDARD ADMIN.

Above is the I to 14 of making a real Esto and thereby a real org. This is really 3rd dynamic auditing for production.

RULE

The EXEC ESTO or his deputy must okay every major action any Esto means to take to be sure it is ON-POLICY, ON-LINES.

HOLD THE FORM

The one thing an Esto I/C or Exec Esto ALWAYS DOES is hold the form and lines of the org.

EQUIPMENT

An Esto I/C or Exec Esto should have a 1-14 checklist with a blank at the top for the Esto's name and date and time.

When a solution is brought in he enters the Esto's name and date and a note of it.

Then he or his deputy keeps tabs on it by checking off the dones.

Such an action as 1-14 takes little time, actually. Twenty-four hours is an AGE.

He will find that some of his Esto I/Ts can't complete them rapidly, a rare one can't complete at all. This needs a Why itself. And maybe a retread or, that failing, a replacement.

A policy and HCOB library like the Qual library is a necessity. You can't hold the form of an org with no record of the form.

FAITH

Faith in the system comes first, then faith in the Esto I /Ts and then faith in the org will prevent a lot of shooting.

But a few right WHYs then show that it usually isn't evil. It's just outpoints. AND THAT THESE CAN BE HANDLED. The real gold of REAL WHYS.

This restores one's faith. Rapidly.

168

SIGN

And on his desk, facing outward, the Exec Esto should have a sign:

THE ANSWER TO YOUR
OFF-POLICY SOLUTION IS "NO!"
FIND THE WHY.
HAT HAT HAT

An Esto is busy hatting staff, handling lines. He is being hit with weird solutions. Product Officers talk to them about how it should really be established (while not themselves producing or getting anything produced).

Someone has to hold the Esto stable as an Esto.

That's the senior Esto of the org.

He hats Estos while they establish. He demands establishment.

And he gets it if he hats, hats, hats Estos and keeps them establishing. He IS the real holder and expander of the form of the org. Via his Estos.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:ne.gm Copyright © 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

169

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 13 MARCH 1972

Remimeo

Establishment Officer Series 5

PRODUCTION AND ESTABLISHMENT

ORDERS AND PRODUCTS

The situation one often finds in an org, after one has, to some degree, conquered dev-t, is that PEOPLE REQUIRE ORDERS.

For years I wondered why this was so. Well, I found it.

WHEN PEOPLE DO NOT CLEARLY KNOW WHAT THEIR PRODUCTS ARE THEY REQUIRE CONSTANT ORDERS.

To the Establishment Officer, this reflects most visibly in trying to get program targets DONE.

Some people have to be ordered and ordered and ordered and threatened and howled at. Then, in a bewildered way, they do a target, sometimes half, sometimes nearly all.

Behind this apparent blankness lies an omitted datum. When they're like that they don't know what their product is or what it adds up to. Or they think it's something else or should be.

That blankness can invite overts.

It is very seldom that malice or resentment or refusal to work lies behind the inaction. People are seldom that way.

They usually just don't understand what's wanted or why.

Because they don't know what a PRODUCT is!

A whole Ad Council of a downstat org was unable even to *define* the word.

They had required orders, orders, orders and even then didn't carry them out.

HAT SURVEY FOR ORDERS

A staff member who requires orders may also think that any order is a policy and lasts forever. If you look into hats you will even find casual "close the door" type of orders, given on one occasion to fit one circumstance are converted over into STANDING (continual) ORDERS that forever keep a certain door closed.

An Esto surveying the hats of a unit may very well find all manner of such oddities.

It is a standard Esto action to survey hats.

In hats you will find despatches giving specific orders or quoted remarks preserved instead of notes on what one has to know to produce a product.

In auditors' hats, directions for 1 specific pc in 1960, never published and from no

170

tape or correct source, held onto like death like it was to be applied to every pc in the world!

A dishwashing hat may have orders in it but not how to wash dishes rapidly and well.

This is all a symptom of a unit or activity that does not know what its products are.

DISESTABLISHMENT

Where you find lots of orders kicking around, you will also find disestablishment by bypass, command channels not held and staff members like to take their orders from anyone but those in authority-any passerby could give them orders.

This is rampant where an executive has not been well on post.

By counting such orders up and seeing who they are from one can determine the unhattedness of staff, their org bd weaknesses and principally their lack of knowledge of their products.

HATTING FOR PRODUCT

If an Esto is to hat so as to get the staff member to get his product out, then the Esto has to know how to clear up "products."

Now an Esto is an Establishment Officer? There are Product Officers. The product of an Esto is the establishment. Then what is he doing with products?

Well, if he doesn't hat so staff members get out products then the org will be a turmoil, unhappy and downstat.

Production is the basis of morale.

Hattedness is a basic of 3rd dynamic sanity.

But if you don't HAT SO AS TO GET THE STAFF MEMBER YOU ARE HATTING PRODUCING YOU WILL HAT AND HAT AND IT WILL ALL BE IN VAIN. The person won't stay hatted unless he is hatted so as to be able to produce.

The Product Officer should be working to get the products out.

So if you don't hat for the product then the staff member will be torn between two sets of orders, the Esto's and the Product Officer's.

Only when you hat to get product will you get agreement with Product Officers.

If you are in disagreement with Product Officers, then the Esto is not hating to get production.

RIGHT WAY TO

There is a right direction to hat. All others are incorrect.

1. CLEAR UP WHAT THE PRODUCT IS FOR THE POST AND HAT FROM THERE.
2. HAT FROM THE TOP OF THE DIVISION (OR ORG) DOWN.

These are the two right directions.

All other directions are wrong.

171

These two data are so important that the failure of an Esto can often be traced to violation of them.

You can have a senior exec going almost livid, resisting being hatted unless you hat by first establishing what the *product* is. If PRODUCT is first addressed and cleaned up then you can also hat from the top down.

If this is not done, the staff will not know where they are going or why and you will get silly unusual situations like, "All right. So you're the Establishment Officer. Well, I give up. The division can have 21/2 hours a day establishment time and then get the hell out of here so some work can be done! . . ." "Man, you got these people all tied up, stats are down! Can't you understand. . . ."

Well, if you don't do one and two above you'll run into the most unusual messes and "solutions" you ever heard of, go sailing off policy and as an Esto wind up at your desk doing admin instead of getting your job done in the division. And an Esto who is not on his feet working in the division is worth very little to anyone.

So see where the basic errors lead and

Hat on product before doing anything else and

Hat from the top down.

STEPS TO CLEAR "PRODUCT"

This is a general rundown of the sequence by which *product is* cleared and recleared and recleared again.

This can be checklisted for any exec or staff member and should be with name and date and kept in the person's "Esto file folder" for eventual handing to his new Esto when the person is transferred out of the division or in personnel files if he goes elsewhere.

1. Clear the word PRODUCT.

2. Get what the product or products of the post should be. Get it or any number of products he has fully fully stated, not brushed off.

3. Clear up the subject of *exchange*. (See HCO PL 27 Nov 71 Exec Series 3 and HCO PL 3 Dec 71 Exec Series 4.)

4. Exchange of the product internal in the org. For what valuable?

5. Exchange external of the valuable with another group or public. For what valuable? (Person must come to F/N VGIs on these above actions before proceeding or he goes to an auditor to get his Mis-Us and out-ruds very fully handled.)

6. Does he want the product? Clean this up fully to F/N VGIs or yourself get E/S to F/N or get an auditor to unsnarl this.

7. Can he *get* the products (in 2 above) out? How will he? What's he need to know? Get him fully settled on this point.

8. Will it be in volume? What volume? Is that enough to bother with or will it have to be a greater volume? Or is he being optimistic? What's real? What's viable?

9. What quality is necessary? What would he have to do to attain that? To attain it in volume?

172

10. Can he get others to want the product or products (as in 2 above)? What would he have to do to do this?

11. How do his products fit into the unit or section or department or division or the org? Get this all traced.

12. Now trace the blocks or barriers he may believe are on this line. Get what HE can do about these.

13. What does he have to have to get his product out? (Alert for unreasonable "have to have before he can do" blocks.)

14. Now does he feel he can get his product or products out?

Signature of Esto or Clearer

NOW he really can be hatted.

BRUSH-OFF

Quickie handling is a very very bad fault. "Quickie" means a brush-off "lick and a promise" like wiping the windshield on the driver's side when really one would have to work at it to get a whole clean car.

So don't "quickie" product. If this is poorly done on them there goes the old balloon. Hatting won't be possible.

Orders will have to be poured in on this terminal. Dev-t will generate. Overt products will occur, not good ones. And it won't be worthwhile.

DISAGREEMENT

There can be a lot of disagreement amongst Product Officers and Estos on what products are to be hammered out.

In such a case, or in any case, one can get a Disagreements Check done in Dept of Personnel Enhancement (who should look up how to do one).

This is a somewhat extreme way to settle an argument and should only be a "when all else fails."

It is best to take the whole product pattern of the org apart with the person, **STARTING FROM THE BIGGEST PRODUCT OF THE ORG AND WORKING BACK TO THE PERSON'S PRODUCT.**

Almost always there will be an outpoint in reasoning.

An exec who only wants GI can be a trial as he is violating EXCHANGE. As an org is paid usually before it delivers, it is easy to get the org in trouble by backlogs or bad repete for nondelivery. An org that has credit payments due it that aren't paid maybe didn't deliver. But Div III may soften up collections for some reason like that and then where would the org be?

Vol 0 of the OEC Course gives an excellent background of how a basic org works. As one goes to higher orgs, lower orgs are depended upon to continue to flow upward to them. (See HCO PL 9 Mar 72 Issue I Finance Series No. I I "Income Flows and Pools.")

173

A study of Vol 0 OEC and a full understanding of its basic flows and adapting these to higher orgs will unsnarl a lot of odd ideas about product.

The Esto has to be very clear on these points or he could mis-hat a person.

Usually however this is very obvious.

PRODUCT OFFICERS

Heads of orgs and divisions have had to organize so long they get stuck in it.

They will try to order the Esto.

This comes about because they do not know their products or the Esto is not following 1 and 2 above and does not know his own product.

The Product Officer may try to treat the Esto as a sort of "organizing officer" or a "program officer" if

A. The Esto is not hatting to get production.

B. The Product Officer is not cleared on product.

So it comes back to the 1 and 2 first mentioned.

You can look over it now and see that if one is not doing these two things, dev-t, nonviability and orders will occur.

So where you have dev-t, down stats and orders flying around you know one thing that will resolve it:

SOMETHING WILL HAVE TO BE IRONED OUT ABOUT *PRODUCT*.

When it all looks impossible, go to this point and get to work on I and 2.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:ne.rd.gm Copyright © 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

174

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 14 MARCH 1972

Issue I

Remimeo

Establishment Officer Series 6

SEQUENCE OF HATTING

I. The Executive Establishment Officer or Establishment Officer In-Charge hats and keeps Estos working in their areas.

2. The Estos work in their areas hatting and establishing.

3. The Product Officers get production.

In that way the org is built or expands stably. In that way the org is prosperous, the staff is happy.

If some other sequence is being tried or other things are happening then the org is likely to be slow, upset or nonviable.

When an org has both an Exec Esto and an Esto I/C or Chief Estos or Leading Estos the Exec Esto shall hat (a) all the Estos and the I/C or Chief or Leading Estos especially until they can safely be trusted to become a IA relay point in the above where I would be "The Exec Esto hats all Estos I/C, Chief and Leading Estos until they in turn can hat and handle their Estos as per 2."

SPEED

Power is proportional to the **speed of particle** flow. This applies to despatches, bodies, materiel and anything else that can be called a particle.

What then slows things down?

UNCERTAINTY.

Many things can cause uncertainty. Threats, transfers, rumors.

People want their posts. Leave one without one awhile and see what happens!

Firm establishment, unchanging orders, give certainty.

Nothing however causes more uncertainty than what one's product is.

Or if he can get someone to get out a product.

As certainty becomes firm on the product of a post or org, the ability to get it out, then all else falls into place and establishment has occurred.

BYPASS

It is easy for an Exec Esto or Esto I/C or any Esto to imagine he could make it all right by just bypassing and doing the product job. If he does that he fails as an Esto and the staff becomes uncertain as they feel they can't get out the product

SPEED UP

If you want to speed up an org just do the usual 1, 2, 3 as given above.

The org will become certain.

It will speed up.

175

ESTO DESKS

Estos who do lots of admin are not being Estos. They belong on their feet or at best sitting with a staff member hatting him.

When an Esto has given up he begins to do admin.

Of course one has to do org boards and CSWs for posting, lines and materials. And one does have despatches. But if these require more than a couple hours a day something is very wrong.

The Esto is the only one who **MUST** bring a body.

ASSISTANT MASTER-AT-ARMS

In a very large org there are at least two Esto Masters-at-Arms.

Both have crew mustering, exercises, etc. Their functions can interchange.

But the senior is the Exec Esto's MAA for investigation and finding Whys.

The Assistant MAA is the one who helps handle the Estos and crosschecks on them and helps them and acts as liaison between them and the Ethics Officer or HCO terminals of the org.

Estos do **NOT** go to the HCO Esto for HCO PRODUCTS. They go to the HCO terminals involved or, far better, put it via the Asst Exec Esto's MAA-"the Esto's MAA." And *he* does not go to the HCO Esto either but to the proper terminals in HCO.

The Assistant MAA should know at any given moment where to find any Esto in the org. This is so he can get them for the Exec Esto or locate them due to emergencies.

He is their personal troubles terminal.

He verifies their presence at any muster.

He is in fact keeping the lines in. between the Exec Esto and the Estos.

It is all done by body traffic, not by any despatch.

In an exact division of duties the Senior Exec Esto MAA is responsible for the whole staff as people. And how they influence org form.

The Assistant Esto MAA is responsible for the Estos as Estos on post and as people. And how they influence the Esto pattern of operations 1, 2 and 3 above.

SUMMARY

Thus the pattern can be held.

If it is, the wins are fantastic.

It is an easy pattern to hold.

It can be done.

ORGS ARE BUILT OF PEOPLE.

ESTOs WORK DIRECTLY WITH PEOPLE.

And the pattern of the work is 1, 2 and 3 above.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:mes.rd.gm Copyright © 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

176

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 14 MARCH 1972

Issue II

Remimeo

Establishment Officer Series 7

FOLLOW POLICY AND LINES

About the fastest way Estos can unmock an org is pursue the fatal course of Org Officers in the first Product Officer-Org Officer system.

These Org Officers bypassed all normal lines for personnel, materiel, spaces and supplies and by disestablishing in that fashion tore more org apart than they built. This made it almost impossible for the lonely HAS to establish anything.

An Exec Esto especially and any Esto must

1. Get personnel on usual channels.
2. Get materiel only by proper procurement.
3. Get and use spaces only according to standard CSW to the authorities involved usually the C/O or ED.

4. Get supplies only by the exact Purchase Order and supply channels.
5. Follow the exact admin lines designed to achieve establishment.

For, after all, those lines ARE a major part of establishment.

If these lines are not in they must be put in.

If the Exec Esto and Estos cannot or do not follow the *exact* procedure required in policy or routing forms or admin patterns **THEY WILL TEAR THINGS UP FASTER THAN THEY CAN BE GOTTEN IN.**

Estos must be drilled on these lines until they are truly in and effective.

It is up to them to set the example to others.

LINES

Lines that cross from one division to another such as public lines are under the control of Dept 2 HCO.

They are dummy run by the Dir Comm under the guidance of the HCO Esto and with the cooperation of the Esto Conference.

These lines are vital to an org.

This is also true of personnel *lines*, *supply lines* and routing forms for new staff or transfers or any other action that may involve 2 or more divisions.

Lines within a division are the business of the Estos of that division.

Where departmental Estos exist, the lines linking up departments are handled by the Esto Conference of that division.

177

INVISIBLE

Lines are invisible to many people. They disregard them and chaos results.

Thus Estos of all people must see that edges are put on those lines, usually in the form of HCO routing forms and ethics actions for violations.

AN ORG WHOSE ADMIN OR BODY LINES ARE BEING VIOLATED WILL DISESTABLISH.

What is gained in sudden action is lost in disestablishment. The seized desk without permission, the grabbed space without proper allocation, the ripped off supplies for lack of chits and supply lines, the suddenly transferred personnel all end up with a headache for somebody else and an unmocked area.

WORKING INSTALLATION

DO NOT DISESTABLISH A WORKING INSTALLATION!

Example: An exec spends months building up a producing Qual Div. The Qual Sec is suddenly ripped off without replacement and apprenticing the replacement. The div collapses. There went months of work. It was far more economical to have a Qual Sec In-Training under that Qual Sec for a month or two before the transfer.

Using the wrong personnel pools for want of proper recruiting and training is the downfall of most orgs.

Because it wrecks working installations.

This applies as well to org machinery. Don't wreck one machine to get a part for another. And don't ever take one apart that is running well.

OPERATIONAL

The definition of OPERATIONAL is running without further care or attention.

Anything that needs constant fiddling or working at to make it run is nonoperational! It must be repaired fully or replaced.

Man-hours and time waste easily eat up any value of the inoperational machine.

Further, a machine that is forced to run that does not run well may then break down utterly and expensively. The time to repair is soon, the moment it cannot be run without great care or attention.

OPERATIONAL is a key definition that answers many problems.

It is also true of people. Those who need continual pushing around or rounding up cannot be considered operational. They can absorb time totally out of proportion to worth.

This is no license to shoot staff down. But it is a warning that where too much time is absorbed trying to make a staff member functional he cannot be considered OPERATIONAL.

If an Esto spent 100% of his time for weeks on just one staff member and let the rest go hang, he'd soon find he was rewarding a downstat as well as violating the definition of operational.

RIGHT TARGET

A working unit that is getting on well, has an already established activity even to

178

internal training, is not the right target for an Esto to reorganize.

His whole activity should be to get it support and new trainees for it. His internal functions should be minimal so long as it runs well.

He helps it without hindering it.

Putting a unit there that is already there is a bit foolish

The right thing to do is get it help and support!

Example: An exec who really turns out the production. Seven Esto should groove in his communicator and support lines and hat hell out of *them*.

Example: A Mimeo Section that runs like a bomb. The Esto recruits new in-trainings for it, eases its supply problems and better establishes the outside lines into it.

You keep what's established going.

New brooms may sweep clean. New Estos know their scene. And *then* establish what *isn't* established, or its support lines. To do otherwise can hurt a working unit or activity.

SUMMARY

Know what disestablishes.

Then you won't accidentally tear down faster than you build up.

The hallmark of the good Esto is

ESTABLISH AND MAINTAIN.

Sometimes he is unlucky and has disestablishing going on.

Sometimes he is very lucky and only has to maintain!

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:mes.rd.gm Copyright © 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

179

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saini Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 16 MARCH 1972

Issue I

Remimeo

Establishment Of

.J

.Ticer Series 8

LOOK DON'T LISTEN

An Establishment Officer who stands around or sits around just talking to people or seniors is dev-t.

If these people knew what was wrong the stats would be in Power. So if they aren't, why gab?

Questions, sharp and pointed, as in an investigation, yes.

But an Esto who just talks, no.

A GOOD ESTO LOOKS.

The scene is in the hats or lack of them. The scene is on the org bd or lack of it.

THE SCENE IS RIGHT BEFORE ONE'S EYES.

It is moving or it is not

Its graphs are rising or they are level or falling or they are false or don't reflect the product or they aren't kept or they aren't posted.

Products are appearing or they are not.

Overt products are occurring or good products.

The lines are followed or they aren't.

The mest is okay or it isn't.

It is a SCENE. It is in three dimensions. It's composed of spaces and objects and people.

They are on a right pattern or they aren't.

A person is on post or he is moving onto one or moving off or isn't there at all or he is dashing in and out.

None of these things are verbal.

Few are in despatches. Quantities of despatches, types of despatches, yes. Content? Only good for investigation, not for adjusting the lines, types and volumes.

Example: Overloaded exec. Examine his traffic. Don't talk to him. Examine his traffic. Look to see if he has an in-basket for each hat he wears, a folder for each type or area. Find a WHY. It can be as blunt as he doesn't know the meaning of the word "despatch." Use the WHY. Handle. Hat his communicator on comm procedures. Hat him on comm procedures. Examine his org bd. Find where it's wrong. Adjust it. Get his agreement. And the load comes off and product goes up.

180

Now there are moments in that example when one talks. But they are concerned with ACHIEVING THE PRODUCT OF AN ESTABLISHED PRODUCING EXECUTIVE.

If the Esto doesn't himself know, name, want and get and get wanted his Product I (an established thing) or Product 3 (a corrected establishment) he, will talk, not look. (See P/L 29 Oct 70 Org Series 10 for Products 1, 2, 3, 4.)

You can't know what's happening in a kitchen by talking to a cook. Because he's not cooking just then. You can't know how good the food is without tasting it. You don't know really how clean a floor is without wiping at it. You don't know how clean an ice box is without smelling it.

You don't know what a tech page is really doing without watching him.

You don't know how an auditor is auditing without listening to him, looking at the pc, the exam reports, the worksheets, the date and progress of the program. If you *listened* to him, wow, one sometimes hears the greatest sessions that you ever could conceive.

To adjust a scene you have to LOOK AT IT.

ADMIN

An Esto or Esto I/C or Exec Esto who tries to do it with admin will fail.

Admin is S-L-O-W.

A Product Officer acts very fast if he is producing. The flurry to get a product can tear the establishment apart.

You don't halt the flurry. That's exactly counter to the purpose of an Esto.

The right answer is to ESTABLISH FASTER AND MORE FIRMLY.

It takes quickly found RIGHT Whys to really build something up.

And it isn't done by admin!

"Dear TEO. I have heard that you are in trouble with the D of P. Would you please give me a report so I can bring it up at a meeting we are holding at the Hilton next week to see if we can get people to cooperate in sending us Whys about the insolvency of the org. My wife said to say hello and I hope your kids are all right. Drop around some time for a game of poker. Seeing you some time. Don't forget about the report. Best. Joe, Esto I/C."

Right there you'd have a Why of org insolvency. Not any meeting. But that it's on a despatch line. TOO DAMNED SLOW.

Already establishment is slower than production. It always is. And always will be. It takes two days to make a car on an assembly line and two years to build a plant.

BUT when you make establishing even slower, you lose.

Esto admin is a spendid way to slow down establishment.

Let me give you some actual times.

1. SITUATION: Overloaded exec. Three periods of looking, each 15 to 20 minutes. Time to inspect and find WHY, and handle Mis-U word 32 minutes. Time to write cramming orders on a communicator 17 minutes. Total time to totally Esto handle: 1 hr and 49 minutes over a period of three days.

181

2. SITUATION: Investigation of lack of personnel. Collection of past records 1 hour. Location of peak recruitment period by record study 7 minutes. Location of EDs and hats of that period 35 minutes. Study of what they did. 20 minutes. Location of Why (dropped out unit) 10 minutes. Orders written as an ED to reestablish unit. Approval 9 minutes. Total Esto time 2 hours and 21 minutes. Plus time to form unit by HAS, 1 day. Unit functioning in 36 hours and got first 3 products in 2 days.

3. SITUATION: Backlog on an auditor. Inspection of lines one half hour. Of folders of all auditors and their times in session 2 hours. Finding WHY and verifying 25 minutes (other HGC auditors dumping their pcs on one auditor because he had a slightly higher class and "they couldn't do those actions"), investigation of D of T 32 minutes (not on post, doing admin, Supers doing admin). Writing pgrm 35 minutes. Locating P/Ls on course supervision, one hour. Writing cramming chits on 6 auditors, Supers and D of T 1 hour 15 minutes. Total time 6 hours and 17 minutes. Check of Why five days later found HGC stats up and auditor not backlogged.

4. SITUATION: Stats I/C goofing, making errors. Meter action Method 4, 18 minutes. Found word "statistic" not understood. Total time 18 minutes. Check back in 3 days, Stats I/C doing well, taking on all the duties of the hat.

5. SITUATION: Pc Admin only instant hatted. Getting her mini-hatted. M4, demos, clay demos, 4 days at 1 hour per day and 15 minute check in late day to see if she is applying it to produce what it says, 5 hours.

6. SITUATION: Exec believes all his products are overt. Three hours and 15 minutes completing 14 Steps of Esto Series 5 on him, locating only one product was overt. Twenty minutes cleaning up how to unbug it. Three hrs and 35 minutes.

These are typical Esto situations. They are not all the types of actions Estos do. They would be typical total required time involved if the Esto were right on his toes.

I do such Esto actions. They are very rapid and effective. So what I am writing is not just theory.

Not all actions are at once successfully resolved. I have been involved in efforts to find a WHY in a very broad situation for months before all was suddenly revealed.

But where in all this was writing despatches about it?

F/N VGIs

One knows he is right when he looks and when he finds the right WHY. It's always F/N VGIs. Gung ho! ("Pull together.")

So one isn't only looking. He is looking to see the scene and find the WHY and establish.

If the Esto has spotted, and named the product he wants, then he has a comparison with the existing scene.

He cannot compare unless he looks!

Product named and wanted. Is it here in this scene? One can only see by *looking*.

You start listening and you get PR, problems, distractions, 3rd partying, etc., etc. An Esto gets into a cycle of

Outpoint, handle, outpoint, handle, outpoint, handle.

He hasn't looked and hasn't found a Why. So the scene *will get worse*.

You have then a busy, frantic Esto with the walls of Jericho falling down all over him because he listens to people blowing their own horns.

182

When you see an Esto standing and listening. Okay. If you see it again elsewhere. What? What? This Esto is not doing his job.

If you see an Esto standing and watching, okay. If you see him pawing through old files, okay. If you see him sitting doing a checkout, okay. If you see him working with a meter on somebody, okay. If you see him with a pile full of hats gazing into space tapping his teeth, okay. If you see him running, okay. If you see him reading policy, okay.

If you see him sitting at a desk doing admin, no, unless it's "today's chits." As a habit all day, No No No No No No.

If you see him standing talking, standing talking, give him a dev-t chit. He's not being an Esto.

The real tale is told when a division or an org is established so that its stats RISE and RISE.

When the staff looks happier and happier.

When the public being served is bigger and bigger and more and more thrilled.

And the Esto achieves all that by LOOKING.

A good Esto has the eye of a hawk and can see an outpoint a hundred feet away while going at a dead run.

A good Esto can find and know a real WHY in the time it takes a human being to wonder what he'll have for dinner.

A good Esto LOOKS. And he only listens so he can look.

And like Alice he knows he has to run just to keep up and run like everything to get anywhere.

And so a good Esto arrives.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:ne.rd.gm Copyright © 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 16 MARCH 1972

Issue II

Remimeo

Establishment Officer Series 9

STUCK IN

An Esto, as well as being mobile, must not get "stuck in" on one point of a division or org.

Spending days hating only *one* staff member and letting whole departments go is an example of what is meant by "getting stuck in."

This is why one "short cycles" an area. By that is meant doing a short start-change- stop that COMPLETES that action.

This is why one (a) instant hats, (b) gets production, (c) does a mini hat P/L on the person, (d) gets production, (e) does another P/L, (f) gets production.

The Produce is a test to the Esto of whether or not he is winning on a post.

You cover your whole area as an Esto with short cycles you can complete on each person individually.

You do group drills of the whole group, little by little.

Gradient scales are at work here. (Look it up if you don't know it.)

Like, found one basic product for each in the div. Then handled other things. Then got product moved to Exchange on each one. Then did other things. Etc., etc.

The other things are find a Why for a jam area or handle a blow or any other Esto duty.

But don't spend 82 hours hating Joe who then doesn't make it while the rest go hang.

Dev-t drops little by little and production rises IF you short cycle your actions.

Don't get "stuck in." "I've been working on Dept I and it is better now. Next month I go to Dept 2" is a wrong look.

Short cycles. Each staff member getting attention individually as well as a group.

If one man was totally hatted and all the rest not, they'd just knock his hat off anyway.

Don't get stuck in on a dev-t terminal. Instruct, cram, retread, dismiss is the sequence.

Short cycles work. They show up the good as well as the bad. This gives upstats a reward.

Never have a situation where a Product Officer can say to you, "I appreciate all the trouble you're taking getting Oscar hatted. Let me know some day when you've

finished so I can stop holding the div together and get on with my product."

Little by little a whole group makes it. Drilled as a group as on org bds. Hatted on one product or a P/L as an individual.

In between you work like mad to get up an org bd and groove in the new staff member or find the WHY the Exec Esto is so anxious to get.

If 2 days pass and a staff member has not had any individual attention, no matter how brief, from an Esto, that Esto has gotten "stuck in."

Stay unstuck!

Flow. Be mobile.

You can, you know. And be very effective too.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:mes.gm Copyright © 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

185

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 18 MARCH 1972

Remimeo

Establishment Officer Series 10

FILES

The lowly and neglected item called FILES is the cause of more company downfalls than desks and quarters and sometimes even personnel.

Because files are looked upon as routine clerical work they seldom are given enough attention by executives. Yet the downfall of most executives is lack of information and FILES.

Files are often considered an area of overwork on the shoulders of one person or a part-time action. This is the most expensive "saving" an org can get itself into.

Example: One org (Jbg early '60's) did not have file cabinets or proper respect for files and kept losing their 6500 Central Files of clients. The org remained in income trouble.

Example: Another org (SH '60) would not file into its bills files or keep them up and routinely overpaid creditors. In '64 for lack of these proper accounts files, it thought it owed E1000 when it actually owed £22,000! And don't think that didn't cause management overwork!

Example: An org didn't have its CF straight and its Address was therefore incorrect and not tabbed for publics. (AOLA 1971-72.) This cost thousands of dollars a week in (a) promo wasted to wrong addresses, (b) low returns, (c) insolvent cash-bills.

I could go on and on with these examples. FSM pgms broken down as Dept 18s had no proper FSM file or any real selection slip file. Inability to promote to correct publics because of no tabbed address plates. Inability to locate suppliers due to no purchaser files. No personnel obtained as personnel files nonexistent. And so on.

There are LOTS of files in an org. HCO P/L 23 Feb 1970 "The LRH Comm Weekly Report" lists the majority of these.

ORGANIZING FILES

The Establishment Officer will find all too often that in the flurry to get products, the file forming and maintenance function is bypassed. He will find files are being pawed through and destroyed by frantic staffs.

He will seldom find similar attention being given to files. He will even find local (and illegal) orders like, "They are spending too much time organizing and too little time producing. So just produce, don't organize."

Such people are getting this week's stats at the expense of all next year's income!

They even order files destroyed as "old" instead of setting up archives.

Half to two-thirds of an org's income comes from having a well kept Central Files and Address and FSM files and a lot of credit rating and correct payment comes from bills files. P/L and HCOB files almost totally monitor training and processing and admin quality.

So files are FINANCIALLY VITAL TO AN ORG.

186

Efforts to block or cheapen files supplies and personnel must be countered. This is the first step of organizing files.

The next step is using a simple system that lets one recover things once they are filed.

The next step is collecting everything to be filed *whilefiling it*.

The next step is *completing* the files (usually by extra hands).

The final step is MAINTAINING the files by keeping people there to do it and having exact lines.

Independent files all over a division are liable to file out-of-date or lost. Therefore it is best to have DIVISIONAL FILES. These usually go in the last dept and section of the division. Usually every type of file in the div is kept there.

In this way you *can* keep a files person on the division's files.

A big deep FILES BASKET exists in the div comm center.

A log-out log-in book exists to locate where files have gone. This can be a large colored card that takes the place of the file.

A pre-file set of boxes A-Z sits above the files and is used, so one isn't opening and closing file cabinets every time one files in one scrap of paper.

Files personnel HAVE TO KNOW THEIR ALPHABET FORWARDS AND BACKWARDS LIKE LIGHTNING. This is the biggest cause of slow or misfiling,

All hands of the division actions can be taken for an hour or two a day to catch a sudden inflow or backlog.

There are *no* "miscellaneous files" or catch all "that we put things in when we don't have another place for them."

Clerks must be able to get things out of files rapidly as well as file in.

The files location must not be so distant from the users (like Letter Reges or accountants) that use of them is discouraged by the delay or the time lost. When this is true they start keeping their own independent files.

MEMORY

A person without memory is psychotic.

An org without files has no memory.

ESTOs

The Esto is responsible for organizing, establishing and maintaining files even when there is a files I/C. The div head and dept heads are in command of files and their use and over files people. But this does not excuse an Esto from having the div's files established.

If an Esto only did this file action well, the increased income of an org and the decreased cost would cover his and the file clerk's pay several times over!

FILES ARE VALUABLE TO AN ORG.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.rd.gm Copyright v 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

187

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 23 MARCH 1972

Remimeo

Establishment Officer Series 11

FULL PRODUCT CLEARING

LONG FORM

(Reference HCO P/L 13 Mar 72

Esto Series No. 5)

MUST BE DONE ON AN ESTO

BEFORE HE DOES IT ON STAFF

If you ask some people what their product is, you usually get a DOINGNESS.

There are three conditions of existence. They are BE. DO and HAVE.

All products fall under HAVE.

The oddities you will get instead of a proper product are many.

Thus it is possible to "clear products" without any real result.

PRODUCT CLEARING FORM

Org Person's Name

Date

Post

The 14 Points of Esto Series 5 are done in this fashion, with a meter used to check words.

STEP ONE

DO NOT TAKE FOR GRANTED THAT THE PERSON KNOWS WHAT "PRODUCT" MEANS. GET IT AND EVERY WORD IN THE DEFINITION LOOKED UP.

(a) Clear the word PRODUCT. Dictionaries give a variety of definitions. Make sure you get a useable definition that the person understands AND WHICH HE UNDERSTANDS ALL THE WORDS IN. He can be hung up on "that" or "is" in the definition itself believe it or not.

(b) Have the person USE the word PRODUCT 10 times in sentences of his own invention and use it correctly each time.

(c) Now clear up BE, DO, HAVE, the conditions of existence. People often think a BE is a product or a DO. It is always something someone can HAVE.

Clear the words BE, DO, HAVE by dictionary, especially HAVE.

188

(d) Write these on a sheet of paper

BE

DO

HAVE.

Tell the person to name a product out in the world (a car, a book, a cured dog, etc.).

Put an arrow into the word DO if he gives you a "do," into BE if he gives you a "be" instead of a HAVE.

Mark HAVE with an arrow each time he gives a right HAVE product.

When he can *rapidly* name a product that is something that one can HAVE, without a comm lag, go on to next step.

(e) Clear up this question on a meter Method 4 (see HCOB 22 Feb 72, Word Clearing Series 32, "Word Clearing Method 4"):

"Have 1 used any word so far you did not understand?"

Get it clean.

(f) Now give the person a copy of HCO P/L 29 October 70 Org Series 10.

Have him read the policy letter.

(g) Clear by Method 4 Word Clearing this question:

"Are there any words in the policy letter you did not understand?"

Get it cleaned up. If there were any, have him reread the policy letter until he says he has it.

(h) Drill the pc on Products 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Write:

Product 1 Product 2

Product 3 Product 4

on a sheet of paper.

Let him retain and consult the HCO P/L 29 Oct 70 Org Series 10.

Put the point of your pen on one of the products (Product 1 or 2 or 3 or 4) and say, "Name a Product U" "Name a Product 3." "Name a Product 4." "Name a Product 2." Do this until pc has it.

Now take the P/L away from him and repeat the drill.

When your Product 1, etc., is all blacked up with ballpoint spots *and* the person is quick at it, thank him. Tell him he has it and go on to next step.

STEP TWO

(a) Look up the hat and org board of the post of the person being product cleared and get some idea of what the post's product would have to be to fit in **with the rest of the scene**. It won't necessarily be in

189

former hat write-ups. What the post produces must be worked out. Write down what it possibly may be.

(b) Get the person to tell you what his post *produces*. Have him work the wording around until it is totally satisfactory to him and is not incorrect by Step 2 (a).

Be *very* careful indeed that you don't get a wrong product or you could throw the whole line-up of the org out,

Beware of "a high stat" or "a bonus" or "GF" as these are items received in exchange, not the person's produced product.

Once more resort to BE

DO

HAVE

to be sure he is not giving a doingness. And point this out until he actually has a HAVE.

Write down the product on the worksheet.

(c) Ask if there are any more products to the post. If the person is wearing several hats, he would have a product for each hat.

List each hat and get the product of each hat written after it.

(d) Now take the principal product of the post and see if it is really three products of different degrees or kinds. (Example: an auditor has [A] a well pc [one who has been gotten over a psychosomatic illness], [B] a person who is physically active and well and will continue to be well, and [C] a being with greatly increased abilities. A Super has [A] a trained student, [B] a course graduate, [C] a person who successfully applies the skills taught.) (Note: The above are rough wordings.)

The A, B, C you will notice fit roughly into (A) BE, (B) DO, (C) HAVE.

If the person has trouble with this, write BE, DO, HAVE on the worksheet.

(e) Find out if the person has had these confused one with another or if he is trying for A when his product was C, or any other mix-up.

See if he has to first get a BE, then a DO to finally achieve a HAVE.

When he has all this straight he should cognite on what product he is going for on his post, with VG1s.

(f) Tell the person that's it for the step and verify the products with a Product Officer. (Be sure it's a Product Officer who has had his Product Clearing. If this is THE Product Officer of the org, see if it compares to the valuable final products of an org [see HCO P/L 8 Nov 73RA, revised 9 Mar 74, *The VFPs and GDSs of the Divisions of an Org*].)

If the products are not all right check the person on a meter for Mis-Us and do Steps 1 and 2 again. If okay, proceed to Step 3.

STEP THREE

(a) Give the person HCO P/L 27 Nov 71, Executive Series No. 3 and

HCO P/L 3 Dec 71 Executive Series 4. Have him read them.

190

(b) Return and do Method 4 on the P/Ls and clean up any misunderstood word. If these are found and looked up and used, then have the person read the P/Ls again.

(c) Now that the person has it, exchange objects with him.

Have him now explain exchange until he sees clearly what it is.

STEP FOUR

(a) Now write his product on the left-hand side of your worksheet and draw an arrow from it to the right:

His product

And one to the left below it

Have him tell you what, *internally* in the org, he could get in *exchange* for producing his product and getting it out.

Have him clear up why he might not get that.

(b) Have him look at a worksheet picture:

Overt Act Injury

Injury * Overt Act

SELF No Product OTHERS

Nothing o Nothing

as a cycle. Be sure he grasps that.

(c) Have him look at a worksheet picture:

Overt Product Upset

Upset * Overt

And have him grasp that cycle,

(d) Now have *him* draw various such cycles having to do with the products he has been getting out. Such as:

Bad Product Dissatisfied

Bad Feelings Ethics

But using various versions of products.

Do this until he has it untangled and feels good.

(e) Have him write down his product on the left, arrow to the right, what comes back on the right and what occurs on the left.

If he has this now, tell him that's fine.

STEP FIVE

(All in Big Clay Demos)

(a) Have him work out what theft is in terms of exchange, and arrows.

191

(b) Have him show how his product contributes to the org's product.

(c) Have him work out how the org's product as relates to his division is then exchanged with society outside the org and Scri and what society exchanges back to the org.

(d) Have him work out how his product contributes to org's product outward and outside the org and Scri and then from the society outside back to the org and org back to him.

This may have more than two vias each way.

(e) Have him work out the combined staff products into an org product and then out into the society and then the exchange back into the org and to CLOs and upper management and to org staff.

(f) When the demos are all okay and BIG, tell him that's fine and go on to next step.

STEP SIX

(Metered)

(a) Find out if person wants his product? (not the exchange).

If not find out who might suppress it? and E/S times.

Who might invalidate it? and earlier times.

Two-way comm it to F/N Cog VGIs.

(b) Establish now if the person wants his product.

(If bogs turn over to a C/S and auditor for ruds and completion.)

STEPSEVEN

(Metered)

(a) Can the person get his product out?

(b) Handle by 2wc E/S to F/N.

STEP EIGHT

(Metered)

(a) What will his product be in volume?

Is that enough to bother about or will it have to be in greater volume?

What would be viable as to volume?

Clean up RUSHED or failures.

To F/N Cog VGIs.

STEP NINE

(Metered)

(a) What quality would be necessary?

Get various degrees of quality stated.

What would he have to do to attain that quality?

What volume could he attain?

192

What would he have to do to attain that?

To F/N Cog VGIs.

STEP TEN

(Metered)

(a) Can he get others to want the products he put out?

What would he have to do to attain this?

STEP ELEVEN

(In BIG Clay)

(This is a progressive clay demo
added to at each step.)

(a) How does his product or products fit into the framework of his section? Requires he work out the section product if his is not it. Then fit his to it.

(b) How does his product fit into the department? Requires he work out the department's product and fit his to it if his is not the dept's product.

(c) How does his product fit into the division's products? He will have to work out the div's product or consult HCO P/L 8 Nov 73RA, Revised 9 Mar 74, *The VFPs and G DSs of the Divisions of an Org.* "

(d) How does the division's product exchange with the public? And for what?

(e) What happens to the org on this exchange?

STEP TWELVE

(In Big Clay)

- (a) What blocks might he encounter in getting out his product?
- (b) What can HE do about these?

STEP THIRTEEN

(Two-way Comm)

(a) What does he have to have to get his product out? (Beware of too much have before he can do. Get him to cut it back so *he* is more causative.)

STEP FOURTEEN

(Written by Pc)

- (a) What is his product on the 1st dynamic-self?

How does it fit in with what he is doing?

- (b) What is his product on the 2nd dynamic-family and sex?

How does it fit in with what he is doing?

- (c) What is his product on the 3rd dynamic-groups?

How does it fit in with what he is doing?

193

- (d) What is his product on the 4th dynamic-man kind?

How does it fit in with what he is doing?

- (e) What is his product on the 5th dynamic-animal and vegetable kingdom?

How does it fit in with what he is doing?

- (f) What is his product on the 6th dynamic-the universe of matter, energy, space and time?

How does it fit in with what he is doing?

- (g) What is his product on the 7th dynamic-beings as spirits-thetans?

How does it fit in with what he is doing?

- (h) What is his product on the 8th dynamic-God or the infinite or religion?

How does it fit in with what he is doing?

- (i) What is his post product?

O) Can he get it out now?

Esto or Product Clearer

Note this long form has to be run on leading executives and eventually on all staff. The short form in Esto Series 5, 14 Points, serves as a rapid action. Where there is any hang-up on the short form, send the person to an auditor. Where there is a hang-up on the long form, send the person to an auditor. The auditing action is to fly ruds on the RD and assess any key words the pc is upset about and do an 18 button prepcheck carrying each prepcheck button to F/N.

Where the TA is already high do not attempt the short or long form.

Where the person turns on a rock slam check for rings on the hands. If so, remove rings. Note if R/S continues.

In either case the person should be programmed for TA trouble with C/S 53RRR and handled, and then given a GF40RR Method 3 (F/Ning each question that reads) and then running the engrains with drugs run first.

Product Clearing is best done after Word Clearing No. 1 is successfully done.

An Esto who can use a meter and Method 4 WCing and knows clay demoing can do it.

HCO Bulletins are planned to be issued on this RD to handle it on rough ones or repair it as needed in the hands of an expert auditor.

L. RON HUBBARD Founder LRH:mes.rd.gm Copyright © 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[*Note: The original issue of the above Policy Letter contained a reference to HCO PL 24 Mar 72, The VFPs of an Org, in paragraph (f) on page 190 and part (c) of Step Eleven on page 193. This PL was never issued. The correct reference is as given in this edition in a different type style.*]

194

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 1 APRIL 1972

Remimeo

Establishment Officer Series 12

Executive Series 11

MAKING AN EXECUTIVE

FLOW LINES

If an executive has his flow lines wrong he will NEVER be a Product Officer but only a comm clerk.

For some poor reason executives get themselves onto all comm lines in their area. Probably it is an individual Why for each one. But the fact remains that they do do it!

And they promptly cease to be useful to anyone. While they "work" like mad!

Basically *they have confused a comm line with a command line*. These are two different things. A comm line is the line on which particles flow, it is horizontal. A command line is a line on which authority flows. It is vertical.

Here is an example of a divisional secretary who can get nothing accomplished while sweating blood over her "work."

Secretary being a relay messenger clerk

ALL org traffic to Div In and Out

6ept Dept lie~t

Wrong

Now quite obviously this secretary is suffering from "fear of juniors' actions" or "having to know all." Exactly nothing will happen because the person is plowed under with paper. No real actions are taken. Just relays.

One such secretary of a division even acted as the relay point on all out and in BODY traffic. In short, just a divisional receptionist.

No product. Nothing happening at vast expense.

195

Here is another example. The correct one.

Div Secretary as Product Officer

Right

.4

10,

No

This is known as horizontal flow.

It is a fast flow system.

The correct terminals in each department are addressed by terminals outside the dept, directly. And are so answered.

Now we have a divisional secretary who is a PRODUCT OFFICER and whose duty is to get each department and section and unit producing what it is supposed to produce.

MISROUTE

So long as a command line is confused with the comm line an org will not produce much of anything but paper.

INFORMATION

It is vital that an executive keep himself informed.

The joker is, the despatch line does NOT keep him informed. It only absorbs his time and energy.

The data is not in those despatches.

The data an executive wants is in STATISTICS and REPORTS and briefings.

Statistics get posted and are kept up-to-date for anyone to look at, especially but not only the executive. They must ACCURATELY reflect production, volume, quality and viability.

Reports are summaries of areas or people or situations or conditions.

The sequence is (a) statistic goes unusually high, (b) an inspection or reports are required in order to evaluate it and reinforce it.

196

Or (a) the statistic dives a bit and (b) an inspection or reports are needed to evaluate and correct it.

Thus an executive is NOT dealing with the despatches or bodies of the division's inflow and outflow lines but the facts of the division's production in each section.

An executive makes sure he has comm lines, yes. But these are so he can make sure stats get collected and posted, so reports can be ordered or received and so he can receive or issue orders *about these situations*.

Despatch-wise that is all an executive handles.

INSPECTIONS

Personally or by representative, an executive INSPECTS continually.

His main duties are

OBSERVATION

EVALUATIONS (which includes
handling orders)

and SUPERVISION.

All this adds up to the production of what the division is supposed to produce. Not an editing of its despatches.

A good executive is all over the place getting production done.

On a product he names it, wants it, gets it, gets it wanted, gets in the exchange for it.

He cannot do this without doing OBSERVATION by (1) stats, (2) reports, (3) inspections.

And he can't get at what's got it bugged without evaluation. And he can't evaluate without an idea of stats and reports and inspections.

Otherwise he won't know what to order in order to SUPERVISE. And once again he supervises on the basis of what he names, wants, gets, gets wanted and gets the exchange for.

THESCENE

This is the scene of an executive.

If he is doing something else he will be a failure.

The scene is an active PRODUCTION SCENE where the executive is getting what's wanted and working out what will next be wanted.

ABILITY

An actual executive *can* work.

A real fireball can do any job he has getting done under him better than anyone he has working for him or under him.

He can't be kidded or lied to.

He *knows*.

Thus a wobble of a stat has him actively looking in the exact right place. And evaluating knowingly on reports. And getting the exact right WHY. And issuing the exact right orders. And seeing them get done. And knowing it's done right because he knows it can be done and how to do it.

Now that's an ideal scene for an exec.

But any exec can work up to it.

If he does a little bit on a lower job each day, "gets his hands dirty" as the saying goes, and masters the skill, he soon will know **the whole area**. If he schedules this as his 1400 to 1500 stint or some such time daily, he'll know them all soon. And if he burns the midnight oil catching up on his study.

And he *knows* he must watch stats and then rapidly get or do observations, so he can evaluate and find real WHYS quickly and get the correction in and by supervision get the job done.

That's the ideal scene for the exec himself where he's head of the whole firm or a small part of it.

If he can't do it he will very likely hide himself on a relay despatch line and appear busy while it all crashes unattended.

An exec of course has his own admin to do but they don't spend hours at it or consider it their job for it surely isn't. Possibly an hour a day at the most handles despatches unless of course one doesn't police the dev-t in them.

Most of their evaluations are not written. They don't "go for approval" when they concern somebody's post jam. They are done by investigation on the spot and the handling is actual, not verbal.

A desk is used (a) to work out plans, (b) catch up the in-basket, (c) interview someone, (d) write up orders. Two-thirds of their time is devoted to production. Even if a thousand miles away they still only spend 1/3rd of their time on despatches.

An executive has to be able to produce the real products and to get production. That defines even an Esto whose product has to do with an established person or thing.

Any department, any division, any org, any area responds the same way favorably-to such competence.

ANALYSIS

To attain this ideal scene with an executive, one can find out WHY he isn't, by getting him to study this P/L and then find WHY he can't really do it and then by programming him to remedy lack of know-how and other actions increase his ability until he is a fireball.

If you are lucky you will have a fireball to begin with. But only the stats and *the truth of them* tell that!

Esto action: Can you do all this and these things? If the answer is no or doubtful or if the executive isn't doing them, find the Why and remedy.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.mes.bh.ts.gm Copyright © 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

198

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 3 APRIL 1972

Remimeo

Establishment Officer Series 13

DOING WORK

The basic Esto problem is getting somebody to do his job.

This is not just executives nor "bad staff." It tends to be rather prevalent in our modern culture.

The basic question really is "Why can't you do what you are supposed to be doing?"

An Esto will find many people "busy," but really not doing their post hat.

As the Esto's own stat depends on people actually doing their jobs, and as the pay and well-being of those people also depend on it, it amounts to quite a problem.

You can do a Product Rundown to cognitions. But then in some cases nothing happens.

You hat and still nothing happens.

ABERRATION

To understand this you have to understand "aberration."

Get the idea of a being doing wholly what he is doing. You get this:

e

A.

IIII Task

It is a straight line of attention.

Now get the idea of somebody "doing a job that is not doing what he is doing."

We get

e Being 'v

B. '\.X

, 111 Tas

This is aberration. Which means "not in a straight line."

199

So in example A, the person *does* what he is doing.

In example B, he is doing but he is not doing what he is doing MENTALLY. Mentally he is doing something else while he is doing what he *seems* to be doing.

SCHIZOPHRENIA

The most prevalent "mental disorder" is supposed to be schizophrenia. This means "SCISSORS" or 2 plus "head." A two-head in other words. And in this case two heads are not better than one (joke).

You see this in institutions. A person is changing valences (personalities) clickclick-click, one to the next.

But the condition is a gradient one that worsens between sanity and the bottom of the scale.

Midway, the condition is common but almost never noticed. It is so common today that it passes as normal humanoid.

The person is not doing what he is doing.

Examples of this are-people who do not like a job with responsibility because they "like to do mechanical things so they can dream of something else while working"; persons who "have to do something else before they can ⁵⁹ persons who are out of area; persons who continually make dev-t.

There is also the person who rams sideways into the work of others with "mistakes," "demands," and prevents them from doing what they are doing while himself not doing what he is doing.

One can't say these people are crazy. Not today. But one can say they make problems which are very difficult unless you know how to unlock the riddle.

BARRIERS

Study Series No. 2 HCOB 2 June 1971 Issue I "Confronting" and the drills given in the Esto tape series can push their way through an astonishing mass of barriers.

For this is what the condition is-an effort to get through barriers.

The reason example B above occurs is that the person's attention is misdirected by mental barriers each time he tries to do A above.

Yet only if he can do A will he have any self-determinism and power.

It does not mean he is crazy. It means he is incapable of directing his attention straight. Each time he does, he hits something that deflects it (sends it off at an angle).

All this will seem very reasonable to him because it is the way it has always been. And like the little girl who never knew she had had a headache from the time of birth, and only knew it when it quit suddenly, such a person does not realize he cannot control his attention.

Such think about lots of other things while apparently thinking about what they are doing. And they do lots of other things.

MISUNDERSTOODS

Misunderstood words prevent them being in communication with materials or others. Thus they do not read or *listen*. They maunder (which means wander about mentally).

200

This is the inflow side of it.

The outflow side are barriers of odd fears and peculiar ideas.

Such people appear rather weak and dispersed. Or too heavy and stubborn to make up for it.

They have fixed ideas and other outpoints because their thoughts *detour* instead of running along a highway.

HAPPINESS

To get someone to actually do what he is doing when he is doing it will sound cruel to some people. That's because they find it painful to confront and would rather withdraw and maunder, sort of self-audit themselves through life.

They are not happy.

Happiness comes from self-determinism, production, and pride.

Happiness is power and power is being able to do what one is doing when one is doing it.

COMPETENCE

When a person is competent, nothing can shake his pride. The world can yell. But it doesn't shake him.

Competence is not a question of one being more clever than another. It is one being more able to do what he is doing than another is.

Example A is competence.

Example B is incompetence.

MORE THERE

You could say a competent person was "more there." But this is really "more able to put his attention on what he has his attention on."

WHY

Anyone who is not a fireball on his post could be described by this WHY:

Unable to do his post for an individual WHY for each person.

Thus there are two ready remedies an Esto can use.

1. He can find the WHY a person cannot do his post and then handle it.
2. He can do Esto drills on the person.

In finding the WHY the observation itself that his stats are low may find the person a bit defensive.

It just could be that he *does* do what he is doing. But if so his stats would be high and he would be moving fast.

Thus one has to find his personal WHY. If it is the right one he should have very good indicators and speed up and do his job. If it is not quite the right one he may feel degraded or ashamed.

201

The test of any right WHY is does it raise the existing scene toward the ideal with existing resources.

Thus you can get a WHY that is not wholly acceptable until handled. But if you really are spot on it should blow a lot of the barriers.

Thus a real WHY blows a lot of the barriers, when handled, between the being and his job.

The drills then push it on through.

The drills sometimes blow through the WHY. The WHY sometimes blows right through any need of drills.

So these two actions interact.

If you see someone feeling very guilty after the WHY "is found," better check it over. It could be a wrong WHY and in this case, just find a new one.

THIRD ACTION

The Primary Rundown, HCOB 30 Mar 72, should be done on a staff member thoroughly.

Otherwise he will remain to some degree out of comm. He will not be able to take in data quickly if he cannot communicate with words.

PROCESSING

Of course processing removes all the barriers eventually. But it is not necessarily aimed at doing a job.

Ability potential is enormously increased by processing.

But traditionally we do not rely on processing to handle staff.

We handle people and we handle cases.

But auditors and staff members, simply because we do handle people and cases, must not have cases on post. We do not admit that they have cases. This raises necessity level.

And it is quite amazing how high that necessity level can be raised and how a person can function despite his case.

If we admitted that staff had cases we couldn't handle public cases. It's that simple.

So an Esto does not advise or use auditing on staff members as a post remedy nor accept case as a WHY.

Of course "case" is a WHY. But when you accept it you retreat from example A above and at once get a B.

You will be amazed how a person can begin to do what he is doing by finding his WHY and doing drills.

And of course you also have to handle the fellows who jam in from the side at every turn and disperse the staff member's attention. He too (and especially) isn't doing what he is doing.

The same procedure (WHY and drills) handles him as well.

202

In sum, if a staff member isn't doing what he is doing he is doing something else. They never do nothing.

Ask "What is the reason you do not fully do your post?" or any such version. Find the real WHY. And handle the person.

That's the major part of an Esto's job.

And don't be surprised if you get a cheerful "but I am!" And find he is.

But his stats and speed tell the whole story.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:mes.bh.gm Copyright © 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

203

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 4 APRIL 1972

Remimeo

Establishment Officer Series 14

ETHICS

The normal level of an unhatted dev-t nonproducing org is out-ethics.

The reason you see so many heavy ethics actions occurring-or situations where heavy ethics actions should occur if they aren't-in such an org is that it has its EXCHANGE flows messed up.

It is important to know this fact as this factor alone can sometimes be employed to handle persons in the area whose ethics are out.

CRIMINALITY

Unless we want to go on living in a far nowhere some of the facts of scenes have to be confronted.

An inability to confront evil leads people into disregarding it or discounting it or not seeing it at all.

Reversely, there can be a type of person who, like an old-time preacher, sees nothing but evil in everything and, possibly looking into his own heart for a model, believes all men are evil.

Man, however, (as you can read in HCOB 28 Nov 70 C/S Series 22 Psychosis) is basically good. When going upon some evil course he attempts to restrain himself and caves himself in.

The Chart of Human Evaluation in *Science of Survival* was right enough. And such people also can be found by the Oxford Capacity Analysis where the graph is low and well below a center line on the right.

This sort of thing can be handled of course by auditing but the Esto does not depend on that to handle his staff's problems.

Criminal actions proceed from such people *unless checked* by more duress from without not to do an evil act than they themselves have pressure from within to do it.

Criminality is in most instances restrained by just such an imbalance of pressures.

If you have no ethics presence in an org, then criminality shows its head.

Such people lie rather than be made to confront. They false report-they even use "PR" which means public relations to cover up-and in our slang talk "PR" means putting up a lot of false reports to serve as a smoke screen for idleness or bad actions.

Unless you get ethics'in, you will never get tech in. If you can't get tech in you won't get admin in.

So the lack of ethics permits the criminal impulse to go unchecked.

Yes, it could be handled with tech. But to get money you have to have admin in.

204

Unless there is ethics and ways to get it in, no matter how distasteful it may seem. you will never get tech and admin in.

Of course there is always the element of possible injustice. But this is provided against. (See HCO PL 24 Feb 72 Injustice.)

When ethics is being applied by criminal hands (as happens in some governments) it can get pretty grim.

But even then ethics serves as a restraint to just outright slaughter.

Omitting to handle criminality can make one as guilty of the resulting crimes as if one committed them!

So criminality as a factor has to be handled.

It is standardly handled by the basic ethics P/Ls and the Ethics Officer system.

EXCHANGE

The unhatted unproducing staff member, who is not really a criminal or psychotic, can be made to go criminal.

This joins him to the criminal ranks.

The ethics system also applies to him.

However there is something an Esto can do about it that is truly Esto tech.

This lies in the field of EXCHANGE.

If you recall your Product Clearing, you will see that exchange is something for something.

Criminal exchange is nothing from the criminal for something from another.

Whether theft or threat or fraud is used, the criminal think is to get something without putting out anything. That is obvious.

A staff member can be coaxed into this kind of thinking by

PERMITTING HIM TO RECEIVE WITHOUT HIS CONTRIBUTING.

This unlocks, by the way, an age-old riddle of the philosophers as to "what is right or wrong."

HONESTY is the road to SANITY. You can prove that and do prove it every time you make somebody well by "pulling his withholds." The insane are just one seething mass of overt acts and withholds. And they are very physically sick people.

When you let somebody be dishonest you are setting him up to become physically ill and unhappy.

Traditional Sea Org ethics labeled noncompliance as Liability and a false report as Doubt.

And it's true enough.

When you let a person give nothing for something you are factually encouraging crime.

Don't be surprised that welfare districts are full of robbery and murder. People there give nothing for something.

205

When *exchange* is out the whole social balance goes out.

Every full scholarship ever given by an org wound up in a messy scene.

When you hire a professional pc who just sits around making do-less motions while people audit him and contribute to him DO NOT BE SURPRISED IF HE GETS SICKER AND SICKER.

He is contributing nothing in return and winds up in overwhelm!

Similarly if you actively prevented someone from contributing in return you could also make him ARC broken and sick.

It is EXCHANGE which maintains the inflow and outflow that gives a person space around him and keeps the bank off of him.

There are numbers of ways these flows of exchange can be unbalanced.

It does not go same out as comes in. Equal amounts are no factor. Who can measure good will or friendship? Who can actually calculate the value of saving a being from death in each lifetime? Who can measure the reward of pride in doing a job well or praise?

For all these things are of different values to different people.

In the material world the person whose exchange factor is out may think he "makes money." Only a government or a counterfeiter "makes money." One has to produce something to *exchange* for money.

Right there the exchange factor is out.

If he gives nothing in return for what he gets the money does not belong to him.

In Product Clearing many people it was found that some considered their food, clothing, bed and allowance were not theirs because they produced. They were theirs "just by being there." This funny "logic" covered up the fact that these people produced little or nothing on post. Yet they were the first to howl when not getting expensive (to the org) auditing or courses or tech!

Thus such a person, not hatted or made to produce, will get ill.

It is interesting that when a person becomes productive his morale improves.

Reversely it should be rather plain to you that a person who doesn't produce becomes mentally or physically ill. For his *exchange* factor is out.

So when you reward a downstat you not only deprive upstats, you also cave the downstat in!

I don't think welfare states have anything else in mind!

The riots of the ancient city of Rome were caused by these factors. There they gave away corn and games to a populace that eventually became so savage it could only enjoy torture and gruesome death in the arena!

A lot of this exchange imbalance comes from child psychology where the child is not contributing anything and is not permitted to contribute.

It is this which first overwhelms him with feelings of obligation to his parents and then bursts out as total revolt in his teens.

Children who are permitted to contribute (not as a cute thing to do but actually)

206

make noncontributing children of the same age look like raving maniacs! It is the cruel sadism of modern times to destroy the next generation this way. Don't think it isn't intended. I have examined the OCAs of parents who do it!

So if a person is brought up this life with the exchange all awry, the Esto has his hands full sometimes!

He is dealing with trained-in criminality!

WHAT HE CAN DO

The remedy is rather simple.

First one has to know all about EXCHANGE as covered in the Product Clearing policy letters.

Then he has to specially clear this up with people who do not produce.

He should get them to work on it as it relates to ALL THEIR DYNAMICS IN RELATIONSHIP TO EVERY OTHER DYNAMIC.

That means he has to clear up the definitions of dynamics with care and then have the person draw a big chart (of his own) and say what he gives the first dynamic and what it gives him. Then what he gives the second dynamic and what it gives him. And so on up the dynamics.

Now, have him consider "his own second dynamic." What does his second dynamic give his first dynamic? What does his second dynamic give the second dynamic and what does it give him?

And so on until you have a network of these exchange arrows, each both ways.

Somewhere along the way, if your TRs are good and you have his attention and he is willing to talk to you he will have quite a cognition!

That, if it's a big one, is the end phenomena of it.

And don't be surprised if you see a person now and then change his physical face shape!

CONDITIONS BY DYNAMICS

An Ethics type "action" can be done by giving the person the conditions formulas (pages 189, 237, 245, 247, 249 of Vol 0, Basic Staff Hat. HCO PL 14 Mar 68-page 247-gives one the table.)

Method 4 the person on the table of conditions and pick up any other misunderstandings.

Have the person study the formula of each of these conditions in the table so that he knows what they are and what the formulas are.

When he has all this now with no misunderstood words, you must clear up the words related to his dynamics I to 8 and what they are.

Now you're ready for the billion dollar question,

Ask him what is his condition on the first dynamic. Have him study the formulas. Don't buy any glib PR.

Don't evaluate or invalidate. When he's completely sure of what his condition really is on the first dynamic he will cognite.

207

Now take up the second dynamic by its parts-sex, family, children. Get a condition for each.

Similarly go on up each one of the dynamics until you have a condition for each one.

Now begin with the first dynamic again.

Continue to work this way.

You will be amazed to find he will come out of false high down to low and back up again *on each dynamic*.

Somewhere along the line he will start to change markedly.

When you have a person in continual heavy ethics or who is out-ethics (ethics bait, we say) and who is floundering around, you can do an S & D on him and quite often save his future for him.

When you have such a person you do this one first before you do the Exchange by Dynamics.

In other words, you use this on "ethics bait" and then when he's come out of such, you do Exchange by Dynamics on him.

SUMMARY

When all looks black, and you are getting false reports, and the things said done were not done and what was really being done were overt products and despite all your work, the stats just *won't* go up, you still have three answers:

1. GET IN ETHICS ON THE ORG.
2. GET EXCHANGE DONE ON INDIVIDUALS.
3. GET IN CONDITIONS BY DYNAMICS ON THE ETHICS BAIT,

And after that keep a strong, just Division I Dept 3.

You'll be amazed!

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sb.rd.gm Copyright © 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

208

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 6 APRIL 1972

Remimeo

Establishment Officer Series 15

PRODUCT CORRECTION

If you find the wrong product for a post, you knock the staff member's hat off.

Example: Get the janitor a product of "a well established business" and he's the Exec Esto!

When all the "products" have been "found" you can have bits of trouble here and there. This would be very mysterious unless you realize that a certain percentage of products found will be

- (a) Incorrect
- (b) Too few
- (c) Incompletely worded
- (d) Are doingnesses not havingnesses
- (e) Can't be worked into a stat.

There will also be a certain small number who were upset by a poor Product Rundown and will have to have auditing to handle (usually the bypassed charge list L I C on the Product Rundown or what is called a Green Form or even a Word Clearing Correction List).

The majority probably will be all right so that's a pluspoint.

But these flubbed rundowns become themselves a WHY.

So let's see how to correct one.

1. Did the product add up to a havingness?
2. Was it exchangeable?
3. Did it match the actual hat?
4. Were there more for the same post?
5. Is the person really wearing several hats, each of which has a product?
6. If more than one found did they go together with each other?
7. Does it give the person a different hat?
8. Did it give the person somebody else's hat?
9. Were there misunderstood words in the rundown?
10. Does the person have contrary orders from some other person?
11. Was it just an exercise to the person?
12. Did doing the rundown make the person ARC broken or otherwise put ruds out?

13. Didn't the person agree with it?
14. Was the person really trying to do some other job?
15. Was the person about to leave present post or wanted to?
16. Was the Product Rundown really not done?
17. Is the person unhappy on post?
18. Is the person taking illegal orders?
19. Is the person connected to antagonistic people (PTS)?
20. Wrong post for the product?
21. Wrong org bd?
22. Crossed over into another department?
23. Crossed over into another division?

The questions, assessed on a meter, should be handled if they read.

And when that is done (assessed and handled), the door is open to finding the WHY called for in Esto Series 13. The above questions could be the Why or part of it but usually that's just a symptom of the real Why called for in Esto No. 13.

But in any event the questions correct the Product Rundown and it's vital to do that.

HATS AND ORG BD

EXISTING ORG BD

The routine action with a post is to get the person to list on separate cards **WITH CORRECT EXACT WORDING** each hat the person wears or has been wearing no matter how small. This is **NOT** copied from a P/L. It's an honest "What hats do you really wear?"

The list may be as long as 35 or 40. The higher you go on the command channel, the more of these hats.

Having done that for every member in a division you wind up with either

- (1) Completely expressed division hats or
- (2) Woefully missing functions or
- (3) Badly adjusted work loads.
- (4) A totally cross-hatted scramble.

You put these cards (identified as whose by the writing) onto a blank org board. You now have **AN EXISTING ORG BD**.

NEXT ACTION

The following is an entirely separate action.

Now you take the 1965 org bd or FEBC org board or whatever org board is a model and see if the "hats" you have go under the functions listed on the board.

You adjust the hats around to cover the actual functions of the division.

You write up cards to cover the missing functions.

You put these new cards on the org board.

210

FUNCTION BOARD

You write up the *functions* of the org board of the division by departments on a separate model and add the valuable final products per HCO PI, 4 Mar 72.

This gives you the functions to get out the VFPs expected.

These functions will or won't get out the VFPs.

What *functions* are needed to get them out?

By blocking in these you have now a **FUNCTION ORG BOARD**.

TITLE ORG BD

From this function org board you can now make up a **TITLES ORG BD**.

Each title has some of these functions. The functions must be of the same general type for the title.

When you have done this (with divisional secretary, divisional Org Officer and divisional Esto and department heads), you now have a **TITLES ORG BD**.

POSTING

The main failure in putting names on an org bd is that people take the easy way out and try to put a different person's name on each title. This gives you a 100 person division "absolutely vital" while the production is about 5 man!

You take the names you have **NOW** in the division and post those to cover all the functions and titles.

You post from the top down. **YOU NEVER POST FROM BOTTOM UP**. And you **NEVER LEAVE A GAP BETWEEN PERSONS ON LOWER POSTS AND HIGH POSTS**. Either of these faults will raise hell in the division's functioning and are grave faults.

Having done this you now have a **POSTED ORG BOARD**.

MATCHING

Now the hat lists you have are probably wildly different than your posted org bd.

Take the cards of hats they were wearing and try to fit these onto your **POSTED ORG BD**.

You now at once "before your very eyes" will see what's wrong with your product and what might be right with it.

You will have one of these:

- (1) Completely expressed division hats
- (2) Woefully missing functions
- (3) Badly adjusted work loads, OR

(4) A function not on the POSTED BD but done by someone that is getting the product!

You will see that the board made from the hat cards they wrote, doesn't usually compare with your posted org bd!

AND THAT'S A POSSIBLE WHY YOU COULDN'T GET PRODUCT RUNDOWNSDONE!

211

Hats don't add up to product. Or the actions really being done are totally unproductive.

You now have it before your eyes.

CAUTION

By an excess of purity you can crash a division or an org by removing a key function someone is doing that's NOT on the posted org bd *but* IS getting the product!

We had a Phone Reg recently removed because he wasn't allowed for on the org bd and "had to be Dir Reg but wouldn't." When he was *forced* into line, the stats promptly crashed!

The stats recovered promptly when his removal was spotted and he was ordered back on post.

You don't juggle an org board lightly. You can destroy a division or unit by juggling hats.

The rule is DON'T DISMANTLE A WORKING INSTALLATION. NEVER!

You can build around it, support it, put in another one like it. But don't touch it!

It is heartbreaking to build a successful upstat division-takes months-and have somebody crash it by musical chairs, musical functions.

So always look at stats. And look at the PAST points of high stats of that div in past years and see what was its organization when it was *really* upstat.

You could do no better than to rebuild that old structure.

But if your div or activity was a working installation that was really getting out the product don't monkey with it. Study it instead.

RECLEARING PRODUCT

If Product Clearing wasn't good, and the unit isn't doing well, then do the above org bd exercises to see what gave.

And you probably will now see that you didn't have the right products.

Try to get your division or dept standard if its stats are low. Standard is your 1965 SH org bd for a big org. That org really ran! Most policy is built on it.

But a little org builds up from "Org Program No. I" LRH ED 49 INT 9 Dec 1969. And can go through the 6 dept stage of London, LA and DC in their glory ('56-'62). They had an HCO, a Registration, Accounts, Training, Processing and a Department of Personnel Efficiency (public). These did all the functions. There was an HCO Sec and an Association Sec. But Org Pgm No. I phases into it with a person in full charge of public.

Or a little org can build a big org from Org Pgm Number I right on into the '65 org bd.

The *approximate* products of HCO PL 4 Mar 72 are being worked for. I say approximate as there may be more and the wording may be better adjusted.

When you have the hats getting out the subproducts (those necessary to make the VFPs of the org) you will get the VFPs.

CORRECTED ORG BD

You may find it necessary to correct your posted org board to get the VFPs.

212

Remember, it has the staff it has, plus any new ones it manages to get plus any field technical persons it can get in to go on staff.

YOU HAVE TO SET IT UP TO GET OUT THE VFPs NOW NOW NOW.

An org can't stand idle to be organized. It can die if it is hatted just to establish.

So you post the people you have to do the functions that must be done.

Then you Product Clear.

You clear from the top down.

You HAT *to produce*.

There isn't anything more important than this step.

EASY WAYS

The easy way to do this is to do 2 of the short form steps quickly on EACH staff member from the top down.

Then take the next two on ALL the staff, each one.

If a Product RD has been done already but it isn't running well, correct it, with above list.

And do it with two steps and go on to the next staff member.

NEGLECTING TO CLEAR PRODUCTS

The biggest omission is not clearing products at all.

The next biggest omission is failing to clear from the top down.

The next is not clearing them all through the div two at a time.

The next is not clearing products on the new people coming into the div promptly.

CRISSCROSSING PRODUCTS

A div can be tangled by having the wrong products for the hats.

So product is always suspect when stats are down or lines tangle.

BIGGEST WHY

The biggest Why of products not getting cleared is an Esto I/C in a small org or an Exec Esto who does not run and train his Estos. If an Exec Esto listens to "but I can't use a meter," "my

TRs are out," "she won't let me hat her," "I have Mis-Us on the P/Ls so don't read them" and does not handle his Estos the way a coach handles a hot football team, products won't get cleared.

Naturally if products are not cleared on an Esto I/C or an Exec Esto or if they aren't cleared on the Estos they will flounder.

Once again it's a two-step- at-a-time action round and round while getting other things done between each two steps.

EXAMPLE OF PRODUCTS

An example of Product Clearing that throws things out is crossing the hats of the Esto MAAs.

The Exec Esto's MAA is responsible for the schedule and getting to work and exercise and activities of STAFF MEMBERS.

213

The Assistant Esto MAA is responsible for Estos.

If their products are incorrectly cleared they will flounder around and their posts may look of little value.

The Exec Esto's MAA probably has a product like "effective post hours of each staff member." Each staff member on post one hour is a product. He also therefore has a welfare sort of function that leads to a lesser product that leads to the main one. Like, "a staff member in good physical condition for the day." And this gives another lesser product, "a secure staff member for that day." And so it goes. This is not a list nor an exact wording of his products. But do you see that they all fit? They are ethics type stats so they have *time* in them because they *preserve* and measure survival. They could not be graphed without *time* in them. They would not vary.

The Esto's MAA has "an Esto on post with ethics in that day." He has lesser products of "a defended or secure Esto that day" and "an Esto assisted with liaison with HCO." Do you see that the products mesh? If an Esto has out-ethics he can't be defended because he can be hit from above.

Also the Exec Esto's MAA has the staff and the Esto's MAA has the Estos so "both sides" are supported.

Now if you product cleared the Exec Esto's MAA as having "a working Esto" as his product he would be at once the Exec Esto! While called "Esto's MAA." He wouldn't be able to make head nor tail of his post.

If the org's HCO Ethics Officer had the same products as the Esto MANs (or, lord help us, all three had wrong products) whole zones of ethics would be missing in the org and out-ethics would occur. The Ethics Officer has several products but as HCO is a production division, he has "an out-ethics person whose ethic level has been made acceptable." It would not be "Ethics Orders issued" as that isn't the whole product of the E/O nor would "people hit by ethics" be a product because it isn't a product. The product would have to include public and if it didn't the whole public zone would be out. Students would get into an E/O section jammed with staff backlog and would be kept off course and maybe blow. Decent investigations couldn't be made. So ethics would go out in the area.

But an Esto having trouble with a staff member would know, if products were right and published, to send him to the Exec Esto's MAA!

And what of files? It's useless to duplicate files so HCO Ethics Files has all Ethics files and the Exec Esto MANs files and the Esto MANs files,

So, just with this example, you can see that products can be very neatly coordinated. AND MUST BE FROM STAFF MEMBER TO STAFF MEMBER in a section, a department, a division, an org. Then it all FLOWS. Somebody is in charge of each internal product in the org that it takes to make a VFP and in charge as well of that VFP loosely (incorrectly called) the GI (GI is really the valuable FINAL REWARD for which the VFPs are exchanged).

Thus, an org properly product cleared RUNS, PRODUCES VFPs in high volume and quality and is rewarded with GI and other things for which VFPs exchange.

And that's the org you want!

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.mes.gm Copyright © 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

214

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 24 APRIL 1972

Remimeo

Establishment Officer Series 16

HATTING THE PRODUCT OFFICER OF THE DIVISION

Estos have been told "hat from the top down."

Why? Because the head of a div or org or the Product Officer of the org is the one who gets other people to work.

If the Product Officer is not hatted to get people to work there will be no products, the stats will be very low and that Esto could be very mystified and look bad as an Esto.

For if he does not do this one thing first then whatever else he does will be wasted.

An Esto who gets drawn in and given orders by a div head or who cannot confront the div head will wind up withdrawing from the div or just being inactive.

The first major failure of an Esto would be a failure to hat the Product Officer of the org or div.

FIRST SITUATION: There is no head of div (or org). Correct action: Get a head of div (or org) *fast* and rapidly org board the div. The number of people in the div (or org) does not matter at this stage. First things first. Get a head of div (or org). And rapidly org bd the place.

SECOND SITUATION: You have a head of div (or org). Correct action: Hat him with HCO P/L 28 July 71 Admin Know-How No. 26. Tell him you will attend to the hating IF he will get them producing. *He is* responsible for their production. Get him to know this P/L. (Method 4 WC.) Tell him he is in Phase 1. So let's see some production.

THIRD SITUATION.- The head of div or org flies about, looks busy or just sits there. He is not getting out production. He will tell you all about "not being hatted," "doesn't know the tech" on and on, excuses excuses. But no production from him or staff. Correct action: He has to be made to understand that he isn't doing his job no matter how busy he looks or how many reasons he has. He probably has not noticed and does not know that he is faking work. People with low confront don't *see*. If he is really doing his job and getting out his products and forcing any staff to get out theirs, you have a pearl. Cherish him, and don't consider doing this third action on him. But one is easily fooled. Only real products tell the tale. A busy exec or division is not necessarily a producing exec or div. So if no products from him or staff for whatever reason, he's below Danger. You don't have a head of div or org if you don't have products coming off and exchange occurring. Only *these*, not excuses or motions, tell the tale. You can get "PR" and glowing (but false) reports. You can get all sorts of things. But where are the products? So you bait (tease) and badger (nag) the head of div (or org) to IMPINGE ON HIM (draw his attention) until he snarls or cries or screams AND SPITS OUT AN OUTPOINT. You don't ask him like repetitive commands "Why aren't you working?" You ask in many ways "Where are the products?" And he'll eventually tell you an outpoint. Like "But I can't get out any products because they aren't products until they are back home telling people how good we are so how can I .¹⁹ Or "I just keep running around here and nothing happens." Or some other nonsense that is nonsense. That's his Why. So you tell him,"Look,

215

you don't get out products because you don't think you can!" Or "You are just trying to look busy so you won't be thought idle." And if you're smart and on the ball, that will be it. The exec will cognite and go into smooth 2WC at once and you got him out of the Esto P/L Series 13 state into a confront. This is "Bait and Badger" to get him broken out of nonconfronting. That's all that's wrong with him really. He doesn't look.

SITUATION FOUR: The exec won't let an Esto near him. Snaps, snarls. Don't avoid him. Correct action: Bait and Badger. He's already halfway through Situation Three above. Finish it up.

SITUATION FIVE: The exec goes into shock. This is a symptom of no confront. He won't fight back. He will propitiate. But he won't do anything either. Correct action: Get a new exec. Tame execs who won't fight and can't work will never get a staff to work. After getting a new exec, salvage the old one with processing. Do Steps One to Four on the new one.

SITUATION SIX: Having gotten the original or a new exec this far, you will find he is usually outpointy in his actions even if producing. Correct action: Run Confront in his area. Run Reach and Withdraw in his area. Then product clear him on every section and department he has as though he's the head of it.

SITUATION SEVEN: Gets out volume but quality suffers. This is a general nonconfront. Correct action: Bring him personally up through each dynamic, through the conditions per Esto Series No. 14. Get him in normal or higher on each dynamic. Now do Dynamic Exchange, Esto Series No. 14.

SITUATION EIGHT- He is active, producing but isn't forcing staff to produce. Correct action: Recheck him on HCO P/L 28 July 71 Admin Know-How 26 and look for a Why that he can't pull himself out of Phase I into Phase 11. Get this VGled. Tell him, "Preach to them that dones come from effective doingness. If they don't do things that are effective they will not get a *done*. Demand DONES."

SITUATION NINE: He really doesn't know his job. Correct action: Begin to hat him. Don't start hatting him further than an instant hat before you have worked it up to Situation Eight. His *confront will* not be good enough to apply the material even if he knows it. So only at this stage do you start to really hat. And at this stage you hat by *observing* what he doesn't know that he needs to know and you look up and select P/Ls that fit his current state of unhattedness and check him out on only these. You keep a log of what he's checked out on so he gets credit for it.

SITUATION TEN: The executive skids back. He roller-coasters or gets ill. Correct action: Recognize this as a PTS situation. Get him interviewed by the D of P. Get the PTS situation HANDLED and don't buy "It's just the flu" or whatever. He's PTS and that's trouble. (See HCOB 17 Apr 72 C/S Series 76.)

SITUATION ELEVEN: The exec does not seem to remember what he's been checked out on or apply what he knows. He is glib or he is foggy. Correct action: Get him word cleared Method 1. Then word clear him Method 4 on the materials he has covered. (See Word Clearing Series HCOBs.)

HOW MUCH TIME

How much time do you spend with an exec?

Well, effective or not his time is valuable.

Do not use peak load post time or he'll be going mad with the PTP of unhandled actions needing to be done. So you won't get anywhere.

Try to do these actions on an exec during his *study time*.

Observe him on post to know what to do in his study time.

216

If he has no study time, you must get the Study Correction List (HCOB 14 Jan 72 Study Series 7) done on him and handled as in Situation Thirteen. An exec who can't study can't see either.

If this conflicts with your own study time, make other arrangements for that portion of yours. But get yours IN too.

SITUATION TWELVE: Has study time in addition to working hours but does not study. Correct action: See that study time is run per "What Is a Course?" HCO P/L 16 Mar 71 and "What Is a Course-High Crime" HCO P/L 16 Mar 72 and LRH ED 174 INT 72 .

SITUATION THIRTEEN: Even though staff course exists does not study. Correct action: Have a Study Corr List HCOB 14 Jan 72 Study Series 7 done and properly handled.

REST OF STAFF

What do you do with the rest of staff?

These thirteen situations cover as well any staff member.

You could do no worse than do these things on each one as beginning actions.

There are many Esto actions that can be done but if you don't get these done you won't get far.

But on staff below dept head, Situations One, Two and Eight do not apply.

SITUATION ONE STAFF: Major post not posted. Correct action: Force a Dept One into existence via the Exec Esto and get it producing staff and get the post posted. (Don't do an incorrect action and use other parts of the org as personnel pools and dismantle working installations or rob tech.) Get the org bd up and the person on it.

SITUATION TWO STAFF: You have a person on the post. Correct action: Instant hat him. Get him programmed for training for post. Unbug his study time. See that he studies per pgm.

SITUATION EIGHT STAFF: He is active and producing but isn't moving his products or is backlogging and/or gets in jams. Correct action: Volume 0 of OEC Course, get in its comm sections, drill him on org bd and show him the other terminals he is supposed to be in comm with. Make him follow his product physically through lines and then make him follow the routes of things that should come to him. While doing this you will find bugs in the lines or in his own lines. Smooth them out. Drill the person further.

THIS P/L AS A CHECKLIST

You can use this P/L as a checklist.

Get a cardboard folder. Put the person's name on it.

Write the person's name in at the top of this P/L.

When each action is done, mark the dates it is being worked on in the margin beside the situation with your initial.

When fully done mark it DONE with date. Beware of NOT-DONES or HALFDONES or BACKLOGS. (See Admin Know-How 29 , Executive Series 5, both are HCO P/L 26 Jan 72 Issue 1.)

Don't skip about on this one.

217

THE GENERAL WHY OF INACTIVITY OR NONPRODUCTION IS: LOW CONDITION ON ONE OR MORE DYNAMICS MAKING A NONALIGNMENT WITH OTHER DYNAMICS CAUSING AN INABILITY TO CONFRONT.

Most beings are not there as a being as they are below existence. As a being plus body they have social responses and can do orders or will do at something when attention is called to it. Otherwise they are blind with their eyes wide open. They are not malicious. They just don't SEE.

If they are not there they won't have to be responsible for what they do, will they? They do not think they have lived before or will live again, which is why the population is fixed on a one life idea.

As a result the above situations do occur. And the handling has been tested and works.

Do not say, "Why haven't you seen - - " this or that outness. Say, "Do you see this -" outness. And they will look in that direction. But sometimes have to be shown further evidence. Then they *see* it. Until the above situations are handled, you are working with social machinery.

When you have handled these situations as above correctly as noted, you will get toward full application of HCO P/L 5 May 1959 "Policy on Sec EDs and Hats" page 64, Vol 0 of OEC. Call the above "correct actions" the modern processes plus many other Esto actions and you *can* bring the exec to CAUSE so that he CREATES his post.

Until you have handled, using his social machinery as per the situation handlings above, he *is not* being bad, he just *can't see*.

This is how you get an exec functioning.

It is no overt act to get him functioning as only until you do will he have any morale at all.

SITUATION FOURTEEN.- An exec or staff member may try to use the Esto as an Org Officer or to get the Esto to get involved in the division's products. BOTH are fatal Esto errors. Correct action: Explain Esto functions to them briefly so they know the Esto's product is THEM.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.rd.gm Copyright Q 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[*Note.*- The following data is taken from a Founder advice of April 1972.

"The Org Officer gets the CO's programs logged and done. This is in addition to his FEBC Org Officer duties, less interviewing staff.

The first product of a Product Officer is an Org Officer but the first product of an Org Officer was the HAS and is now the Exec Esto.

The first product of an Exec Esto is a divisional Esto working on Products I and 3 in the division."-LRH

Further data on the above is given in the FEBC Tapes and Esto Tapes.]

218

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 13 MAY 1972

Remimeo

Study Series 4

Establishment Officer Series 17

Language Series 4

CHINESE SCHOOL

As very few westerners have ever seen a Chinese or Arab school in progress, it is very easy for them to miss the scene when one says "Chinese school."

The term has been used to designate an action where an instructor or officer, with a pointer, stands up before an assembled class and taps a chart or org board and says each part of it.

It is very funny to one who knows or has heard a real Chinese school to see the class sitting there silently. This is strictly a Western pattern. This is how teacher does it in Omaha or Cornell. But never in Shanghai!

A Chinese class sings out in unison (all together) in response to the teacher. They participate!

The only Western near equivalent is a German beer hall where the audience choruses items sung out by the song leader.

Chinese school, then, is an action of class vocal participation. It is a very lively loud affair. It sounds like chanting.

In a real Chinese school the response is so timed that although spoken by many voices it is quite easy to tell what answer is being chorused.

It is essentially a system that establishes instant thought responses so that the student, given "2x2" thinks instantly "4."

For example, the instructor, tapping a big multiplication chart cries, "Two times two." The class in one voice cries, "Four." Instructor: "Five times two." Class: "Ten." And so on and on and on by the hour.

This gets more complex when, let us say, the maxims of good conduct or the Koran are being taught. In such cases the tablets or scrolls are on the wall. The teacher calls chapter and verse and the students chant it.

You could teach the laws of listing and nulling, The Auditor's Code, axioms and so on in this way.

The tools are the same-an instructor, a pointer, a chart or set of pictures or big scrolls, a class.

There are two steps in such teaching.

A. The instructor taps and says what it is. Then asks the class what it is and they chant the answer.

B. When the class has learned by being told and repeating, the instructor now taps with the pointer and asks and the class chants the correct answer.

DRILL

The instructor himself has to grasp the drill.

Here is how it would go on an org bd.

219

A.

Instructor taps Div 1. "This is Division I HCO Division."

Class chants, "Division I HCO Division."

Instructor taps Div 6. "This is Division 6 Distribution Division."

Class: "Division 6 Distribution Division."

And so on until all divisions have been named a few times.

B.

Instructor taps Div 1. "What is this?"

Class: "Division I HCO Division."

Instructor taps Div 4. "What is this?"

Class: "Division 4 Tech Division."

And so on and on. The divisions are then considered trained-in on the class.

Next one would go to departments. Then to philosophic names of departments. Then to sections. Then one would go to the titles of each division head. Then to dept heads, etc., etc.

If one had a function org board of what each div and department and post *did* one would go on with the same thing.

A Chinese school drill run for a short period each day will eventually cover an enormous amount of org bd.

Newcomers to the drill have to be schooled-in to catch up or join a new class.

Anything can be taught by Chinese school that is to be learned by rote. The parts and actions are always the same.

There is also a version that uses a text, preferably with a copy of it in each student's hands. It sounds the same.

One is limited only by what he can put on a chart or even in a text where each student has a copy of the text open before him.

Crude charts are easy to draw up with a felt (heavy ink) pen. The size of a chart is determined by the ability of the students furthest away to see it easily.

Cloud types, pictures to be named in a foreign language, even slides of airplane types, anything can be Chinese schooled that is to be learned verbatim. And you'd be surprised how many things should be. And if they aren't the person has a shaky foundation under the subject.

Care should be taken to define strange words. But it is not really a problem or exercise in Word Clearing. It is verbatim rote teaching.

And it works.

And is lots of fun.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.gm Copyright Q 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

220

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 12 JUNE 1972

Remimeo

Data Series 26

Establishment Officer Series 18

LENGTH OF TIME TO EVALUATE

It will be found that long times required to do an evaluation can be traced each time to AN INDIVIDUAL WHY FOR EACH EVALUATOR.

These, however, can be summarized into the following classes of Whys:

This list is assessed by a Scientology auditor on a meter. The handling directions given in each case are designations for auditing actions as done by a Scientology auditor and are given in the symbols he would use.

1. Misunderstood words.

(Handled with Word Clearing [Method I and Method 4 of the Word Clearing Series].)

2. Inability to study and an inability to learn the materials.

(Handled by a Study Correction List HCOB 4 Feb 72.)

3. Outpoints in own thinking.

(Handled by what is called an HC [Hubbard Consultant] List HCOB 28 August 70.)

4. Personal out-ethics.

(Use P/L 3 May 72 by an auditor. Has two listing and nulling type lists.)

5. Doing something else,

(2-way communication on P/L 3 May 72 or reorganization.)

6. Impatient or bored with reading.

(Achieve Super-Literacy. LRH Executive Directive 178 International.)

7. Doesn't know how to read statistics so doesn't know where to begin.

(Learn to read stats from Management by Stat P/Ls.)

8. Doesn't know the scene.

(Achieve familiarity by direct observation.)

9. Reads on and on as doesn't know how to handle and is stalling.

(Get drilled on actual handling and become Super- Literate.)

221

10. Afraid to take responsibility for the consequences if wrong.

(HCOB 10 May 72 Robotism. Apply it.)

11. Falsely reporting.

(Pull all withholds and harmful acts on the subject.)

12. Assumes the Why before starting.

(Level IV service facsimile triple auditing.)

13. Feels stupid about it.

(Get IQ raised by general processing.)

14. Has other intentions.

(Audit on L9S or Expanded Dianetics.)

15. Has other reasons not covered in above.

(Listing and nulling to blowdown F/N item on the list.)

16. Has withholds about it.

(Get them off.)

17. Has had wrong reasons found,

(C/S Series 78.)

18. Not interested in success.

(P/L 3 May 72 and follow as in 14 above.)

19. Some other reason.

(Find it by 2-way comm.)

20. No trouble in the first place.

(Indicate it to person.)

When this list is assessed one can easily spot why the person is having trouble with the Data Series or applying it. When these reasons are handled, one can then get the series restudied and word cleared and restudied and it will be found that evaluations are much easier to do and much more rapidly done.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:ne.rd.nf Copyright c 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

222

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 13 JUNE 1972

Remimeo

Establishment Officer Series 19

PROGRAM DRILL

A majority of people cannot follow a written program. Yet all legal projects are in program form.

The reasons are various. But when programs are not understood they can be cross-ordered, abandoned, left half done and the next thing you know you have a backlog (HCO P/L 26 Jan 72, Issue 1, Not-Dones, Half-Dones & Backlogs).

There can be (and usually are) other situations that prevent the doing of a program. Out-ethics (P/L 3 May 72), PTS or SP (P/L 5 Apr 72), lack of understanding of a product or exchange, an unmanned or undermanned area are the commonest reasons. But when all

these have been handled, there can be two other reasons-the written project itself is bugged so it can't be done (needs special equipment or finance or is outpointy or doesn't apply) or THE PERSONS CONCERNED JUST CAN'T DO A PROJECT. The former of these reasons is seized upon all too often to excuse the latter WHICH USUALLY IS THE CASE. They can't execute a project and prefer cross orders because the orderliness of a project or what it is. is not understood. Therefore, to handle this we have the following project drills.

The person is just to do these, honestly, each one, from targets I on. DUMMY PROJECT I

PURPOSE: To learn to do a project.

MAJOR TARGET. To get it done.

PRIMARY TARGETS:

1. Read this P/L down to "Dummy Project L"
2. Check off each one when done.

VITAL TARGETS:

1. Be honest about doing this.
2. Do all of it.

OPERATING TARGETS:

1. Take off your right shoe. Look at the sole. Note what's on it. Put it back on.
2. Go get a drink of water.
3. Take a sheet of paper. Draw three concentric circles on it. Turn it over face down. Write your name on the back. Tear it up and put the scraps in a book.
4. Take off your left shoe. Look at the sole. Note what is on it. Put it back on.
5. Go find someone and say hello. Return and write a despatch to your post from yourself as to how they received it.
6. Write a despatch from your post to yourself in proper despatch form Volume 0 OEC correcting how you wrote the despatch in 5 above. File it in your hat.
7. Take off both shoes and bang the heels together three times and put them back on.
8. Write a list of projects in your life you have left incomplete or not done.
9. Write why this was.
10. Check this project carefully to make sure you have honestly done it all.

223

11. List your cognitions if any while doing this project.
12. Decide whether you have honestly done this project.
13. Hand all written papers including the scraps in the book over to your Esto or senior with a proper despatch on top Dummy Project No. I Completion.

END OF PROJECT

DUMMY PROJECT 2

PURPOSE: To learn about production.

MAJOR TARGET- To actually produce something.

PRIMARY TARGETS:

1. Get a pencil and 5 sheets of paper.
2. Situate yourself so you can do this project.

VITAL TARGETS:

1. Read an operating target and be sure to do it all before going on.
2. Actually produce what's called for.

OPERATING TARGETS:

1. Look very busy without actually doing anything.
2. Do it again but this time be very convincing.
3. Work out the valuable final product of your post. Get help from your Esto or senior as needed.
4. Straighten up the papers in your in-basket.
5. Take sheet I as per primary targets above. Write whether or not No. 4 was production.
6. Pick over your in-basket and find a paper or despatch that doesn't contribute in any way to your getting out your own product.
7. Answer it.
8. Take the second sheet called for in the primary target. Write on it why the action in 7 is perfectly reasonable.
9. Take the third sheet of paper and draw the correct comin lines of your post.
10. Get out I correct product for your post, complete of high quality.
11. Deliver it.
12. Review the operating targets and see which one made you feel best.
13. Take the 4th sheet of paper and write down whether or not production is the basis of morale.
14. Take the 5th sheet of paper, use it for a cover sheet and write a summary of the project.
15. Realize you have completed a project.
16. Deliver the whole project with papers to your Esto or senior.

END OF PROJECT

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.gm Copyright c 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 26 JUNE 1972

Rernimeo

Establishment Officer Series 20

SUPERVISOR TECH

(Reference: HCO P/L 25 June 72, Recovering

Students and Pcs.

LRH ED 174 INT 29 Mar 72.

LRH ED 178 INT 30 May 72.)

It should be very plain to an Esto that if the materials of Dianetics and Scientology are not available and not taught, all his work will be in vain.

The TRAINING and HATTING of Course Supervisors is not a Product Officer function. It belongs to HCO Dept I or the E Esto or his TEO.

A failure on course supervision (and Cramming Officer functions) will throw out the whole tech delivery of an org *and* staff and defeat everything an Esto is trying to do.

Public and staff courses are both of vital importance. After these come auditing. But where training fails, auditing won't occur as the auditors won't be able to audit.

Further an Esto often trains and he should have these points down as well. And he should get them in on Supers NO MATTER WHAT DIVISION HE IS ESTOing.

If he doesn't, a training breakdown will defeat all his best laid plans. Bad Supers? So who gets trained?

MATERIALS

First and foremost *is materials*. If you don't have these on the course for that course, what course?

Always check the available materials and then move mountains to get them remedied where out or missing or too few.

SCHEDULES

Next is schedules.

These must be real and KEPT BY THE SUPER AS WELL.

PRESENCE

Next is the existence or presence of the Super.

There may be none, he may be there part-time, he may be there but doing something else.

Get the Super on the course supervising the course, not doing admin or folders. (With a course co-auditing the D of T whose job it is, dumps it on the Super or fails to get a C/S and then there's no Super.)

So get a Super supervising the course properly as his hat and duty.

SUPER ASSISTANCE

Two extremes can happen in course supervision:

1. No attention to the student.
2. Bothering the student and stopping his progress.

The point one has to grasp is "OBNOSIS." This is a coined (invented) word meaning OBSERVING THE OBVIOUS. There is no English or any other language precise equivalent for it.

Man just does not seem to observe the obvious. The reason for it is misunderstood words. Not understanding the symbol (word) the actual thing can become somewhat less visible.

The real job of the Course Supervisor is to get the puzzled or doped or bogged student going. And to *protect* the student who is flying from interference including the Super's own.

To do this the Course Supervisor has to *observe the obvious*.

Is the student going okay?

Is the student bogged?

What is an F/Ning student? Is he chortling and gurgling and slapping his knee? No. He is just calmly going right along.

What is a bogged student? Is he stretched out on the floor snoring? No, he is groggy or puzzled or frowning or even emotionally upset by his Mis-U words. When not caught and handled he will go to sleep or just stare into space.

Should a student's fingers be wiggling? No. He should do demos fully and with full attention only when he has something to demo in order to grasp it.

Should two students be chattering about a date they had? No. They are not F/Ning *students* even if they are F/Ning gossipers.

When the Super does not know the key words of his post, his power of observation is low. To remedy this one does Word Clearing Method 6 on him (HCOB 21 June 72 Issue 11).

And one gets him to look.

To keep from looking a Super can develop systems like, "Every 36 minutes I'll check up on every class member for it takes just 36 minutes to go around them all."

When an F/Ning student is interrupted by the Super he can be given a "withhold of nothingness." The student may say, "No, I've just been checked up" and the Super goes away. But the student now wonders, "Am I trying to hide something?" "Am I really doing all right?" etc. A W/H of nothingness.

To keep students from blowing, BOTH these points have to be looked into.

OBNOSIS is the drill required on the Super.

And a Method 6 on the key words of his post.

And Product Clearing and his own study Why.

Study tech does work but must be applied!

226

A Supervisor must be a Super-Literate to be of real use.

Apply LRH ED 174 INT of 29 Mar 72 and LRH ED 178 INT of 30 May 72.

BLOWN STUDENTS

See HCO P/L of 25 June 72, Recovering Students and Pcs, for check items of how to get students back on course.

SUMMARY

An Esto backed up by good courses and course supervision will eventually bring it all straight.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.gm Copyright © 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

227

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 28 JUNE 1972

Remimeo

Establishment Officer Series 21

FILES ACCURACY

As files are the vital operational line it is of the GREATEST IMPORTANCE that

A LL FILING IS A CC URA TE.

- misfiled particle can be lost forever.
- missing item can throw out a whole evaluation or a sale.

Items get misfiled for four reasons:

1. Ignorance of the alphabet
2. Ignorance of geography
3. Ignorance of the vital role of the files
4. Personal out-ethics.

The remedies therefore are

1. ALL FILES PERSONNEL (a) MUST BE ABLE TO RATTLE OFF THE ALPHABET FORWARDS AND BACKWARDS. (b) They must be drilled then to be able to give the letter ahead of and behind each letter in the alphabet.

2. GEOGRAPHY must be known to files personnel, particularly the locations of orgs, cities, states and continents. This is done by drilling them on a map that has key locations related to files.

3. Method 6 WCing should be done on words connected with the post and action of filing. Then the value and purpose of the files they handle should be done by them,

4. Persons with out-ethics or on an ethics cycle should not be given filing as an amends as they are not drilled and are out of PT to say the least.

ETHICS ACTION

Anyone finding a misfiled particle should report it to the Ethics Officer or Master-at-Arms.

He must then quickly make every effort to locate who is misfiling and take rapid action.

The first action is to hat them as above.

Any repeat is an ethics offense handled by a Court.

If the E/O cannot find the person or does not act he himself must comb all files and straighten up the particles.

SUMMARY

It is of vital interest both in ease of work and financially that all files are straight.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.gm Copyright c 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

228

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 14 JULY 1972

Issue 11

Remimeo

Establishment Officer Series 22

Executive Series 14

Org Series 30

ESTO FAILURES

For several months I have been studying the Esto system in operation and have finally isolated the exact points of any failures so they can be turned to successes.

PUTTING IN THE SYSTEM

An Esto returning to an org can crash it.

The exact reasons for this are

A. The execs who heretofore did organizational work say, "Ah, here's the Esto system at last," and promptly drop their organizational and personnel actions.

Yet here is this lone E Esto, no divisional Estos, no one trained to support him.

The right answer is when an E Esto goes into an org where there are no Estos or only a TEO or QEO, he must gather up the execs and tell them it will take him weeks to recruit and train Estos and

that THEY MUST CONTINUE ANY ORGANIZATIONAL ACTIONS THEY ARE DOING and that the HAS IS STILL ESTABLISHING THE ORG.

Otherwise they let go their lines.

B. The new E Esto takes key production personnel from the divisions to be Estos and they crash.

The answer to this is to RECRUIT the new Estos.

This is easier than it looks if you recruit idle area *auditors* to be Estos.

If you do this remember that they went idle as auditors because they had out-ethics, were PTS, had misunderstands and out TR 0. To get them you do a 3 May 72 P/L, a 5 April 72 P/L, Method 4 on their courses and make them do *real* TRs, especially Zero. And they'll be ready.

You get a list of area auditors and contact them and do the above on them and you'll have Estos who are half-trained already.

Failing this or in addition to it just plain recruit.

C. The first post a new E Esto should take is Dept 1.

He does NOT "hat the HAS" or "just do programs." He rolls up his sleeves and WORKS as director of Dept 1.

He recruits, he posts up Dept 1. He hats the hell out of Dept 1.

He makes a Department I that really really flows in personnel, puts up org bds and hats.

WHEN he has a Department I FUNCTIONING he can begin to recruit Estos as well as other org staff.

If he can't get a Dept I whizzing he has no business being an Esto, does he?

229

00mr-

He **does NOT put in Dept 2** or act as Dept 3. He makes the HAS handle these.

With a *strong, working* Dept 1, an Esto system can then go in.

D. Musical chairs is the commonest reason any org collapses.

A "new broom sweeps clean" complex will wreck any org.

An E Esto on arrival, taking over Dept 1, FREEZES ALL PERSONNEL TRANSFERS. He does not permit even one transfer.

The only exception would be where a musical chair insanity has just occurred. If this was followed by a stat crash then one **REVERTS THE ORG TO THE UPSTAT PERIOD** and *then* FREEZES PERSONNEL TRANSFERS.

But before one reverts one must evaluate the earlier period by stats to be sure it WAS the upstat period.

By freezing personnel one protects what he is building.

Almost all musical chairing is the work of a suppressive except when it is the work of an idiot.

E. Anyone trying to hold Dept I in a personnel-starved org is holding a hot seat as any HAS or Personnel Director can tell you.

Body traffic to this dept in any medium-sized org defies belief.

It looks like Grand Central Station at the rush hour.

9916

"I have to have Where is my Course Super etc.,

etc., etc., is the constant chant.

You can spend the whole day interviewing staff execs and get nothing done.

There is a right way to do all these things and a billion wrong ways.

Obviously the answer to all their problems is to get and train new people. Yet how can one in all the commotion?

Ninety percent of these requests are from people who are not hating and using the people they already have.

The right way is on any new personnel demanded one gets Dept 3 to do an Inspection and Report Form for people in the area of the exec doing the demanding. You will find very often unhatted, untrained and wasted personnel and many outnesses.

You hold the line on personnel by saying: "Handle these unutilized or halfworking staff or these outnesses. You are here on my procurement board as entitled to the (give priority, 3rd, 8th) person we hire or recruit."

And get industrious in recruiting, using all standard actions for that is the only way things can be solved.

Most orgs would run better on less people because the personnel are not hatted or trained. One org, two years before this writing, made *four* times as much money on *half* the personnel it now has.

Unhatted, the staff is slow and uncertain. Unproducing, the div heads demand little.

But they sure can scream for more personnel!

No org ever believes it is overmanned.

F. Some divisions (like the usual Treasury or Dissem) can be undermanned. Key income posts most often are empty.

When one mans up an org one sets priorities of who gets personnel.

This is **done by PRODUCTION** paralleling. One mans up against production.

230

New people come in through Div VI. They are signed up by Div 11. Delivery is done by Div IV. Money is collected by Div 111. That gives you a sequence of manning up.

You man income and delivery posts with new hirings.

The E Esto is trying to get in a Dept I so of course he gives this a priority as well.

Until the income is really rolling in and the delivery rolling out, one does very little about other areas.

Having gained VOLUME, one now begins to man up for quality. This means a Cramming and a WC Section in Qual. It means more HCO.

One now hits for future quantity by getting auditors in training, more upper execs in training.

When the org is so built and running and viable it is time the whole Esto system got manned up.

G. Every 5th person hired on an average should be put in Dept I as a *Dept I* extra personnel who does Dept I duties and trains part-time as an Esto.

This gives the E Esto additional personnel in Dept 1.

It also begins an Esto right.

His most essential duties as an Esto *are* Dept I type duties.

You eventually have a bulging Dept 1. You have a basic Dept I that functions well and will continue so. You have the Esto trainees who are working in Dept I as Dept I personnel. And you have of course some new people who are HCO Expeditors until they get in enough basics for real regular posting.

This makes a fat Dept I and proves one can Esto!

SUCCESS

If an E Esto introduces the Esto system exactly as above and in no other way, he will be a success.

Like an auditor varying processes or altering HCOBs, a new E Esto who varies the above will bring about disaster.

Where E Estos have gone into orgs other ways or where the system has been varied, stats have crashed.

By going in this way, as above, it can be a wild success.

How fast can you put in an Esto system? It takes months of hard work. It depends really on how good the E Esto is at recruiting, org bding and hatting.

If he's good at these things the time does not stretch out to forever.

For comparison, it took half a year each to build DC, Johannesburg and SH to their highest peaks. They were all built from a Dept I viewpoint of recruiting, org bding and hatting hard enough to get production.

So this is the oldest pattern we have-Dept I evolves the org.

When the org gets too big Dept I loses touch. You extend it into each div and you have the Esto system. And you have Estos.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.rd.gm Copyright c 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 23 JULY 1972R

Remimeo REVISED 20 DECEMBER 1978

(Revisions in this type style)

Establishment Officer Series 23R

Executive Series 15R

Org Series 31R

THE VITAL NECESSITY OF HATTING

On a graph analysis of past stats, my campaign on hatting where a hat was a checksheet and pack apparently introduced a steady rise of the international gross income.

Studying this further I discovered a new basic, simple fact:

HATTING = CONTROL

A person who is hatted can control his post.

If he can control his post he can hold his position in space-in short, his location. And this is power.

When a person is uncertain, he cannot control his post. he cannot control his position. He feels weak. He goes slow.

If he can control his post and its actions he feels confident. He can work effectively and rapidly.

The key is CONTROL.

Control is the ability to START, CHANGE and STOP.

When he is hatted he knows the tech of HANDLING things. Thus he can control them. He is at CAUSE over his area.

If you have an org composed only of weak wobbly posts, they tend to collapse in on each other. There is no POWER.

The org then cannot be CAUSE over its environment because it is composed of parts which are not cause. The whole is only the sum of its parts.

If all the parts are each one at cause, then the whole will be at CAUSE over its environment.

Only an org at CAUSE can reach and CONTROL.

Thus a fully hatted org can be at cause over its environment. can reach and control its fates and fortunes.

THUS THE PRIMARY TARGETS OF AN ESTO ARE

A. ESTABLISHED ORG FORM and

B. FULLY HATTED PERSONNEL.

BASIC SEQUENCE OF HATTING

1. Recruited or hired. Signs contract

232

2. Posted in HCO Expeditor pool or division if divisional recruit (per HCO PL 2 Sept 74R RECRUITING AND HIRING).

3. In SO new recruit goes directly onto Product Zero in the Estates Project Force and upon graduation from EPF goes to HCO Exoeditor pool (Ref: FO 3727 PRODUCT TRAINING LINE-UP).

4. Staff Status Zero.

5. Eligible for student auditing but must have a stat and demonstrated he has produced on post.

6. Staff Status I.

7. Staff Status //.

8. Posting as other than an HCO Expeditor.

9. Full hatting with a checksheet and pack with Word Clearing M6, M7 and M4.

10. Method 1 Word Clearing, Primary Rundown or Primary Correction Rundown.

11. Administrative or tech training (OEC or auditing).

No one should have any other training much less full-time training before Step 10 in the above. Flag Orders in the Sea Org may change this line-up slightly but it is basically the same.

There are time limits placed on how long it takes to do SSI and SSII. A person who can't make it is routed to Qual where he is offloaded with advice on how to get more employable. (In the SO it is Fitness Board.)

TIME-TESTED

The above is the route that has been tested by time and found good.

Other approaches have NOT worked.

Granting full-time training at once is folly. The person may get trained but he'll never be a staff member. This is the biggest failure with auditors-they don't know the org. Admin training with no org experience to relate it to is a waste of time.

This was how we built every great org. And when it dropped out the org became far less powerful.

Old-timers talk of these great orgs in their great days. And they will tell you all about the org boarding and hatting that went on. How the Hatting Officer in HCO and the Staff Training Officer in Qual worked as a team. And how fast the lines flew.

The above steps have stood the test of time and are proven by stats.

RECRUITING AND HIRING

You never recruit with a promise of **free courses** or free auditing. Not even HASes or HQSes. You recruit or hire somebody to be part of the team.

OPEN GATE

If *any* opinion or selection is permitted as to who is going to be let on staff, *all* recruitment and hiring will fail.

By actual stats when you let *anyone* say "No! Not him! Not her!" the gate shuts, the flow stops. And you've had it.

Requirements and eligibility *fail*. The proof is that when they have existed in orgs, the org wound up with only PTSes and no-case-gains!

233

The right answer is FAST FLOW hiring. Then you have so many that those who can't make it drift low on the org board or off. You aren't trying to hold posts with unqualified people "who can't be spared."

In a short-staffed org "looking only for the best people" the guy nobody will have gets put on an empty "unimportant" department. He's now a director!

It only happened because you didn't have dozens.

The answer is NOT lock the gate or have requirements. The answer is HAT.

An org that isn't hatted goes weak and criminal.

Don't be selective in hiring or recruiting. Open the gates and HAT!

Follow the steps given above and you have it.

Don't spend coins like training or auditing (or travel) on people until they have proven their worth. No bonuses or high pay for anyone until they have reached and attained Step 8 (a good stat). The cost of such fast flow hiring is not then a big factor.

The only trouble I ever had with this was getting div heads to UTILIZE their staff. A FIRST JOB FOR AN EXECUTIVE IS TO GET THINGS FOR HIS PEOPLE TO DO. AND KEEP THEM BUSY AT PRODUCTIVE THINGS.

So I used to have to go through the org that did FAST FLOW HIRING regularly and get people to use their new people. And to move off those who could not work.

This was ALL the trouble I had with the system.

And until I enforced FAST FLOW HIRING there was always some effort by someone to close the gate.

ALL the great executives in Scientology came up in such orgs.

With a flow of people the best move on up. The worst, if any, drop off.

Only orgs with restricted hiring or recruiting give trouble.

IN A FAST FLOW HIRING ORG THE HAS AND ESTOs MUST BE ON THE BALL. THE BREAKDOWN OCCURS WHEN THEY DO NOT HAT AND KEEP ON TOP OF THE PERSONNEL SCENE.

Fast flow hiring only breaks down and gets protested where HCO and Estos are not doing a top job. They have to really *handle* the personnel, post them, hat them, keep the form of the org.

A fully formed org in a heavily populated location would need hundreds of staff. It would make hundreds of thousands.

But only if it is fast flow hiring, hatting, holding the form of the org, and only then could it produce.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Revision as assisted by

Arden Hansen

FMO 2025 I/C

LRH:AH:nt.jk.gm Copyright © 1972, 1978 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

234

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 25 JULY 1972

Remimeo

EstabUshment Officer Series 24

THE FORM OF THE ORG

You often hear that one should "hold the form of the org."

What is it?

Some people think it is making sure the command channel (Junior to senior to senior's senior or on down) is held. This is only a small part of an org form.

In any new group of a few people, each and every one wears all the hats. This is *not* an org form.

An org form is *that arrangement of specialized terminals which control and change the production and organization particles and flow lines of an activity.*

A *terminal* for this purpose is something that has mass and meaning which originates, receives, relays and changes particles on a flow line.

SPACE

To have any form at all, an org must have *space*.

The space must be located where it can have particles and flows or where the particles and flows with which it deals can easily be gotten to it and sent out from it and where it can conduct its activity without undue disturbance and at a velocity and volume with exchange that makes it viable.

There are a number of factors involved as noted in the above requirement: located, can have particles and flows, can get them in and out, no undue disturbance, velocity and volume, exchange and viability.

Although this looks complex, it is actually very simple as it involves *just those elements* and others are relatively unimportant. When you add aesthetics of building and grounds, and carpets and

desks you can get too far off the definition of space requirement when these are given first priority. These are something you build up to. Clean and neat are closer to importance *after* the basic definition is met.

So one has a space. It has to be big enough for the traffic volume it has to handle to be viable. This is usually smaller than people think. The space is a building or other structure.

So we have a *space* as an essential of org form.

Potential Departing

Traffic Traffic

Inflow

235

TRAFFIC GUIDE

Traffic, particles, flows, have to be *guided*. They have to be pulled in (as per Div 6, Div 2 Reg, Div 2 Letter Reg, ASR, D of Tech Services, etc.). These are *reaches* out into the potential traffic that pulls it up to the space entrance point. In essence these posts work on the potential traffic and get it up to the door. So org form can start way out with a *general* approach, a magazine book ad, word-of-mouth, PR, an FSM, a ticket distributor, a book, etc. A specialized approach to specific names as per the tour, the Letter Reg working CF, the Phone Reg, etc. One generally directs the whole "general public" toward the space and also specifically directs specific people in it toward the space.

This is the org form at work that functions outside the org space. If it doesn't function the org space itself gets no inflow.

Departing traffic must also be guided-and is too often neglected. An org without its CF up-to-date and used is neglecting its departing traffic.

England, for instance, loses a huge percent of its car sales business because it has no decent spare parts stockpiles (government taxes spare parts on the shelf). The customer who purchases often gets no follow-through.

Orgs that neglect departed traffic wind up with ARC broken fields.

So org form *must* include its own space *and* the spaces of its potential traffic and its departed traffic as they relate to the org's activity.

ROUTING

When particles arrive at the org space proper they must be routed AND MUST CONTINUE TO BE ROUTED FROM THE MOMENT THEY ENTER UNTIL THEY LEAVE THE ORG SPACE.

Thus there must be a Reception for bodies, for mail, for phone, for telexes and for messages in general.

There must also be an exit point for all these things and someone to send them on their way *out* of the org space.

Lack of a Reception that can and does route can break an org of any type or kind and has done so.

When bodies can't contact the org they assume the org is dead. And so it dies. The org can be so mislocated for its type of traffic that it can't get anyone in or out. Then too the org will seem dead.

No matter the INTERNAL form of the org, its external form can be so remote that success is impossible to maintain. Thus org form does not begin with reception and routing. This is an action that occurs after the external requirements are met.

But once the particle (body, despatch, raw materials, whatever) is at the door RECEPTION must establish the routing.

This is done usually with an each-step-signed-off ROUTING FORM that gives the full road map of the particle.

Without this, particles don't enter, jam up, get lost, go astray and DESTROY THE INTERNAL ORG FORM by making confusions.

Thus Reception has to have a very good idea of particle *types* and *orgform* even to be able to issue the right routing form.

INTERNAL LINES

Routing forms often carry a particle into the org but not out.

This becomes a serious problem in getting anything *completed*. The start is on the form and not the exit. Thus the particle doesn't exit but piles up some place.

When you see a mass of paper (in-baskets, pending, etc.) or a jam of bodies (Reg waiting room, D of Ts, etc.) or piles of unused pamphlets or unsold books you know two things at once:

A. Routing is unknown or not done or incomplete but in any event is faulty.

236

B. The internal org form is bad.

TERMINALS

To say internal lines are out, one must also be saying internal terminals are faulty.

Ideally, the internal org form is designed for flows with the target of production.

The internal space has to be so allotted and arranged that the lines flow.

The lines flow to terminals in the sequence of change required in each particle.

The principal particle, meaning the most important one for that org has the total priority for design of space and terminals.

If wheat were being processed, then the whole space and terminal allocation of the plant or org, to have orgform would have to deal with *wheat*.

In a Scientology org it is public bodies. Thus the whole design of space and flows must deal with public bodies.

This is easily violated and when it is it makes a terrible confusion.

You have to trace such a flow with what is called a DUMMY RUN. This means going through the place pretending to be the principal particle.

When you first try this in most plants or orgs you really begin to wonder how *anything* happens ever.

The answer is correction of location, either of the whole space or the terminals in the space.

One can dummy run as anything. First dummy run the principal particle and lay that out by what has to be done to adjust the space and terminals to it. Then as a telex, then a despatch, then as a piece of money, then as an invoice, etc.

When you've done all these you'll really know what you're doing in terms of space and terminals. Until then it's all guess work.

You will find you can't get in, you can't get handled, you can't stay in and you can't get out!

So you adjust space and terminals for the main particle and then for the lesser particles.

You will achieve a near optimum compromise.

Then you arrange it and drill it in on the terminals.

After that things will speed up and stats will go up.

HOLDING THE FORM

You now and only now have the **FORM OF THE ORG.**

It must be drawn up as org boards and flow plans and terminal location plans (3 quite separate things). These three plans give you the form of the org.

Then you have to drill-in **EACH OF THE THREE PLANS** usually with Chinese school.

You do the routing forms.

Now by **HATTING** you give each terminal control over his portion of the line.

The terminals will thereafter interact to bring about the needful flows.

And if your product is good and desired, the place will boom.

And that's what's really meant by the **FORM OF THE ORG.**

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.gm Copyright © 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

237

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 27 JULY 1972

Remimeo

Establishment Officer Series 25

FORM OF THE ORG

AND SCHEDULES

Those parts of the org engaged upon similar functions must be on the same schedule.

In essence, you can't play a ball game with different members of the team appearing at different times. It would look pretty silly to have a goal keeper show up in the last third of the game. By that time it would be lost.

If over a 24-hour period people on public lines showed up, each one, at different hours, there would be no public line. Thus there would be no org form. For there could be no flow of the major particle.

If an activity is open for business at 0900, let us say, the persons on key posts would have to be there at 0830 or at least 0845 in order to "open for business" (which means open for flow) at 0900.

Precision of schedule is determined by the type of particle the org form is set up to handle.

A service org handles bodies. A management org handles messages as the principal flow particle. A refinery would handle crude oil. A flour mill wheat, etc.

Of all particle types bodies tend to be the most random and are most likely to erode or knock out org form.

Thus a service org handling bodies has to be established and hatted about a dozen times more than one which handles inert particles.

This is one of the reasons "standard business practices" do not work in setting up an org. They are not strong enough or fast enough,

Schedules become very important in orgs which handle bodies. The lines rapidly jam up and make considerable confusion wherever the line goes faulty.

As almost every part of an org requires internal cooperation from almost every other part of an org, lack of schedules, unreal schedules or failure to keep a schedule are, after hating and line establishing, the most likely causes of confusion or nondelivery.

It is important to start as a team and it is also important to stop as one if there is a "next shift" as in a Foundation. As the staffs collide, the students collide and the space tangles.

Operating a number of schedules at the same time for different parts of the org can get complicated. Governments do this to ease off automobile and commuter traffic but then they (governments) do not produce much and it doesn't matter. Half a dozen daily schedules running at the same time for one org can cause a considerable confusion.

The best schedules are very simple ones. You can have a schedule that has so many times in it, so many musters, that it is a full day's work just to keep the schedule!

238

A grave fault in schedules is not allowing any slack between two time points. Example: Class ends 1600, next class, three blocks away, begins at 1600! Either one class has to let out early or everyone is late to the next class!

Schedules commonly omit any time spaces to take care of things. Example: 0900 on post. 0900 public lines open. Well, it's going to take 15 minutes or more to get a post set up, so the schedule gets violated. Thus we have it saying 0900 when it can only be 0915! This makes schedules look

unreal to people, so they drop out. A correct version would be 0840 on post. 0850 open for business checklist collected. 0900 public lines open.

CLOSING LINES

Closing of lines costs a great deal. An extreme example is closing an org for 2 weeks "so everyone can have a vacation." African orgs used to do this and would often lose their higher stats for months.

Closing orgs "during a congress" can cost. During one national congress, several franchises closed for a week and had to fight crashed stats for months.

Closing an org at noon or for supper can ball up lines and can have a heavy effect on stats.

All this "closing" is simply saying "we're dead."

Lines have a tendency to keep flowing when flowing and remain stopped when they are stopped.

If an org began at 0900 and, with a Foundation or second and weekend shifts, ran continuously until 2300 seven days their general stats would improve out of proportion to the additional time open.

Management orgs run very raggedly on schedules as their traffic loads vary so greatly.

It takes good observation and skill to write a good schedule for an org. If an unreal schedule exists or if one is too complex, it will not be kept. Peak loads have to be taken into account and their approximate times have to be established. There are also no-load times and to cover these with a full org is to fail to have an adequate org there for the peak loads.

Careful, real study, on the ground, watching traffic flows, has to be done to make a real schedule that will be kept and which boosts production.

A schedule which does not boost production or a schedule just to have one, are a waste of everyone's time.

So select the principal particle the org handles. Use it to determine the times of peaks and no-loads, study what goes on in actual fact. And then write the schedule. And see that it is kept.

This will greatly improve org form.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.sb.bh.gm Copyright © 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

239

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 28 JULY 1972

Remimeo

Establishment Officer Series 26

Executive Series 16

Org Series 32

ESTABLISHING

HOLDING THE FORM OF THE ORG

If a person who could not play a piano sat down at a piano and hit random keys, he would not get any harmony. He would get noise.

If the head of a division gave orders to his staff without any regard to their assigned posts or duties, the result would be confusion and noise.

That's why we say a division head "doesn't know how to play the piano" when he knows so little about org form that he continually violates it by giving his various staff members duties that do not match their hats or posts.

But even if one could play the piano, one would have to have a piano to play.

SPECIALISTS

Each org staff member is a specialist in one or more similar functions. These are his specialties.

If he is fully trained to do these he is said to be HATTED.

The combined specialties properly placed and being done add up to the full production of an org.

The org form is then the lines and actions and spaces and flows worked out and controlled by specialists in each individual function.

These specialists are grouped in departments which have certain actions in common.

The departments having similar functions are grouped into divisions.

The divisions combine into the **whole org form**.

It is far less complex than it looks. It would be very complicated and confusing if there weren't divisions and departments and specialized actions. Without these you would get noise and very limited production and income, and at great strain.

Take a theater as an example. There are people who advertise it; these are the public relations people; they are hatted to get publicity and make people want to come to the play; call them the PR Division. There are the producers and directors; they are hatted to present a performance and make it occur; call them the Production Division. There are the actors and musicians; call them the Artists Division. There are the property men; they are hatted to get costumes and items needed; call them the Property Division. There are the stage hands and electricians and curtain and set men; call them the Stage Division. There are the ticket sellers and money handlers and payroll and bills payers; they are hatted on money and selling; call them the Finance Division.

240

There are the people who clean the theater and show people to seats and handle the crowds; call them the House Division. And there are the managers and playwrights and score writers and angels (financiers); call them loosely the Executive Division.

Now as long as they know their org board, have their flows plotted out, are hatted for their jobs and do a good job, even a half-good play can be viable.

But throw away the org board, skip the flows, don't hat them and even a brilliant script and marvelous music will play to an empty house and go broke.

Why? Because an org form is not held. Possibly an untrained unhatted producer will try to make the stage hands sell tickets, the actors write the music, the financiers show people to their seats. If he didn't know who the people were or what their hats were he might do just that.

And there would be noise and confusion even where there was no protest. People would get in one another's road. And the general presentation would look so ragged to the public they'd stay away in droves.

ESTO ACTION

Now what would an Esto (or an Executive Director) have to do with, let us say, an amateur, dilettante theatrical company that was about to bog.

Probably half the people had quit already. And even if there were people in the company they would probably need more.

The very first action would be to Esto Series 16 the top men to make money quick.

The first organizing action would be to kick open the hiring door. This would begin with getting out hiring PR and putting someone there to sign people up who came to be hired (not to test and audition and look at references, but just to sign people up).

The next action would be to do a flow plan of public bodies and money. So one sees where the org form reaches. Then a schedule.

The next action would be to do an org board. Not a 3-week job. (It takes me a couple hours to sketch one with a sign pen for posting.) AND GET IT POSTED.

One then takes the *head* of each of these divisions and *hats* him on what his division is supposed to do and tell him to do it. NOW.

You make and post the flow plan, org bd and terminal location plan where the whole company can see them.

Chinese drill on a flow plan to show them what they're doing and what has to be done.

Chinese drill on the org board including introducing each person named on it and getting it drilled, what he does and who he is.

You Chinese drill the terminal locations where each of these persons (and functions) is to be found.

You get agreement on schedules.

You now have a group that knows who specializes in what and what's expected of each.

You get the head of the whole company to work with and hat the heads of his divisions.

241

Now you get the heads of divisions to hat their own staffs while you help.

And you get them busy.

You then put the polishing touches on your own Dept I (personnel PR, personnel hiring, personnel placement, org bds, hat compilations, hat library and hatting hatting hatting).

And by hatting and insisting on each doing his specialized job and getting seniors to HOLD THE FORM OF THE ORG by ordering the right orders to the right specialists and targeting their production and MAGIC! This amateur theatrical company gets solvent and good enough to wind up on Broadway. It's gone professional!

You say, yes, but what about artistic quality? What about the tech of writing music and acting.
...

Hey, you overlooked the first action. You kicked the door open on hiring and you hatted and trained. And you let go those who couldn't get a stat.

Eventually you would meet human reaction and emotion and would put in a full HCO and a full Qual particularly Cramming. But you'd still do that just to be sure it kept going.

Yessir, it can't help but become a professional group IF you, the Esto, established and made them HOLD THE FORM OF THE ORG and produce while they did it.

An Executive Director can do all this and produce too. The great ones do things like this. But here it is in full view.

A Scientology org goes together just like that. Which could be why, when we want to get something started, we say:

"Get the show on the road!"

But there is no show until it is established and the FORM OF THE ORG is held.

You are luckier than the amateur theatrical company's Esto. You have policy for every post and a book of it for every division and all the tech besides.

So there is no valid reason under the sun you cannot establish and then hold the form of the org.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.bh.ts.gm Copyright Q 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

242

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 21 AUGUST 1972

Rernimeo Hatting Officer Hats

Establishment Vficer Series 27

EFFECTIVE HATTING

Here is a report from the Ship Programs Chief on Flag of the results obtained from following my orders on how to get Estos to hat people.

It should be noted that the procedure laid down by my despatch on the second half of this PL was exactly how I operated to develop the data used for Esto Series No. 16. (HCO PL 24 April 72 HATTING THE PRODUCT OFFICER OF THE **DIVISION**.)

THE REPORT

"Dear Sir,

"We have been having trouble getting Hatting Officers in Dept I to actually produce. They don't complete cycles of action to a result, they don't hat from the top down or hat for production. They don't seem to understand *why* they are hatting and what are the results they should achieve in hatting.

"This was the same problem we had back in May of this year in getting Estos to do effective hatting.

"At that time you sent me the attached despatch addressed to the Exec Esto. I used it faithfully and, with it, actually got hatting to occur.

"The results are still evident on the ship. With the DEO hatting per this despatch the then Dissem Division came right up in production and is still producing very well as the PR and Consumption Bureau.

"The Treasury Division improved markedly. Some improvement was attained in the Steward's Dept, Electronics and Qual Div where all Estos hatted per this despatch.

"All of these Estos had big wins hatting because I *used* the data on this despatch and forced them to persist with a hatting action to a RESULT.

"I kept a big log book with each hatting cycle noted down. I insisted the Esto kept at *that* cycle until it was complete.

"Each division had its own program for hatting from the top down.

"Each exec and staff member had his or her own personal hatting program kept by the Esto. These were followed and checked off as they were done.

"A number of the blue chip FSO crew now so valuable for Flag stability were *made* by heavy hatting last spring.

"I know the data on your despatch *works* if it is *done*.

"The Estos under me at the time first had to be *forced* to hat and to continue hatting to a *result*. Apparently their lack of confront had to be overcome by a hard driving senior.

243

"Generally, once they started getting results, they no longer had to be forced. They knew that Esto tech worked and willingly went ahead and applied it with vigor.

"Their confront was improved as well by doing Esto No. 16 drills on each other and running TRs 6-9 on each other every evening for at least an hour.

"Only by applying the principles laid out by you on the attached despatch was I able to get real hatting done by others,

"As we are having the same problem now with Hatting Officers in Dept 1, I feel that if this data were released as policy I could force it into use and get the ship hatted up faster."

GETTING HATTING DONE

Here is the despatch I wrote to the Exec Esto on Flag back in May of this year:

Inspections do not show Estos being industrious in their divs. They are more active than they were.

They are not hatting from the top down and not hatting to get production.

Basically they do not parallel the current push. They do little cycles down the org board.

A general grasp of what's needed and wanted is missing. Thus Estos are actually in or below Non-Existence and have not achieved upgrade from a new post or new system condition.

They are getting individual results in some cases. They are not integrated into the scene with what they are doing.

They would have to upgrade their handlings about 500% in order to actually effect a marked change in the org.

Inspections show only a small % of Estos do Esto actions for a small period of time each day. **They have other fish frying** or are acting a bit confused.

If you had that many auditors and found them auditing pcs as seldom as Estos are found doing Esto actions the HGC stat would be nearly zero WDAH.

I know what I'm talking about here because I am piloting the system to find out why it isn't producing marked changes. I find that, with 2 messengers a watch of 6 hours, working myself part-time on it, I have been able to get areas working. They were NOT producing under the attention of existing Estos.

The difference is, I force those I find not working at the top to actually produce and demand production from their staffs.

In doing this I have never crossed or found an Esto working on it. I *have* found 2 div heads who were refusing to be gotten going. Both of these I later got going.

Thus from my viewpoint

- (a) It can be done with untrained Esto Commodore's messengers.
- (b) I find messengers who know little of a meter can use one without coaching or training-
- (c) Production can be achieved by getting people to work.
- (d) That Estos have to be run and exactly ordered to do exactly so and so.

244

(e) That in running Estos one has to keep track of what one is doing with them so one doesn't get a lot of half-dones. One has to make up for a lack of persistence.

Therefore I conclude

- A. One has to know what he is trying to build.
- B. One has to target and direct its building.
- C. One has to force in a persistence.

I also conclude that training of Estos is secondary to getting them to DO and that lack of training" is an excuse not to do.

This is what I am learning about the system from actually working it.

The current on-board application of the system lacks planning, direction and persistence, does not start from the top down and does not start toward production. It *MUST BEGIN*.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:FH:nt.gm Copyright c 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

245

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 23 JULY 1981

Remirneo Issue 11

CANCELS

BPL 4 Oct 72R Esto Ser 28R

Rev. & Reiss. 9 Jul 74

CANCELS AND REPLACES

BPL 4 Oct 72R CANCELLED 22 Jan 77

Esto Ser 28RA, Same Title

Establishment Officer Series 28RB

HANDLING PTS AND OUT-ETHICS

PERSONNEL CANCELLED

REFERENCES:

HCOB 10 Aug 73 PTS HANDLING

HCOB 24 Apr 72 1 PTS INTERVIEWS

HCO PL 3 May 72R ETHICS AND EXECUTIVES

HCOB 20 Apr 72 11 PRODUCT PURPOSE AND WHY AND WC

ERROR CORRECTION

HCO PL 16 May 80 1 ETHICS-PTS TYPE A POLICY ON HANDLING

ANTAGONISTIC SOURCES

BPL 4 October 72R, Esto Series 28R, HANDLING PTS AND OUT-ETHICS PERSONNEL is hereby CANCELLED.

This BPL stated that before doing a 3 May PL or PTS handling on a staff member one should verify that a situation does exist by STATISTICS. This brought about the false idea that a PTS staff member had to have down stats before he could receive any PTS handling.

In an effort to do away with this false idea, BPL 4 Oct 72R CANCELLED 22 Jan 77, Esto Series 28RA, HANDLING PTS AND OUT-ETHICS PERSONNEL, was written to cancel Esto Series

28R. In doing so, however, no explanation was given as to why this issue was being cancelled. Therefore BPL 4 Oct 72R CANCELLED 22 Jan 77, Esto Series 28RA, HANDLING PTS AND OUT-ETHICS PERSONNEL, is CANCELLED and REPLACED by this policy letter.

PTS tech has helped salvage many staff members. Its full use is to be encouraged.

The correct policies and bulletins for handling PTS and out-ethics personnel are given in the reference section above.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Assisted by

Bill Morey

Mission Issues Revision 2nd

Flag Compilations Bureau

As accepted by the

BOARD OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA

BDCSC:LRH:BM:dr.gm Copyright © 1981 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

246

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 24 JUNE 1973R

Remimeo REVISED 23 OCTOBER 1975

(The revision is the signature.)

Establishment Officer Series 29R

Personnel Series 27R

The concept of what is a "complement" is probably generally misunderstood. This means the officially allowed number of persons and the officially designated posts for an activity, whether an org or a ship.

Without these basic complements orgs get misposted. Instead of ten auditors they have one auditor and nine admin personnel somewhere else.

This general concept of complement is generally missing and underlies the reason why org boards are, to some degree, in disuse.

In any org which is not doing well you may find not enough personnel and too many personnel. You may also find that the personnel there are not posted onto the post necessary to be held.

Designating the post necessary to be held is what is meant by "assigning a complement."

I never realized the concept was hard to get across until recently. In the dictionary it says that a complement is simply a full list of the officers and men of a ship. This falls so far short of the actual definition that it generates confusion.

A complement is the full list of posts and where they belong on the org board, which must be held. This gives you a slightly different idea of what is meant by "complement."

One org, for instance, didn't have a standard complement. It simply had all possible posts which could be held in the org. This does not tell you what posts should be held in the org.

Therefore, personnel control is not possible.

In the case of another org there was a maximum allowed complement but it was never filled up.

There is a complement for every separate and individual org.

Until the complement of an org is laid out, known and filled, there will be continual trouble with personnel and difficulties in handling it.

The sooner this is straightened out, the easier time there will be for all.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:mg.gm Copyright c 1973, 1975 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

247

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 22 NOVEMBER 1973

Remimeo

Esto Series 30

All persons doing Esto work may only use the title "Esto I/T" (In-Training) until he has successfully and honestly completed:

1. HCOB 21 Nov 73 "The Cure of Q and A."
2. The PRD (Primary Rundown).
3. The OEC.
4. The Esto Series.
5. Has shown on post the ability to see situations and handle them terminatedly.
6. Gets staff members actually producing by increased stats.

Any reasons for failure of the Esto system anywhere have derived from (a) a dishonest "completion" of the PRD and (b) Qing and Aing instead of seeing and handling situations terminatedly.

An Esto must be at CAUSE.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.gm Copyright o 1973 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

248

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 9 MAY 1974

Remimeo

PROD-ORG, ESTO AND OLDER

SYSTEMS RECONCILED

In the last three years there have been two new organization systems developed. These were **THE PRODUCT-ORG OFFICER SYSTEM** and the **ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER SYSTEM**.

Reviewing these I find that these systems not only reconcile with each other but also with the HCO Exec Sec and Org Exec Sec system and the Supercargo, Chief Officer system of the Sea Org.

TOP DOWN

In '67 I found that an organization must always be posted from the top down.

This means it cannot be posted with gaps between the top or lower levels on the org board.

The org, of course, must always have a top.

And there must not be a gap between the top and the next lower post. Or any gaps on the way down.

Example: Orgs run by a committee but without a head of org seldom succeed.

Example: An org with a CO or ED, no HAS but only a Master-at-Arms or Ethics Officer in the HCO Division will not function but disintegrate.

Example: A musical group with an I/C and all the rest just musicians will deteriorate.

Example: A small vessel with three men aboard will not function with one the Captain, another the cook and another the deckhand.

In the first example, there has to be someone responsible for the whole organization whether above or below the committee.

In the second example, an org without an HAS or HCO Exec Sec or Supercargo, there is no one to take all those lower functions and they settle on an overloaded top.

In the musical group the I/C finds himself with many juniors and no specialized organizational handling of anything.

In the small vessel all the functions of the first three divisions are mainly abandoned and the last four as well.

All these and many more are lessons learned the hard way.

249

The seven division org board is present even in organizations that know nothing of it! And not knowing it or using it can bring chaos.

EARLIEST SYSTEM

In early days there was an HCO Sec in charge of the functions of the first 3 divisions (Exec, HCO, Dissem) and an Assoc Sec in charge of the functions of the last four divisions. These functions were not fully known as the seven division board had not been developed.

The org board evolved further and the HCO Exec Sec became the person in charge of the functions of the first three divisions and the Org Exec Sec, the last four.

In the Sea Org these titles became Supercargo and Chief Officer but the functions were similar.

PROD-ORG SYSTEM

Then, within the last four years, the Product Officer/Org Officer system was developed.

The Executive Director or Commanding Officer had (or was) a Product Officer. The Product Officer was supported by an Org Officer to keep the place organized.

THE ESTO SYSTEM

The Establishment Officer system or "Esto tech" was developed in the same time period as the Prod-Org system.

The Esto kept the place established and organized for production and despite heavy production demands.

RE-EXAMINATION

Looking over these systems, I find they fall into place naturally one with the other.

The realization is that an org with only one Product Officer and Org Officer has a gap-the HCO Exec Sec!

Actually an org needs TWO senior Product Officers-one to get the products of Divisions 7, 1 and 2 and one to get the products of 3, 4, 5 and 6!

When this gap exists, no one in real practice is functioning over Divs 7, 1 and 2 and so there is an imbalance of the org board. The org tends to fall apart. It does not rapidly expand as it has no Product Officer for expansion or dissemination.

ESTO SYSTEM

The Esto system with its powerful tech is really the Org Officer system.

The duties of the Org Officer in the Prod-Org system were not as fully laid out as they might have been.

The tech of the Org Officer is really the Esto tech!

250

LRH

Board of Directors

o o

.c

Flag Representative Executive Director (Commanding Officer)

o

o.c

HCO Exec Sec (Supercargo, Org Exec Sec (Chief Officer,
Product Officer Divs 7, 1, 2) Product Officer Divs 3, 4, 5, 6)

0 9) et

.1.m

HCO Exec Sec's Org Officer Org Exe, sec's Org Officer

0.4

(HCO Exec Esto) (Org Esto)

0

U 0

0 \$.

54 1 1 ---1 1 1 1 1

ed z LRH Comm HCO Sec Dissem Sec Treasury Sec Tech See Qual Sec Public Exec

E !~

4. Div 7 Div 1 Div 2 Div 3 Div 4 Div 5 Sec

0

Div 6

0

1 1

Usual Usual Usual Usual Usual Usual Usual

Depts Depts Depts Depts Depts Depts Depts

0

0 U

So where you have a Product Officer and Org Officer to the org, you are missing two posts and so are not posted from the top down!

You should have TWO Product Officers, one who is also the HCO Exec Sec (or Supercargo) and one who is the Org Exec Sec (or Chief Officer).

And each of these has an Org Officer who is also an Esto and who uses Esto tech.

This gives the ED (or CO) FOUR terminals he is directly operating with, even though the O/Os are also junior to and under their Product Officers.

SUMMARY

This ties together all existing systems.

It finds and fills an unnoticed gap in posting from the top down.

It prevents Estos from working independently from the side into the org off command chain.

In posting Product Officers use the old titles: HCO Exec Sec (Supercargo) and Org Exec Sec (Chief Officer), remembering that these are now Product Officers operating on the Prod-Org system into their own divisions.

Post any Esto as an Org Officer under one or the other of these executives, one the "HES Org Officer" the other the "OES Org Officer." And insist they use Esto tech and consider themselves Estos.

Size of org has little to do with it. A one-man org would simply have all these titles and functions. A ten-man org would be posted from the top and all other functions directly below them not posted or held by them would also be performed by them.

IMPORTANCE

Failing to post the top and from the top down is the main failure point in ANY organization (not just ours).

Finding this gap is important and filling it will raise stats.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:ntm/ams.gm Copyright © 1974 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

252

CANCELLED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE See page 255

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 12 NOVEMBER 1974

Remimeo (Suspends HCO P/L 9 May 74)

IMPORTANT

PROD-ORG REINSTATED

As very few orgs have been able to effectively institute HCO P/L 9 May 74 which posted Org Officers as Estos under the HES and OES, mainly due to a scarcity of actual trained Establishment Officers and executives, HCO P/L 9 May 74 is suspended.

Orgs should revert to an ED or CO-Product Officer-Org Officer posting.

The Product Officer may retain the title of Chief Officer or Org Exec Sec and the Org Officer may retain the title of Supercargo or HCO Exec Sec but their functions are exclusively that of the Product Officer and Org Officer of the org respectively, covering all divisions.

The CO or ED, Product and Org Officers form the Executive Council.

Anyone holding the post of HES 0/0 or OES 0/0 should take posts in HCO or revert to their last successful posts.

In a very small org the CO or ED is double-hatted as the Product Officer.

At this time it is FAR more important to cover HCO and make HCO do all its functions in each HCO department.

The head of every division is a Product Officer for that division.

Such division heads can have an Org Officer who has essentially the duties of an Esto as well as an Org Officer for that division. A divisional Org Officer also has, today, recruiting and hating functions for that division.

The Prod-Org system was very workable and attention must be directed back to it as it has tended to drop out.

The following materials and tapes give the data for the Prod-Org system:

FEBC Tape 2, 18 Jan 71, 710IC18SO Side 2

PR Becomes a Subject

FEBC Tape 3, 18 Jan 71, 710IC18SO Side I

The Org Off-Prod Off System, Part I

FEBC Tape 4, 18 Jan 71, 710IC18SO Side 2

The Org and Prod Off System, Part 2

FEBC Tape 5, 23 Jan 71, 7 10IC23SO Side I

How to Post an Org

FEBC Tape 6, 23 Jan 71, 7 10 1 C23SO Side 2

The Org Off and His Resources, Part I

FEBC Tape 7, 23 Jan 71, 710IC23SO Side I

The Org Off and His Resources, Part 2

FEBC Tape 8, 24 Jan 71, 7 10 1 C24SO Side 2

Viability and the Role of the HAS

253

FEBC Tape 9, 24 Jan 71, 7 10 1 C24SO Side I Prediction and the Resources of the HAS

FEBC Tape 10, 24 Jan 71, 710IC24SO Side 2 The HAS and the Coins of the Organization

These can be obtained from FLAG.

HCO

A VERY STRONG FUNCTIONING HCO IS VITAL TO BACK UP THE PRODORG SYSTEM.

When there is no HCO recruiting people who will stay, hatting them and apprenticing them and keeping their ethics in, there is a lot of commotion generated in an org as fast production requires not only an Org Officer but an HAS (and HCO Cope Officer) who put the org there rapidly and thoroughly.

Full use of the Prod-Org system, combined with a strong HCO that does its recruiting and hatting job brings about high stats.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.gm Copyright 'a, 1974 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

254

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 DECEMBER 1974

Remimeo

HCO P/L 9 MAY 74 RE-ESTABLISHED

CANCELLATION OF HCO P/L 12 NOV 74

"PROD-ORG REINSTATED"

PROD-ORG, ESTO AND OTHER SYSTEMS

RECONCILED REINSTATED

HCO P/L of 12 Nov 74 suspended HCO P/L 9 May 74 which put an Executive Council back into an org.

The suspension was temporary.

What happened was that, at least in some orgs, the Product Officer immediately began to product officer GI only. Delivery stats crashed in those orgs.

Obviously the OES is vital as a Product Officer of Divisions 3, 4, 5 and 6.

Thus any org that reverted to having only a Product and Org Officer and no HES or OES must reinstate the HES and OES and, as available, their Org Officers.

Delivery alone provides the exchange for GI and GI which is not at once earned is a liability.

There obviously must be an OES to ensure volume and quality delivery and, through Div 6, new people into the org.

Orgs must become exchange oriented.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

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

255

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 AUGUST 1976

Remimeo Issue I

All Execs

All Purchasers

Admin Know-How Series 33

Esto Series 31

PRODUCT/ORG OFFICER SYSTEM

NAME YOUR PRODUCT

The Product/Org Officer system, covered fully in Flag Executive Briefing Course tapes, contains the key phrase for any Product Officer. This is

NAME, WANT AND GET YOUR PRODUCT.

Breaking this down into its parts we find that the most common failure of any Product Officer or staff member or Purchaser lies in the first item, NAME YOUR PRODUCT!

On org boards and even for sections, one has products listed. Departments have valuable final products. Every staff member has one or more products.

IF PRODUCTION IS NOT OCCURRING, THE ABILITY TO NAME THE PRODUCT IS PROBABLY MISSING.

Misunderstood post titles were collected once on a wide survey. Whenever it was found a staff member did not seem to be able to do his job, it was checked whether he knew the definition of the word-or words-that made up his post title. It was found, one for one, that he could not define it even though no unusual or special definition was being requested. In other words, the first thing about the post could not be defined-the post title. This may seem incredible, but only until you yourself check it out on staff that habitually goof.

The ability to NAME the product required goes further than a mere, glib definition. Some engineers once drove a Purchaser halfway up the wall by glibly requesting "one dozen bolts." The Purchaser kept bringing back all different thicknesses and lengths and types of bolts. The Purchaser was going daffy and so were the engineers. Until the engineers were forced to exactly name what they were seeking by giving it ALL its name. The Purchaser trying to purchase could not possibly obtain his product without being able to FULLY name it. Once this was done, nothing was easier.

A Product Officer can ask, beg, plead, yell for his product. But maybe he isn't naming it! Maybe he isn't naming it fully. And maybe even he doesn't know the name of it. A Product Officer should spend some time exactly and accurately naming the exact product he wants before asking for it. Otherwise he and his staff may be struggling around over many misunderstood words!

When you see a staff whirling around and dashing into walls and each other and not producing a thing, calmly try to find out if any of them or their Product Officer can NAME what products they are trying to produce. Chances are, few of them can and maybe the Product Officer as well.

Handle and it will all smooth out and products will occur.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.gm Copyright © 1976 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

256

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 AUGUST 1976

Rernimeo Issue 11

All Execs

All Purchasers

Admin Know-How Series 34

Esto Series 32

PRODUCT/ORG OFFICER SYSTEM

WANT YOUR PRODUCT

A Product Officer has to name, WANT and get his product.

Where no real or valuable production is occurring, one has to ask the question, does the Product Officer really WANT the product he is demanding? And does the staff member or members he is dealing with WANT the product?

The reason that a psychotic or otherwise evilly intentioned person cannot achieve anything as a Product Officer or staff member is that he does NOT want the product to occur. The intentions of psychos are aimed at destruction and not at creation.

Such persons may SAY they want the product but this is just "PR" and a cover for their real activities.

People who are PTS (potential trouble sources by reason of connections with people antagonistic to what they are doing in life) are all too likely to slide into the valence of the antagonistic person **who definitely would NOT want the product.**

Thus, in an org run by or overloaded with destructive persons or PTS persons, you see a very low level of production if you see any at all. And the production is likely to be what is called "an overt product," meaning a bad one that will not be accepted or cannot be traded or exchanged and has more waste and liability connected with it than it has value.

One has to actually WANT the product he is asking for or is trying to produce. There may be many reasons he does not, none of which are necessarily connected with being psycho. But if it is a creative and valuable product and assists his and the survival of others and he still does not want it, then one should look for PTSness or maybe even a bit of psychosis. And at the least, some withholds.

One does not have to be in a passionate mystic daze about wanting the product. But one shouldn't be moving mountains in the road of a guy trying to carry some lumber to the house site either.

The question of WANT the product has to be included in any examination of reasons why a person or an org isn't producing.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.gm Copyright © 1976 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

257

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 AUGUST 1976

Remimeo Issue III

ALL EXECS

Admin Know-How Series 35

Esto Series 33

PRODUCT/ORG OFFICER SYSTEM

TO GET YOU HAVE TO KNOW HOW TO ORGANIZE

A Product Officer and ESPECIALLY an Org Officer has to know how to GET a product.

All science and technology is built around this single point in the key phrase "Name, want and get your product." Managers and scientists specialize in the HOW TO GET part of it and very often neglect the rest.

There are many Product Officers who do NOT know enough about organization to organize things so they actually GET their product. These, all too often, cover up their ignorance on how to organize or their inability to do so by saying to one and all "Don't organize, just produce!" When you hear this you can suspect that the person saying it actually does not know the tech or know-how of organizing or how to put an organization together. He may not even know enough about organizing to shove aside other paper on his desk when he is trying to spread out and read a large chart-yet that is simple organization.

A bricklayer would look awfully silly trying to lay no-bricks. He hasn't got any bricks. Yet there he is going through the motions of laying bricks. It takes a certain economic and purchasing and transport tech to get the bricks delivered-only then can you lay bricks.

A manager looks pretty silly trying to order a brick wall built when he doesn't have any bricks or bricklayer and provides no means at all of obtaining either one.

A Product Officer may be great at single-handing the show. How come? He doesn't realize that building a show comes before one runs it. And even though economics demand at least a small show before one builds a large show, a very bad Product Officer who can't really organize either, will, instead of making the small show bigger, make the small show smaller by trying to run a no-show.

There is a HOW of organization. It is covered pretty well in the Org Series and elsewhere. Like you can't put in comm lines unless you put in terminals for them to connect with. Like you can't get particles flowing in a profitable way unless they have something for them to run on. That's simply the way things go in the universe in which you are operating. Now of course you could build a new universe with different laws but the fact is, that would require a knowledge of organization as well, wouldn't it?

The tech of how to produce something can be pretty vast. One doesn't have to be a total expert on it to be able to manage the people doing it, but one has to have a pretty good idea of how it goes and how enough NOT to stop the guys who do know how to make bricks when one wants bricks.

If the product is to get somebody to come in to see you, then you have to have some means of communication and some tech of persuasion to make him want to come in to see you. Brute force may seem okay to cops but in organization it seldom works. There is more tech to it than that.

258

If a Product Officer does not know there is tech involved in GETTING the product, then he will never make his staff study it or teach anybody to do it. And he will wind up with no product. So beware the Product Officer who won't give time off for hatting! He doesn't know one has to know the tech of getting his product. What do you think the OEC (Org Exec Course) Volumes and the technical bulletins are all about?

One has to spend some time organizing in many different ways-the organization itself, the hatting, the technical skill staff members would have to have, to get anywhere in GETTING a product.

Sure, if you only organize and never produce you never get a product either. But if you only produce and never organize, the only brick wall you'll ever see is the one you run into.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.gal.gm Copyright © 1976, 1979 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[*Note:* There is no Esto Series 34.]

259

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 26 MARCH 1979RB

Rernitneo REVISED 2 SEPTEMBER 1979

(Also issued as an HCO Bulletin

of same date, same title.)

(Revisions in this type style)

Esto Series 35RB

Word Clearing Series 6ORB

Product Debug Series 7R

MISUNDERSTOOD WORDS AND CYCLES OF ACTION

MISUNDERSTOOD WORDS AND NO PRODUCT

A misunderstood word can prevent a person from understanding the remainder of what is heard or written.

I have now discovered that: A MISUNDERSTOOD on any given subject CAN PREVENT THE COMPLETION OF A CYCLE OF ACTION related to that subject.

Therefore those people who don't complete cycles of action on certain subjects have a misunderstood word on them.

This then results in no-product situations,

Therefore when you are getting no product, look for the misunderstood word on the subject no matter how long and arduous it is. It's there. And when it's found the person can go on and complete a cycle of action and get a product.

CAUTION.- Make sure the person actually does have an inability to complete a cycle of action *before* you get into handling him. You don't handle somebody who is completing cycles of action that result in production.

MISUNDERSTOODS AND PERCEPTION

Misunderstoods can also act as perception shut-offs. They can actually interrupt a person's perception.

It is quite astonishing that perceptions such as sight, sound and even touch can be shut off by Mis-U words.

This opens the door to the fact that people apparently do not see, hear, notice or handle outnesses when they have Mis-Us on them.

This also may open the door to people who have perceptic shut-offs, such as poor eyesight, deafness or other perception difficulties.

MISUNDERSTOODS AND COMPLEXITY

Misunderstoods lead to complexity. People who have Mis-Us in an area are inclined to develop vast complexities. They can generate confusions and complexities beyond belief.

260

People do this because, having misunderstands, they do not confront and duplicate in the area and so get into a lot of think-think and unnecessary significance. Their ability to get things done in that area dwindles as a result. And at the bottom of all this is simply misunderstood words.

MISUNDERSTOODS AND TOTAL ORGANIZE

When you see an area that is organizing only, you know that area is loaded with misunderstands.

When people have incomplete cycles due to Mis-Us they get bogged down into organization,

You can tell when people have Mis-Us-they are totally involved in organize. organize, organize. They don't know what they are doing.

There is a level below this-they have overts and withholds which prevent even organizing.

Below that level people are PTS.

Lacking a sense of organization actually lies below this. It is below the level of Mis-Us, overts and withholds and PTSness-and you'd have to go north through PTSness and overts and withholds to even get to the Mis-Us.

MISUNDERSTOODS AND NO ORGANIZE

There can also exist a condition where someone does not organize any corner of his area or work or organizations or lines. This manifests itself by irrational demands to only produce and to prevent any organization so that production can occur. At the bottom of this you are very likely to find misunderstood words, particularly on the purpose of the production or why one is producing. It is in this sector that you get overt products most frequently.

HANDLING

The exact procedure for handling these Mis-Us is given in HCOB 17 June 79 CRASHING MIS-Us: THE KEY TO COMPLETED CYCLES OF ACTION AND PRODUCTS. Crashing Mis-U finding is done as part of HCO PL 23 Aug 79 / DEBUG TECH. Additional data on the location of Crashing Mis-Us is found in HCOB 14 Aug 79 CRASHING MIS-Us, BLOCKS TO FINDING THEM and HCOB 16 Jul 79 THE "ELUSIVE" MIS-U OR CRASHING MIS-U.

With this knowledge we can now handle all the factors that prevent the completion of cycles of action and products.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:gal.dr.gm Copyright © 1979 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 AUGUST 1979

Remimeo

Sups (Also issued as

Tech HCOB 7 Aug 79

Qual

Execs FALSE DATA STRIPPING)

ALL STAFF

Product Debug Series 8

Esto Series 36

FALSE DATA STRIPPING

(Ref. The Study Tapes

Dianetic Auditor's Bulletin Vol I Numbers 1-2

STANDARD PROCEDURE

Tech Vol 1, pgs. 15-20

Dianetic Auditor's Bulletin Vol I Number 3

HOW TO RELEASE A CHRONIC

SOMATIC

Tech Vol 1, pgs. 24-26

NOTES ON THE

LECTURES Pgs. 52-66, 112-113)

When a person is not functioning well on his post, on his job or in life, at the bottom of his difficulties will often be found unknown basic definitions and laws or false definitions, false data and false laws, resulting in an inability to think with the words and rules of that activity and an inability to perform the simplest required functions. The person will remain unfamiliar with the fundamentals of his activity, at times appearing idiotic, because of these not-defined and falsely defined words.

Verbal hatting is the main source of false definitions and false data. Someone who "knows" tells someone else a definition or a datum. The person now thinks he knows the definition (even though nothing in the field makes any sense to him). The word may not even read on the meter during misunderstood checks because the person "thinks he knows."

A politician is told by an advisor, "It doesn't matter how much money the government spends. It is good for the society." The politician uses this "rule" and, the next thing you know, inflation is driving everybody to starvation and the government to bankruptcy. The politician, knowing he was told this on the very best authority, does not spot it as false data, but continues to use it right up to the point where the angry mobs stand him up in front of a firing squad and shoot him down. And the pity

of it is that the politician never **once suspected** that there was anything false about the data, even though he couldn't work with it.

There is no field in all the society where false data is not rampant. "Experts," "advisors," "friends," "families," seldom go and look at the basic texts on subjects, even when these are known to exist, but indulge in all manner of interpretations and even outright lies to seem wise or expert. The cost, in terms of lost production and damaged equipment is enormous. You will see it in all sectors of society. People cannot think with the fundamentals of their work. They goof. They ruin things. They have to redo what they have already done.

You'll find people whose estimate of the environment is totally perverted to the point they're walking around literally in a fog. The guy looks at a tree and the reality of the tree is blurred by the "fact" that "trees are made by God" so he won't take care of the tree because he is convinced.

262

What we're trying to cure in people is the inability to think with data. This was traced by me to false data as a phenomenon additional to misunderstood words, although the misunderstood word plays a role in it and will have to be allowed for.

When a person is having difficulty in an area or on a post, when he can't seem to apply what he has "learned" or what he is studying or when he can't get through a specific drill or exercise in his training materials, you will suspect he has false data in that area or on those materials. If he is to use it at all effectively he must first sort out the true facts regarding it from the conflicting bits and pieces of information or opinion he has acquired. This eliminates the false data and lets him get on with it.

INABILITY TO HAT

We are looking here at a brand new discovery I have made which is that it can be nearly impossible to hat anyone who is sitting on false data on the subject you are trying to hat him on. This is the *primary* reason people cannot be hatted and False Data Stripping therefore enables a person to be hatted even though other approaches have failed. This is a very valuable discovery-it solves the problem of inability to hat or train.

SOURCES

False data on a subject can come from any number of sources. In the process of day-to-day living people encounter and often accept without inspection all sorts of ideas which may seem to make sense but don't. Advertising, newspapers, TV and other media are packed with such material. The most profound false data can come out of texts such as Stanislavsky (a Russian actor and director); and even mothers have a hand in it, such as "children should be seen and not heard."

Where a subject, such as art, contains innumerable authorities and voluminous opinions you may find that any and all textbooks under that heading reek with false data. Those who have studied study tech will recall that the validity of texts is an important factor in study. Therefore it is important that any supervisor or teacher seeking to use False Data Stripping must utilize basic *workable* texts. These are most often found to have been written by the original discoverer of the subject and when in doubt avoid texts which are interpretations of somebody else's work. In short, choose only textual material which is closest to the basic facts of the subject and avoid those which embroider upon them.

It can happen, if you do False Data Stripping well and expertly without enforcing your own data on the person, that he can find a *whole* textbook false-much to his amazement. In such a case, locate a more fundamental text on the subject. (Examples of false texts: Eastman Kodak; Lord Keynes

treatises on economics; John Dewey's texts on education; Sigmund Freud's texts on the mind; the texts derived from the "work" of Wundt (Leipzig 1879-Father of Modern Psychology); and (joke) a textbook on "Proper **Conduct for Sheep**" written by A. Wolf.)

USE OF FALSE DATA STRIPPING

False Data Stripping should be used extensively in all hatting and training activities. **Current society is riddled with false data** and these must be cleared away so that we can hat and train people. Then they will be able to learn useful data which will enable them to understand things **and produce** valuable products in life.

False Data Stripping can be done on or off the meter. It can be done by an auditor in session, by a Supervisor, Cramming Officer or Word Clearer or by an exec, Esto or any administrator. Students and staff can be trained to do it on each other.

Not a lot of training is required to deliver this procedure but anyone administering it must have checked out on this HCOB/PL and have demoed and drilled the procedure. If it is going to be done on the meter (which is preferable) the person doing it must have an OK to operate an E-Meter.

263

GRADIENTS

It will be found that false data actually comes off in gradients.

For example, a student handled initially on false data on a particular drill will appear to be complete on it. He goes on with his studies and makes progress for a while and then sometimes he will hit a bog or slow in his progress. This is usually an indication that more false data has been flushed up (restimulated or remembered as a result of actually doing studies or drills). At that point more basic false data will come off when asked for. The reason for this is: when you first give a student false data handling he doesn't know enough about the subject to know false data from the true. When he has learned a bit more about the subject he then collides with more false data hitherto buried. This can happen several times, as he is getting more and more expert on the subject.

Thus the action of stripping off false data can and must be checked for and used in any training and hatting. The rundown has to be given again and again at later and later periods, as a student or staff member may come up against additional faulty data that has been not-ised. It can be repeated as often as necessary in any specific area of training until the person is finally duplicating and is able to use the correct tech and only the correct tech exactly.

THEORY

There is a philosophic background as to why getting off false data on a subject works and why trying to teach a correct datum *over* a false datum on the subject does not work. It is based on the Socratic thesis-antithesis-synthesis philosophical equation.

Socrates: 470 B.C.-399 B.C. A great Greek philosopher.

A *thesis* is a statement or assertion.

Antithesis: **opposing statement or assertion.**

The Socratic equation is mainly used in debate where one debater asserts one thing and the other debater asserts the opposite. It was the contention of Socrates and others that when two forces came into collision a new idea was born. This was the use of the equation in logic and debate.

However, had they looked further they would have seen that other effects were brought into play. It has very disastrous effects when it appears in the field of training.

Where the person has acquired a *false* thesis (or datum), the *true* datum you are trying to teach him becomes an antithesis. The true datum comes smack up against the false datum he is hanging on to, as it is counter to it.

In other words, these two things collide, and *neither one will* then make sense to him. At this point he can try to make sense out of the collision and form what is called a synthesis, or his wits simply don't function. (*Synthesis*: a unified whole in which opposites, thesis and antithesis, are reconciled.)

So you wind up with the person either

- (a) attempting to use a false, unworkable synthesis he has formed, or
- (b) his thinkingness locks up on the subject.

In either case you get an impossible-to-train, impossible-to-hat scene.

GLIBNESS

Probably we have here the basic anatomy of the "glib student" who can parrot off whole chapters on an examination paper and yet in practice uses his tools as a door stop. This student has been a mystery to the world of education for eons. What he has probably done in order to get by, is set up a circuit which is purely memory.

264

The truth of it is his understanding or participation is barred off by considerations such as "nothing works anyway but one has to please the professor somehow."

The less a person can confront, the more false data he has accumulated and will accumulate. These syntheses are simply additives and complexities and make the person complicate the subject beyond belief. Or the collision of false data and true data, without the person knowing which is which, makes him look like a meathead.

Therefore, in order to cure him of his additives, complexities, apathy and apparent stupidity on a subject, in addition to cleaning up misunderstood words, it is necessary to strip the false data off the subject. Most of the time this is prior to the true data and so is basic on the chain. Where this is the case, when that basic false data is located and stripped, the whole subject clears up more easily.

FALSE DATA PRONE

Some people are prone to accepting false data. This stems from overts committed prior to the false data being accepted. The false data then acts as a justifier for the overt.

An example of this would be a student studying past Mis-U's on a subject, cheating in the exam and eventually dropping the subject entirely. Then someone comes along and tells him that the subject is useless and destructive. Well, he will immediately grab hold of this datum and believe it as he needs something to justify his earlier overts.

This actually gets into service facsimiles as the person will use the false data to make the subject or other people wrong.

So if you see someone who is very prone to accepting false data on a particular subject or in general, the answer is to get the prior overts pulled. Then the person will not need to justify his overts by accepting any false data that comes his way.

PROCEDURE

You may not easily be able to detect a false datum because the person believes it to be true. When False Data Stripping is done on a meter the false datum won't necessarily read for the same reason.

You therefore ask the person if there is anything he has run across on the subject under discussion which he couldn't think with, which didn't seem to add up or seems to be in conflict with the material one is trying to teach him.

The false datum buries itself and the procedure itself handles this phenomenon.

When the false datum is **located it is handled with elementary** recall based on 1950 Straightwire. Straight memory technique or Straightwire (so called because one is stringing a line between present time and some incident in the past, and stringing that line directly and without any detours) was developed originally in 1950 as a lighter process than engram running. Cleverly used, Straightwire removed locks and released illnesses without the pc ever having run an engram.

Once one had determined whatever it was that was going to be run with Straightwire, one would have the pc recall where and when it happened, who was involved, what were they doing, what was the pc doing, etc., until the lock blew or the illness keyed out.

Straightwire works at a lock level. When overdone it can key in underlying engrams. When properly done it can be quite miraculous.

STEPS

A. Determine whether or not the person needs this procedure by checking the following:

265

1. The person cannot be hatted on a subject.
2. No Crashing Mis-Us can be found on a subject yet it is obvious they exist.
3. The person is not duplicating the material he has studied as he is incorrectly applying it or only applying part of it, despite Word Clearing.
4. He is rejecting the material he is reading or the definition of the word he is clearing.
5. You suspect or the person originates earlier data he has encountered on the materials that could contain false data.
6. The person talks about or quotes other sources or obviously incorrect sources.
7. He is glib.
8. The person is backing off from actually applying the data he is studying despite standard Word Clearing.
9. He is bogged.
10. He cannot think with the data and it does not seem to apply.

B. Establish the difficulty the person is having-i.e. what are the materials he can't duplicate or apply? These materials must **be to hand and** the person must be familiar with the basic true data on the subject being addressed.

C. If the action is being done metered, put the person on the meter and properly adjust the sensitivity with a proper can squeeze.

D. Thoroughly clear the concept of false data with the person. Have him give you examples to show he gets it. (This would be done if the person was receiving False Data Stripping for the first time.)

E. The following questions are used to detect and uncover the false data. These questions are cleared before they are used for the first time on anyone. They do not have to read on a meter and may not do so as the person will not necessarily read on something that he believes to be true.

1. "Is there anything you have run across in (subject under discussion) which you couldn't think with?"

2. "Is there anything you have encountered in (subject under discussion) which didn't seem to add up?"

3. "Is there something you have come across in (subject under discussion) that seems to be in conflict with the material you are trying to learn?"

4. "Is there something in (subject under discussion) which never made any sense to you?"

5. "Did you come across any data in (subject under discussion) that you had no use for?"

6. "Was there any data you came across in (subject under discussion) that never seemed to fit in?"

7. "Do you know of any datum that makes it unnecessary for you to do a good job on this subject?"

8. "Do you know of any reason why an overt product is all right?"

266

9. "Would you be made wrong if you really learned this subject?"

10. "Did anyone ever explain this subject to you verbally?"

11. "Do you know of any datum that conflicts with standard texts on this subject?"

12. "Do you consider you really know best about this subject?"

13. "Would it make somebody else wrong not to learn this subject?"

14. "Is this subject not worth learning?"

The questions are asked in the above sequence. When an area of false data is uncovered by one of these questions one goes straight on to Step F-handling.

E When the person comes up with an answer to one of the above questions locate the false datum as follows:

1. Ask "Have you been given any false data regarding this?" and help him locate the false datum. If this is being done on the meter, one can use any meter reads one does get to steer the

person. This may require a bit of work as the person may believe the false data he has to be true. Keep at it until you get the false datum.

If the person has given you the false datum in Step E then this step will not be needed: just go straight on to Step G.

G. When the false datum has been located, handle as follows:

1. Ask "Where did this datum come from?" (This could be a person, a book, TV, etc.)
2. "When was this?"
3. "Where exactly were you at the time?"
4. "Where was (the person, book, etc.) at the time?"
5. "What were you doing at the time?"
6. If the false datum came from a person ask: "What was (the person) doing at the time?"
7. "**How did** (the person, book, etc.) look at the time?"
8. If the datum has not blown with the above questions ask: "Is there an earlier similar false datum or incident on (the subject under discussion)?" and handle per Steps 1-7.

Continue as above until the false datum has blown. On the meter you will have a floating needle and very good indicators.

**DO NOT CONTINUE PAST A POINT WHERE THE FALSE DATUM HAS
BLOWN.**

If you suspect the datum may have blown but the person has not originated then ask: "How does that datum seem to you now?" and either continue if it hasn't blown or end off on that datum if it has blown.

H. When you have handled a particular false datum to a blow, going earlier similar as necessary, you would then go back and repeat the question from E (the detection

267

step) that uncovered the false datum. If there are any more answers to the question, they are handled exactly as in Step F (location) and Step G (handling).

That particular question is left when the person has no more answers. Then, if the person is not totally handled on the subject under discussion, one would use the other questions from Step E and handle them in the same way. All the questions can be asked and handled as above but one would not continue past a point where the whole subject has been cleared up and the person can now duplicate and apply the data he has been having trouble with.

1. CONDITIONAL: If False Data Stripping is being done in conjunction with

Crashing Mis-U Finding one would now proceed with the Crashing Mis-U Finding.

J. Send the person to the Examiner.

K. Have the person study or restudy the true data on the subject you have been handling.

END PHENOMENA

When the above procedure is done correctly and fully on an area the person is actually having difficulty with, he will end up able to duplicate, understand and apply and think with the data that he could not previously grasp. The false data that was standing in the road of duplication will have been cleared away and the person's thinking will have been freed up. When this occurs, no matter where in the procedure, one ends off the False Data Stripping on that subject and sends the person to the Examiner. He will have cognitions and VGIs and on the meter you will have an F/N. This is not the end of all False Data Stripping for that person. It is the end of that False Data Stripping on the person at that particular time. As the person continues to work with and study the subject in question, he will learn more about it and may again collide with false data at which time one repeats the above process.

NOTE

False data buries itself as the person may firmly believe that it is true. Sometimes the person will have such faith in a **particular person, book, etc.**, that he cannot conceive that any data from that particular source might be false. One artist being false data stripped had received some false data from a very famous painter. Even though the data didn't really add up and actually caused the artist tremendous problems, he tended to believe it because of where it came from. It took persistence on the part of the person administering the False Data Stripping to eventually blow this false datum with a resulting freeing up of the artist's ability to think and produce in the area.

MISUNDERSTOODS

Misunderstoods often come up during False Data Stripping and should be cleared when they do. One would then continue with the False Data Stripping. One person being false data stripped knew he had some false data from a particular source but the false data was a complete blank-he couldn't remember it at all. It was discovered that he had a Mis-U just before he received the false data and as soon as this was cleared up he recalled the false data and it blew. This is just one example of how Word Clearing can tie in with False Data Stripping.

REPEATED USE

False Data Stripping can be done over and over as it will come off in layers as mentioned before. If False Data Stripping has been done on a specific thing and at some later point the person is having difficulty with a drill or the materials, the stripping of false data should be done on him again. In such a case it will be seen that the person recognizes or remembers more false or contrary data he has accumulated on the subject that was not in view earlier. As he duplicates a drill or his materials more and more exactly, former "interpretations" he had not-ised, incorrect past flunks that acted as invalidation or evaluation, etc., may crop up to be stripped off.

268

CAUTIONS

CODE. False Data Stripping is done under the discipline of the Auditor's Code. Evaluation and invalidation can be particularly harmful and must be avoided. All points of the code apply.

RUDIMENTS. One would not begin False Data Stripping on someone who already has out-ruds. If the person is upset or worried about something or is critical or nattery, then you should fly his ruds or get them flown before you start False Data Stripping.

OVERRUN. One must be particularly careful not to overrun the person past a blow of the false datum. The stress in recall is that it is a light action which does not get the person into engrams or heavy charge. Keep it light. If you overrun someone past the point of a blow, he may drop into engrams or heavy charge. Just take the recall step to a blow and don't push him beyond it.

DATE/LOCATE. Date/Locate is another way of getting something to blow. If a false datum does not blow on the recall steps despite going earlier similar, then it could be handled with Date/Locate *in session* as ordered by the C/S. This would normally be done as part of a False Data Stripping Repair List. Date/Locating false data would never be done except in session as ordered by the C/S or as directed by the False Data Stripping Repair List. The auditor must be totally starrated on Date and Locating and practised in it before he attempts it.

FALSE DATA STRIPPING REPAIR LIST. The False Data Stripping Repair List is used in session by an auditor when False Data Stripping bogs inextricably or the person is not F/N GIs at Exams or gets in trouble after False Data Stripping has been done. A bogged False Data Stripping session must be handled within 24 hours.

NEW STUDENTS. Students who are new to Scientology should not use this procedure on each other as they may be insufficiently experienced to deliver it competently. In this case the Supervisor or someone qualified would administer False Data Stripping to those students who need it.

SUMMARY

The problem of the person who is unable to learn or who is unable to apply what he learns has never been fully resolved before. Misunderstoods were and are a major factor and Word Clearing must be used liberally. Now, however, I have made a major breakthrough which finally explains and handles the problem of inability to learn and apply.

Man's texts and education systems are strewn with false data. These false data effectively block someone's understanding of the true data. The handling given in this **HCOB/PL makes it possible to remove that block and enable people to learn data** so they can apply it.

With the ability to learn comes stability and the production of valuable products. With stability and the production of valuable products comes the achievement of one's purposes and goals, high morale and happiness.

So let's get to work on stripping away the false data which plagues Man, clogs up his ability to think and learn and reduces his competence and effectiveness. Let's increase the ability of individuals and the human race.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:gal.gm Copyright © 1979 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

269

HUBBARD COMMUNICATION

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 23 AU

Issue I

Remimeo

Product Officers

Org Officers

Execs

All Staff

Programs Chiefs
Project Operators
Mission Operators
Missionaires
Assistant Guardians *Product Debug Series I*
Flag Representatives
LRH Communicators *Esto Series 37*
Cramming Officers
Review

DEBUG TECH

Ref. LRH ED 302 INT DEBUG TECH BREAKTHROUGH
HCO PL 23 Aug 79 11 DEBUG TECH CHECKLIST
HCOB 23 Aug 79 11 PRODUCT DEBUG REPAIR LIST
HCOB 17 Jun 79 URGENT, IMPORTANT-CRASHING
MIS-Us: THE KEY TO COMPLETED
CYCLES OF ACTION AND PRODUCTS
HCOB 7 Aug 79 FALSE DATA STRIPPING
HCO PL 26 Mar 79RA MISUNDERSTOOD WORDS AND
CYCLES OF ACTION-MU
WORDS AND NO PRODUCTS
HCOB 23 Aug 79 1 CRASHING MUs, BLOCKS TO
FINDING THEM

When I wrote **LRH ED 302 DEBUG TECH BREAKTHROUGH** in February of this year I promised that there would be a policy letter issued covering the tech more fully. Well, there have been further breakthroughs in the area of debugging production. The tech given in that LRH ED has been acclaimed by hundreds to be miraculous. This policy reissues that tech and brings it up-to-date with the new discoveries.

HISTORY

Recently I noticed quite a few programs were not progressing rapidly. I found many targets bugged. Project operators did not seem to know what to do and were getting losses and becoming frustrated. Their targets were "bugged."

"Bugged" is slang for snarled up or halted.

"Debug" means to get the snarls or stops out of something.

I had always been given to believe somebody had developed and written up debug tech. People would often tell me they had debugged this or that, so of course I assumed that the tech existed and that issues and checksheets existed and were in use. Yet here were people operating projects who couldn't get the targets done by themselves or others.

I didn't recall ever having written any policy letter containing the tech of debugging programs or targets.

So I called for the various "debug checksheets" and "debug issues" they were

270

using and found something very astonishing. None had any real tech on them to debug something. They just had various quotes that did not necessarily apply.

I did a study of the subject based on what people trying to debug should be doing and what they were not doing and developed a fast, relatively simple system. Some project operators were located in very bugged areas which had brought them to apathy and even tears of frustration. The new debug tech was put into their hands and they came streaming back in wild excitement. It worked! Their areas were rolling!

I am releasing this tech to you as it is vital that programs are quickly executed and that production occurs.

This debug tech is tested, fully valid and for immediate use.

Debug tech is a vital executive tool. Anyone who is responsible for getting targets and programs executed, getting production out, turning insolvency into solvency and generally making a better world frankly can't live without it.

Debug tech is used to debug program targets, programs, a lack of completion of the cycles of action which lead to production and in short, whenever there *is any* insufficiency of viable products coming from an area, org or individual.

THE TECH

1. INSPECTION

The first action in debugging an area is an inspection to see what is going on in terms of production. In inspecting the area you do the following:

1. You look for what products have been gotten out in the past.
2. You look for products that are there completed.
3. You look for what products can be attained in the immediate future.
4. You look for the **value of the products produced** as compared to the overall cost of the production organization.
5. You look for overt products or cycles where products continuously have to be redone, resulting in no or few products.

The full volume of data on how to do an investigation is given in the Investigations Checksheet on page 175 of *The Volunteer Minister's Handbook*.

When you first inspect an **area for products you just** look. Policies on "Look Don't Listen" apply (HCO PL 16 Mar 72, Esto Series 8, LOOK DON'T LISTEN). Don't listen to how they are going to get 150 products, just look and walk around with a clipboard.

If you don't see 150 products waiting to be shipped or invoices showing they have been, they don't exist. If you don't see receipts for 150 shipped products, they don't exist and never have. The

product is either there or there is ample shipping or departure or finance evidence that they have just left or been shipped. Products that are only in people's heads don't exist.

Dreams are nice-in fact they are essential in life but they have to be materialized into the physical universe before they exist as *products*.

The most wide trap the debugger can fall into is, "But next week since experience will tell you that next week's production may never arrive. The definition of product is something that can be exchanged for a valuable product or currency. They

271

have subproducts. These are necessary. A subproduct can also be an overt product and block final products.

When you have ~done your product inspection, you then look over the period of time from a viewpoint of time and motion. This is to answer the question, "Are things arranged so that there is no time wasted in useless motions which are unnecessary?" This includes poor placement of materiel on a flow line or tool sheds five miles from the site of work so that one has to go there every time one wants a hammer, out-of-sequence flows or waits.

One counts up the amount of wasted time simply because of the disorganization of a place. It isn't enough to say a place is disorganized. How is this disorganization consuming time and motion which is not resulting in a higher quantity of production? Examples of this are quite gross.

When you have done this study, during which of course you have made notes, you will have the raw materials necessary to make an estimation of the area.

If there is not an adequate and even spectacular record of products getting out and if products have to be redone or if no products are coming out, you proceed as follows:

11. PERSONAL HANDLING

Find a product that *can* be gotten out, any product, and insist that it and products like it or similar cycles be gotten out flat out by the existing personnel.

Do not let this debug act as an excuse for them not to produce. The first step of this handling is to demand production.

When you have gotten them on that, you enter in upon a second stage of debug. This consists essentially of finding if the place is knowledgeable enough and able enough to produce what is actually required and what is actually valuable or being needed from it.

This is accomplished as follows:

(Note: You should not attempt to find Crashing MUs, etc., until the above inspection and the Steps A to H below have been done.)

A. Where are the orders relating to this target (or project or production area)? (Can include policies, directives, orders, bulletins, issues, despatches, tapes, valid texts and previous debugs and any and all files.)

Handling: Collect up all of the orders relating to this target (or project or production area). This includes the orders and policies the person is operating off of as well as all those he should be operating off of. At this point you may need to employ the "How to Defeat Verbal Tech Checklist":

- 1 . If it isn't written it isn't true.
2. If it's written, read it.
3. Did the person who wrote it have the authority or know-how to order it?
4. If you can't understand it, clarify it.
5. If you can't clarify it, clear the MUs.
6. If the MUs won't clear, query it.
7. Has it been altered from the original?

272

8. Get it validated as a correct, on-channel, on-policy, in-tech order.
9. Only if it holds up this far, force others to read it and follow it.

IF IT CAN'T BE RUN THROUGH AS ABOVE *IT'S FALSE!* CANCEL IT! And use HCOB 7 Aug 79 FALSE DATA STRIPPING as needed.

B. Have you read the orders?

Handling: If he has not read them then have him read, word clear and starrate them.

Ca. Do you have MUs on these orders?

Handling: Get the orders word cleared using M4, M9 or M2 Word Clearing whatever Word Clearing is needed to fully clear any MUs he has.

Cb. Do you have false data on these orders?

Handling: Strip off the false data per HCOB/PL 7 Aug 79 FALSE DATA STRIPPING,

Handle this step (Ca and Cb) until the person has duplicated the orders and issues relating to this production area.

D. Are there financial or logistics problems on them?

Handling: Debug using HCO PL 14 Mar 72, Issue II, Esto Series 7, FOLLOW POLICY AND LINES and Flag Divisional Directive of 25 Aug 76 FINANCIAL PLANNING MEMBER HAT CHECKSHEET. Debugging this may require getting the whole FP Committee through the FP pack.

E. Are there personnel problems?

Handling: Debug this using HCO PL 16 Mar 71, Org Series 25, Personnel Series 19, LINES AND HATS and the Personnel Series, as given in *The Management Series*.

It may be necessary to do this debug on the HAS or any person responsible for getting the products of staff members who produce.

F. Are there hatting problems?

Handling: Handle this using full Word Clearing and False Data Stripping and get the scene debugged using HCO PL 29 Jul 71, Personnel Series 21, Org Series 28, WHY HATTING? and HCO PL 22 Sep 70, Personnel Series 9, Org Series 4, HATS and HCO PL 27 Dec 70, Personnel Series 16, HATS PROGRAM PITFALLS.

Hatting problems may include the total and utter lack of a hatting course for the staff or a hatting course where WHAT IS A COURSE? PL is flagrantly not in and if you find this you have

gotten to the root of why you are working hard debugging all over the place and it had better be handled quick.

It may also be that the area senior doesn't make sure his staff puts in study time off production hours and in this you may find the senior is a failed student himself and this you would also have to handle.

Note: A person who cannot be hatted at all has false data. The handling would be to strip off the false data.

273

G. Is there exterior influence stopping the production which cannot be handled in the production area?

Handling: Handle using HCO PL 31 Jan 72, Data Series 22, THE WHY IS GOD and HCO PL 25 May 73, Data Series 27, SUPPLEMENTARY EVALUATIONS and HCO PL 30 Dec 70, Org Series 20, ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL.

When told that these exterior influences exist the wise debugger immediately verifies. The simplest way to verify is to ask the person who is supposed to be putting stops on the line if he has issued such orders. You commonly find out he hasn't. But if he has, then you have started to locate your area to handle.

You commonly run into verbal tech at which moment you use the "How to Defeat Verbal Tech Checklist."

H. What other excuses exist?

Handling: As per HCO PL THE WHY IS GOD, HCO PL 19 May 70, Data Series 8, SANITY, HCO PL 30 Sep 73, Data Series 30, SITUATION HANDLING and HCOB 19 Aug 67, THE SUPREME TEST.

And once any obvious ones in the above have been handled, and production still isn't rolling, you have

1. Routine finding of MUs per Word Clearing Series.

J. Crashing MU tech per HCOB 17 Jun 79 CRASHING MIS-Us: THE KEY TO COMPLETED CYCLES OF ACTION AND PRODUCTS. Crashing MU Finding is done exactly per this HCOB. Crashing MUs can be buried or suppressed as covered in HCOB 23 Aug 79, CRASHING MUs, BLOCKS TO FINDING THEM. The factors as listed in that HCOB which can cause a Crashing MU to remain hidden and unknown may have to be handled before the Crashing MU appears.

K. Do they have any idea at all that they should be getting out any products? Or do they pretend to but don't?

Handling: Simply two-way comm of why the guy was there. It might come as a startling realization that he is supposed to get out products. This can be backed up with Exchange by Dynamics, HCO PL 4 Apr 72, Esto Series 14, ETHICS and Short Form Product Clearing, HCO PL 13 Mar 72, Esto Series 5, PRODUCTION AND ESTABLISH MENT-ORDERS AND PRODUCTS or HCO PL 23 Mar 72, Esto Series 11, FULL PRODUCT CLEARING LONG FORM.

There is also such a thing as a person who will not complete a cycle of action. This is normally true of what we call a "suppressive person" or even an insane person.

Handling: Get the person's case looked into by a competent C/S and also by the Ethics Officer for background.

But as PTS people are in suppressive persons' valences he may only be PTS.

Handling: See Section P below for de-PTSing.

L. Wrong stat. The person has been given a stat that has nothing to do with what he is supposed to produce.

Handling: Get the right stat figured out so that it agrees with what he is supposed to produce and actually measures his actual production.

M. Wrong VFP or wrong product? Do they have the idea of VFP right? (or does

274

the org think it's the award rather than the product, i.e. GI rather than an audited paying pc or a trained paying student?).

It of course can occur, amazingly, that the person or department, etc., is trying to turn out a product that has no exchange value. This can occur because what they do produce is so flabby as to be called "an overt product" which nobody can use further on up the line or even at the end of the line. You handle this by coming down on their sense of fitness of things. Overt products waste resources and time and personnel and are actually more destructive than on first glance. They cannot be exchanged but they also waste resources as well as lose any expected return. You can remedy this sort of thing by improving their tech so they do turn out something decent and useful.

They can also be turning out a type of product nobody wants-such as 1819 buggy whips in a Space Age. They may be great buggy whips but they won't exchange because nobody wants them.

They may also be getting out products of excellent quality but never tell anybody they have or do them. This can apply as narrowly as one worker who doesn't tell anybody he is having or doing them or a whole organization which, with complete asininity, never markets or advertises their products.

It is also possible that a combination of all three things above may be found.

It also may be they have all sorts of products they could get out but they never dreamed of getting them out yet their life blood may depend upon it.

Handling: **HCO PL 24 Jul 78, SUBPRODUCTS**, which tells how to compile a subproducts list and attain VFPs. Exchange by Dynamics per HCO PL 4 Apr 72, Esto Series 14, ETHICS and Full Product Clearing Long Form on the correct and actual VFP (as well as any other products the person or area may have), as well as marketing and PR tech.

N. Never figured out what they would have to do to get a product?

Handling: Handle this using HCO PL 7 Aug 76, Issue 1, 11 and 111, Admin Know-How Series 33, NAME YOUR PRODUCT, Admin Know-How Series 34, WANT YOUR PRODUCT, Admin Know-How Series 35, TO GET YOU HAVE TO KNOW HOW TO ORGANIZE, HCO PL 24 Jul 78, SUBPRODUCTS and HCO PL 14 Jan 69, OT ORGS.

0. Out-ethics?

Handling: Determine the situation and handle with O/W write-ups or auditing and ethics conditions or correction of past conditions and the ethics policies that apply.

P. Is the area or individual creating problems and demanding solutions to them?

Handling: Give the person PTS handling as per ethics policies. If and when available, get the personnel de-PTSed using Clay Table De-PTSing as per HCOB CLAY TABLE DE-PTSing-THEORY AND ADMINISTRATION. (Note: Clay Table De-PTSing can only be done on someone by a person who has had the step himself.)

Q. Total organize? (Is the area organizing only?)

Handling: This is an indicator of many misunderstands in the area, especially on the part of its senior. The senior and the personnel in the area need full Word Clearing on the materials to do with the production area, including Crashing MU Finding as in J (ref. HCO PL 26 Mar 79RA **MISUNDERSTOOD WORDS AND**

275

CYCLES OF ACTION-MU WORDS AND NO PRODUCTS) off production hours and meanwhile make them produce what they can.

R. Organization adequate to get the product?

Inadequate organization:

Handling: Debug the organization per HCO PL 13 Sep 70, Org Series 1, BASIC ORGANIZATION, HCO PL 14 Sep 70, Org Series 2, COPE AND ORGANIZE, HCO PL 14 Sep 70, Org Series 3, HOW TO ORGANIZE AN ORG, HCO PL 8 Oct 70, Org Series 8, ORGANIZING AND PRODUCT, HCO PL 29 Oct 70, Org Series 10, THE ANALYSIS OF ORGANIZATION BY PRODUCT.

No organization:

Handling: This is the situation where someone does not organize any corner of his area or work or organizations or lines. This manifests itself by irrational demands to only produce and to prevent any organization so that production can occur. The handling is to clear the misunderstands (including Crashing MUs) in the area, particularly on the purpose of the production and why one is producing.

Lacking a sense of organization?

Handling: Lack of a sense of organization lies below the level of MUs, overts and withholds and PTSness-and you have to go north through PTSness and overts and withholds to even get to the MUs.

The handling would be de-PTSing as in Step P. Then handle any overts and withholds and then clear the MUs in the area being addressed (including Crashing MUS).

Debug tech is laid out as a checklist in HCO PL 23 Aug 79, Issue 11, DEBUG TECH CHECKLIST. It is a very useful checklist as the points of debug can be assessed on a meter **by an auditor (or any person trained to use an E-Meter) or** be administratively used by anyone wishing to debug an area.

HCOB 23 Aug 79, Issue II, PRODUCT DEBUG REPAIR LIST is for use by an auditor to repair someone who has been messed up by somebody trying to debug his area. As faulty debugging can mess a person up, this repair list has been written to remedy that, should it occur.

Normally, in an area that is very bogged and not producing, the first question or two will deliver the reasons right into your hands. They are trying to produce blue ruddy rods but the order they finally dig up after a fifteen minute search says specifically and directly that green fingleburns are what are wanted here and that blue ruddy rods are forbidden. It is usually outrageous and large. As you go down the list you will find out that you are running into things which open the door to justification. So you take very good care to notice the justifications which are being used. The handling of justifications is indicated in HCOB 23 Aug 79, Issue 1, CRASHING MUs, BLOCKS TO FINDING THEM and the HCOB of JUSTIFICATIONS, 21 Jan AD10.

WHAT TO HANDLE

Handling of course is indicated by what you find and the above references. But handling must always be in the direction of at least 50% production. Even while debugging do not go for an all-organize handling. Also do not go for an all-production handling.

A person, once trained on the data as contained in this PL, Crashing MU tech, False Data Stripping and Product Clearing, will be able to get almost any area

276

debugged and producing. It is important to remember that debug tech applies from the very small expected action to the huge expected project.

THE EP OF DEBUG

The above debug actions are never carried on past the point where the target or area or individual or org has been debugged.

Once production has been debugged and desirable products are now being gotten for real in adequate quantity, the debug has been accomplished.

This could occur at any one of the above steps. And when it does you let the area get on with producing the products they are now able to produce.

EVALUATION AND PROGRAMMING

There is a whole different technology called evaluation. The full tech on how to execute and program is contained in the Data Series and the Data Series Evaluator's Course and BPL 4 Jul 78 ELEMENTARY EVALUATOR'S COURSE and the Target Series HCO PLs: 14 Jan 69 OT ORGS, 16 Jan 69 TARGETS, TYPES OF, 18 Jan 69, Issue 11, PLANNING AND TARGETS, 24 Jan 69, TARGET TYPES, 24 Jan 69, Issue 11, PURPOSE AND TARGETS and HCO PL 4 Dec 73, Data Series 32, TARGET TROUBLES. One is expected to know how to evaluate. But even after you have evaluated, evaluations contain targets. And targets get bugged. So you will need debug tech even when you are an accomplished evaluator.

With the debug tech and the added steps of Crashing MU Finding, overts and withholds, False Data Stripping, Product Clearing, etc., you will be able to crack the back of the most resistive nonproducing areas and get them into roaring, high-morale production.

Between February 79 and 23 August 79, I have spent a great deal of development time on the technology needed to completely debug people, projects, targets and production. A very large number of missions, researches and pilots were undertaken to discover and polish up this tech. It can now be considered a completed development cycle.

The above IS the tech.

USE IT!

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:kjm.gm Copyright c 1979 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

277

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 23 AUGUST 1979

Issue II

Remimeo

Tech

Qual

All Execs

All Staff

Programs Chiefs

Project Operators

Mission Operators

Missionaires

AGs

LRH Comms *Esto Series 38*

FRs

Product Debug Series 2

DEBUG TECH CHECKLIST

Ref: HCO PL 23 Aug 79 DEBUG TECH

Issue I

HCOB 23 Aug 79 PRODUCT DEBUG REPAIR LIST

Issue 11

The Product Debug Series

This checklist is clarified by HCO PL 23 August 79, Issue 1, DEBUG TECH, and is used in conjunction with that PL.)

Production is the basis of morale. People who don't get products have low morale.

Executives and responsible people have the task of getting out products. When they don't get them out, the unit or organization fails.

It is extremely upsetting and puzzling to a staff member and to his seniors when he can't get out the products expected of him. I have seen an executive going around in circles for weeks trying to guess why such and such a staff member couldn't get out the products of his post area. I have seen staff members actually in tears because they were unable to achieve the products of their post. I have

also seen people busy, busy, busy and totally unaware of the fact that they were producing absolutely nothing.

LRH ED 302 was a breakthrough. It has now been written into HCO PL 23 Aug 79, DEBUG TECH and contains a considerably expanded tech on how to debug products. People have had very great success in applying it.

To give them even greater successes, I have rewritten LRH ED 302-1 into this PL. The whole object of this checklist is to debug a lack of products and accomplishments of an org or post.

This Debug Checklist is used in conjunction with HCO PL DEBUG TECH. It gives the person doing the debug a list of things that could be standing in the way of production. The sequence of handling is as laid out in the Debug Tech PL. The first action is an inspection of the area. Then come the personal handling steps.

This sequence must be followed in any debug action. For instance, if you haven't done the inspection then how would you know what it is you are trying to debug?

This checklist can be assessed on a meter or be administratively used (off the meter) by mission operators, program operators, project operators, evaluators, executives and anyone else needing to debug a cycle of action or lack of products, including any staff member or student himself.

278

When assessed on a meter, each reading line would be taken to F/N by doing the handling given for that line.

When doing this checklist the individual should have the issues and references he may need to carry out the handlings along with him.

THE EP OF DEBUG

Debug actions are never carried on past the point where the target or area or individual or org has been debugged.

Once production has been debugged and desirable products are now being gotten for real in adequate quantity, the debug has been accomplished.

This could occur at any one of the steps. And when it does you let the area get on with producing the products they are now able to produce.

PRODUCT DEBUG REPAIR LIST

In case of a bog or trouble on the following checklist use HCOB 23 Aug 79, Issue 11, Product Debug Series 10, PRODUCT DEBUG REPAIR LIST to repair the person so he can continue with the debug actions.

INSPECTION

00. The first action in debugging an area is an inspection to see what is going on in terms of production. In inspecting the area you do the following:

1. You look for what products have been gotten out in the past.
2. You look for products that are there completed.
3. You look for what products can be attained in the immediate future.

4. You look for the value of the products produced as compared to the overall cost of the production organization.

5. You look for overt products or cycles where products continuously have to be redone, resulting in no or few products.

Full data on how to do this inspection is given in HCO PL 23 Aug 79, Issue 1, DEBUG TECH.

0. Find a product that *can* be gotten out, any product, and insist that it and products like it or similar cycles be gotten out flat out by the existing personnel.

THE CHECKLIST

Section A:

A 1. **NO ORDERS?**

(Find out if (a) **he's needing orders due** to not knowing his hat or if (b) he's not getting any direction or guidance from his senior. Handle (a) by getting him hatted, or (b) by doing this checklist on his senior.)

A2. NEVER RECEIVED THE ORDERS?

(Have him get the orders and handle any cut line that isn't relaying the orders.)

A3. CROSS ORDERS?

(Find out what and handle per HCO PL 13 Jan AD29, ORDERS, ILLEGAL AND CROSS.)

279

A4. ILLEGAL ORDERS?

(Find out what and handle per HCO PL 13 Jan AD29, ORDERS, ILLEGAL AND CROSS.)

A5. VERBAL TECH?

(Find out what and handle per the "How to Defeat Verbal Tech Checklist" and HCO PL 7 Aug 79, FALSE DATA STRIPPING.)

Section B:

B 1. HASN'T READ THE ORDERS?

(Have him read, word clear and starrate the orders.)

B2. AVOIDANCE OR NEGATION OF POLICY?

(Pull the O/Ws per W/H system. Then clear up his MUs on the relevant policy.)

B3. POLICY UNKOWN?

(Determine what applicable policy is unknown to him and have him read, word clear and starrate it.)

B4. NO POLICY?

(Have him work out what the policy should be and submit it for approval.)

B5. LACK OF TECH?

(Have him get familiar with the exact problem he's encountering and make him work out a solution that will handle it.)

Section C:

C 1. MISUNDERSTOODS?

(Find and clear the MUs.)

C2. MISUNDERSTOODS ON THE ORDERS? (Find and clear the MUs.)

C3. DOESN'T UNDERSTAND THE ORDERS? (Handle with Word Clearing and False Data Stripping.)

C4. FALSE DATA ON THE ORDERS?

(Handle with HCO PL 7 Aug 79, **FALSE DATA STRIPPING.**)

C5. OUT OF AGREEMENT WITH THE ORDERS?

(Handle any out-ruds. Then handle with Word Clearing and False Data Stripping.)

C6. LACK OF INTEREST?

(Find out if it's out-ruds or MUs or past failures and handle accordingly.)

C7. NO INTEREST?

(Find out if it's out-ruds or MUs or past failures and handle accordingly.)

C8. LACK OF VALUE OF THE CYCLE OF ACTION ITSELF? (Find his MUs and handle. Have him demo out the cycle of action.)

Section D:

D 1. FINANCE BUGS?

(Find out what and get it debugged and also if it amounts to that, get the whole FP Committee through the FP pack.)

280

D2. LOGISTICS PROBLEMS?

(Find out what it is and handle with HCO PL 14 Mar 72, Issue 11, Esto Series 7, FOLLOW POLICY AND LINES, and any other debug tech needed.)

D3. NO EQUIPMENT?

(Find out what is needed, if it is really needed, and if so debug it per D I and D2 above so it is gotten. Remember that there are enormous percentages of people who absolutely have to have before they can possibly do and use that usually as an excuse not to produce.)

Section E:

E 1. SCARCITY OF PERSONNEL?

(Indicate it and then investigate and handle HCO which is usually up to its ears in personnel requests and busy on them instead of putting an HCO there that properly recruits, hats and utilizes personnel. This may mean doing this Debug Checklist on the HAS or any person responsible for that division or activity because they aren't getting the products of staff members who produce.)

E2. SOME OTHER PROBLEM WITH PERSONNEL?

(Debug this using HCO PL 16 Mar 71, Org Series 25, Personnel Series 19, LINES AND HATS and the Personnel Series as given in *The Management Series*.)

Section F.-

F1. ABSENCE OF HATTING?

(Find out if it's (a) lack of a hatting course for the staff, (b) a hatting course where WHAT IS A COURSE? PL is flagrantly not in, (c) the area senior doesn't make sure his staff put in study time off production hours or (d) some other reason why he does not go to study. Handle according to what comes up and HCO PL 23 Aug 79, Issue 1, DEBUG TECH.)

F2. DOESN'T ATTEND STUDY?

(Find out if it's (a) lack of a hatting course for the staff, (b) a hatting course where WHAT IS A COURSE? PL is flagrantly not in, (c) the area senior doesn't make sure his staff put in study time off production hours or (d) some other reason why he does not go to study. Handle according to what comes up and HCO PL 23 Aug 79, Issue 1, DEBUG TECH.)

F3. ABSENCE OF DRILLING?

(Get any needed drilling on equipment and actions done.)

F4. ABSENCE OF CRAMMING?

(Get the subject cramming is needed on and send him to Cramming.)

F5. FALSE CRAMMING?

(Handle per HCO PL 7 Aug 79, FALSE DATA STRIPPING. Assess and handle a Cramming Repair List if necessary.)

F6. A DISASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE DEFINITION AND THE PHYSICAL UNIVERSE?

(Have him demonstrate-in clay if necessary-and give real examples of the definition. Program him for M8 and M9 program and the Disassociation Rundown.)

F7. FALSE DATA ON THE HATTING MATERIALS? (Handle with False Data Stripping.)

281

F8. LACK OF TECHNICAL KNOW-HOW?

(Locate the area of technical know-how he is lacking in and get him studying and drilling the tech on it.)

F9. UNABLE TO BE HATTED?

(Strip off the false data in the area with False Data Stripping.)

Section G:

G1. EXTERIOR INFLUENCE STOPPING THE PRODUCTION

WHICH CANNOT BE HANDLED IN THE PRODUCTION AREA?

(Handle per Section G of HCO PL 23 Aug 79. Issue 1, DEBUG TECH.)

Section H.-

H 1. OTHER EVENTS?

(Find out what and handle per HCO PL 23 Aug 79, Issue 1, DEBUG TECH.)

H2. OTHER REASONS?

(Find out what and handle per HCO PL 23 Aug 79, Issue 1, DEBUG TECH.)

H3. HUGE PRODUCTION BUG?

(Find out what and use full debug tech to handle.)

H4. TIME?

(Find out if there's just NOT ENOUGH time to do what he has to do or if he's wasting time by not being organized or is being dev-ted and handle.)

H5. LACK OF PROXIMITY TO THE SCENE?

(Have him get on the correct comm lines and get in ARC with the scene. Handle ruds if necessary.)

H6. NO COMM LINES?

(Determine whether this is from W/Hs or MUs and handle accordingly.)

H7. INABILITY TO COMMUNICATE?

(Pull his W/Hs. Make him do Reach and Withdraw on the people and objects of his area. Program him for the M8 and M9 program course.)

H8. ABSENCE OF ALTITUDE?

(Have him read HCO PL 4 Oct 68, ETHICS PRESENCE and Exec Series I and 2 and have him demo how he can use them.)

H9. BAD HEALTH?

(Send him to the MO on an MO routing form and get it handled. Get any needed PTS handling done.)

H10. LUCK?

(2WC his considerations on it and bring his cause level up by getting him to look at what *he* can do about it.)

Section I.-

11. MISUNDERSTOODS IN THE PRODUCTION AREA?

(Routine Word Clearing per the Word Clearing Series.)

282

12. MISUNDERSTOODS ON WHAT IS SUPPOSED TO BE DONE? (Routine Word Clearing per the Word Clearing Series.)

13. CONFUSIONS IN THE AREA?

(Routine Word Clearing per the Word Clearing Series.)

Section J_-

J 1. CRASHING MISUNDERSTOOD?

(Crashing MU Finding per HCOB 17 June 79, CRASHING MISUs: THE KEY TO COMPLETED CYCLES OF ACTION AND PRODUCTS.)

J2. TROUBLE COMPLETING CYCLES OF ACTION IN THE PRODUCTION AREA?

(Crashing MU Finding per HCOB 17 June 79, CRASHING MISUs: THE KEY TO COMPLETED CYCLES OF ACTION AND PRODUCTS.)

Section K..

KI. NO IDEA AT ALL THAT PRODUCTS SHOULD BE GOTTEN OUT?

(Simply two-way comm of why the guy is there. It might come as a startling realization that he is supposed to get out any products. This can be backed up by Exchange by Dynamics-HCO PL 4 Apr 72, Esto Series 14, ETHICS, and Short Form Product Clearing per HCO PL 13 Mar 72, Esto Series 5, PRODUCTION AND ESTABLISHMENT-ORDERS AND PRODUCTS or HCO PL 23 Mar 72, Esto Series 11, FULL PRODUCT CLEARING LONG FORM.)

K2. PRETENDING TO KNOW THAT PRODUCTS SHOULD BE GOTTEN OUT BUT DON'T?

(Simply two-way comm of why the guy is there. It might come as a startling realization that he is supposed to get out any products. This can be backed up by Exchange by Dynamics-HCO PL 4 Apr 72, Esto Series 14, ETHICS and Short Form Product Clearing per HCO PL 13 Mar 72, Esto Series 5, PRODUCTION AND ESTABLISHMENT-ORDERS AND PRODUCTS or HCO PL 23 Mar 72, Esto Series 11, FULL PRODUCT CLEARING LONG FORM.)

K3. WON'T COMPLETE A CYCLE OF ACTION?

(Get the person's case looked into by a competent C/S and an Ethics Officer for background. If you are dealing with a suppressive or insane person, handle per ethics policies. If it is PTSness, get the person de-PTSed.)

Section L:

L1. WRONG STAT.?

(Get the right stat figured out so that it agrees with what he is supposed to produce and actually measures his actual production.)

L2. DOES THE STAT HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH WHAT IS SUPPOSED TO BE BEING PRODUCED?

(Get the right stat figured out so that it agrees with what he is supposed to produce and actually measures his actual production.)

283

Section M:

M I. WRONG VFP9

(Use HCO PL 24 July 78, SUBPRODUCTS and Exchange by Dynamics and Full Product Clearing Long Form on the correct and actual VFP-as well as any other products the person or area might have.)

M2. WRONG PRODUCT?

(Use HCO PL 24 July 78, SUBPRODUCTS and Exchange by Dynamics and Full Product Clearing Long Form on the correct and actual VFP-as well as any other products the person or area might have.)

M3. NO IDEA OF THE PRODUCT?

(Get a complete and accurate statement of the correct product and Product Clear him on it. See also HCO PL 7 Aug 76, Issue 1, Esto Series 31, PRODUCT/ORG OFFICER SYSTEM, NAME YOUR PRODUCT.)

M4. UNSURE OF WHAT THE PRODUCT IS?

(Get a complete and accurate statement of the correct product and Product Clear him on it. See also HCO PL 7 Aug 76, Issue 1, Esto Series 31, PRODUCT/ORG OFFICER SYSTEM, NAME YOUR PRODUCT.)

M5. THINKING IT'S THE AWARD RATHER THAN THE PRODUCT.? (Use HCO PL 24 July 78, SUBPRODUCTS and Exchange by Dynamics and Full Product Clearing Long Form on the correct and actual VFP-as well as any other products the person or area might have.)

M6. DOES THE PRODUCT HAVE NO EXCHANGE VALUE?

(Use HCO PL 24 July 78, SUBPRODUCTS and Exchange by Dynamics and Full Product Clearing Long Form on the correct actual VFP-as well as any other products the person or area might have, and per HCO PL 23 Aug 79, Issue 1, DEBUG TECH, Section M.)

M7. OVERT PRODUCTS?

(Handle any W/Hs connected with this. Then handle per HCO PL DEBUG TECH, Section M.)

M8. IS THE PRODUCT A PRODUCT THAT NOBODY WANTS?

(Handle any W/Hs connected with this. Then handle per HCO PL DEBUG TECH, Section M.)

M9. NO MARKETING OR ADVERTISING OF THE PRODUCT?

(Handle any W/Hs connected with this. Then handle per HCO PL DEBUG TECH, Section M.)

Section N:

NI. NEVER FIGURED OUT WHAT WOULD HAVE TO BE DONE TO GET A PRODUCT?

(Handle per HCO PL DEBUG TECH, Section N.)

Section O:

01. OUT-ETHICS?

(Determine the situation and handle with O/W write-ups or auditing and ethics conditions or correction of past ethics conditions and the ethics policies that apply.)

284

02. ACTIVE CO UNTER- INTENTION?

(Pull the O/Ws and then locate the MUs. Then watch him and remove him if he remains CI.)

03. ACTIVE COUNTER-INTENTION ON THE PART OF OTHERS?

(Find out who. Handle any agreement he has with their CI as a W/H. Get the person or persons who have CI handled on their O/Ws and get their MUs found. Remove if the person or persons remain CL)

04. OTHER-INTENTIONEDNESS?

(Pull the O/Ws and then locate the MUs. Then watch him and remove him if he remains other-intentioned.)

05. OTHER-INTENTIONEDNESS ON THE PART OF OTHERS?

(Find out who. Handle any agreement he has with their otherintention as a W/H. Get the person or persons who have otherintention handled on their O/Ws and get their MUs found. Remove if the person or persons remain other-intentioned.)

Section P:

P1. CREATING PROBLEMS AND DEMANDING SOLUTIONS TO THEM?

(Give the person PTS handling as per ethics policies. If and when available get the personnel de-PTSed with clay table de-PTSing, as covered in HCOB 28 Aug 79, CLAY TABLE DE-PTSING-THEORY AND ADMINISTRATION.)

P2. LOTS OF UNSOLVABLE PROBLEMS IN THE AREA?

(Give the person PTS handling as per ethics policies. If and when available get the personnel de-PTSed with clay table de-PTSing, as covered in HCOB 28 Aug 79, CLAY TABLE DE-PTSING-THEORY AND ADMINISTRATION.)

P3. CONNECTED TO SOMEONE OR SOMETHING ANTAGONISTIC?

(Give the person PTS handling as per ethics policies. If and when available get the personnel de-PTSed with clay table de-PTSing, as covered in HCOB 28 Aug 79, CLAY TABLE DE-PTSING-THEORY AND ADMINISTRATION.)

P4. PTS?

(Give the person PTS handling as per ethics policies. If and when available get the personnel de-PTSed with clay table de-PTSing, as covered in HCOB 28 Aug 79, CLAY TABLE DE-PTSING-THEORY AND ADMINISTRATION.)

P5. ACCIDENTS?

(Give the person PTS handling as per ethics policies. If and when available get the personnel de-PTSed with clay table de-PTSing, as covered in HCOB 28 Aug 79, CLAY TABLE DE-PTSING-THEORY AND ADMINISTRATION.)

Section Q:

Q1. ORGANIZING ONLY?

(Handle his MUs in the area including any Crashing MUs.)

Q2. TOTAL ORGANIZATION?

(Handle his MUs in the area including any Crashing MUs.)

285

Section R:

R I. ORGANIZATION INADEQUATE TO GET THE PRODUCT? (Handle per Section R of HCO PL 23 Aug 79, DEBUG TECH.)

R2. LACK OF ORGANIZATION?

(Handle per Section R of HCO PL 23 Aug 79, DEBUG TECH.)

R3. NO ORGANIZING?

(Clear the misunderstands, including Crashing MUs, in the production area, particularly on the purpose of the production and why one is producing.)

R4. LACK OF A SENSE OF ORGANIZATION?

(De-PTSing as covered in Section P. Then handle any overts and withholds and then clear the MUs in the area, including Crashing MUS.)

R5. NO GRASP OF THE CONCEPT OF ORGANIZATION?

(De-PTSing as covered in Section P. Then handle any overts and withholds and then clear the MUs in the area, including Crashing MUS.)

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nc.gm Copyright c 1979 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

286

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 9 AUGUST 1979R

Remimeo Issue 11

All Orgs REVISED 19 NOVEMBER 1979

All Staff

(Revisions in this type style)

Establishment Officer Series 39

Org Series 39

SERVICE PRODUCT OFFICER

(This HCO PL has been revised in order to show the importance of the Product/Organizing Officer and Establishment Officer systems in relation to the Service Product Officer. These systems are totally valid and should be in full use in organizations.)

References:

The Flag Executive Briefing Course tape lectures

The Org Series

The Establishment Officer Series

HCO PL 9 Aug 79 1 CALL-IN: THE KEY TO FUTURE
DELIVERY AND INCOME

HCO PL 7 Aug 76 1 NAME YOUR PRODUCT

HCO PL 7 Aug 76 111 WANT YOUR PRODUCT

HCO PL 7 Aug 76 111 TO GET YOU HAVE TO KNOW HOW
TO ORGANIZE

HCO PL 20 Nov 65 THE PROMOTIONAL ACTIONS OF
AN ORGANIZATION

HCO PL 28 Jul 74 ADDITIONS TO PROMOTIONAL
ACTIONS OF AN ORGANIZATION

HCO PL 28 May 72 BOOM DATA

HCO PL 15 Nov 60 MODERN PROCUREMENT LETTERS

HCO PL 14 Feb 61 THE PATTERN OF A CENTRAL ORG

HCO PL 21 Nov 68 SENIOR POLICY

HCO PL 28 Feb 65 DELIVER

HCO PL 23 Aug 79 1 DEBUG TECH

HCO PL 23 Aug 79 // DEBUG TECH CHECKLIST

HCO PL 9 Aug 79 111 SERVICE/CALL-IN COMMITTEE

HCO PL 10 Jul 65 LINES AND TERMINALS ROUTING

The post of SERVICE PRODUCT OFFICER is hereby established in the Office of the CO/ED, Dept 19, of all Class IV and Sea Org orgs. His direct senior is the CO/ED.

Until such time as a SERVICE PRODUCT OFFICER is posted the responsibilities and duties are covered by the Service/Call-in Committee as fully laid out in HCO PL 9 Aug 79 1, CALL-IN: THE KEY TO FUTURE DELIVERY AND INCOME and HCO PL 9 Aug 79 111, SERVICE/CALL-IN COMMITTEE.

The VALUABLE FINAL PRODUCTS of this post are (1) flawlessly serviced and

completed paid pcs and students who re-sign-up for their next service, and (2) high quality promotional items in the hands of volumes of public who come in, sign-up and start an org service.

The main statistics for the SERVICE PRODUCT OFFICER are

(1) Number of pcs and students completed and re-signed on to their next service. (This includes those actually routed on to the next upper org for services and who do re-sign.)

(2) Number of public in and started onto a service.

Completion: By completion is meant those actions completed and attested at C & A and accompanied by an acceptable success story.

Re-sign: By re-sign-ups are meant pcs and students who, after completion of a service, see the Registrar to sign *up again* for another service while in the org.

Promotional Items: Those items which will produce income for the organization. By promotional items are meant those things which make Scientology and our products known and will cause people to respond either in person or by written reply to the result of receiving Scientology commodities. These are tours, book outlets, Sunday services, events, upstat image, fliers, info packs, handouts, books, ASR packs, specified service promotion, etc.

There are of course many other stats that reflect the SERVICE PRODUCT OFFICER'S subproducts and these are VSD, TOTAL GI, INTENSIVES COMPLETED, BULK MAIL OUT, NUMBER OF PROMOTIONAL ACTIONS OF THE ORG IN, NUMBER OF FULLY AND PARTIAL PAIDS GOTTEN INTO THE ORG AND ON TO THEIR NEXT SERVICE. These are very important parts of the SERVICE PRODUCT OFFICER HAT, as they reflect his subproducts which lead to his valuable final product.

SERVICE PRODUCT OFFICER

RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES

The purpose of an organization is to deliver service to the public. The primary functions which add up to delivery to the public are promotion, sales, call-in, delivery itself and re-sign. The Service Product Officer is responsible for the flow of PRODUCTS through these areas. He is a PRODUCT OFFICER. He names, wants and gets products in these areas and thus ensures that the organization is accomplishing its purpose of service to the public.

The full technology of Product Officers is explained in the Flag Executive Briefing Course lectures, where the Product/Org Officer system was developed. This system is still fully valid and is, in fact, the tech of the Service Product Officer. He is solely interested in products. When the Service Product Officer comes across a situation that requires organizing, he gets his Organizing Officer to handle it. The O/O (Organizing Officer) should actually be operating a few steps ahead of the Service Product Officer at all times-organizing for immediate production, per the Product/Org system. A full study of the Product/Org system, as contained in the FEBC tapes, the Org Series and Esto Series 33, 34 and 35, NAME, WANT AND GET YOUR PRODUCT, is recommended in order to attain a thorough understanding of the actions of the Service Product Officer and his Organizing Officer.

The Service Product Officer is not a stopgap at any point of the promotion, sales, call-in, delivery and re-sign lines, where executives have failed to post and hat staff. This would be the responsibility of the Exec Establishment Officer per Esto Series 1. Establishment Officers see that short and long-range establishment are occurring in the organization in the form of recruiting, hatting and training of staff The Esto system is a necessary and very vital tool for the Service Product Officer and the organization and should definitely be in full use.

The Service Product Officer has the authority to directly order or work with any terminal involved in the promotion, sales, call-in, delivery or re-sign areas so long as he maintains direct liaison with their seniors.

The Service Product Officer must be fully aware of every post in the org and what their jobs consist of. He must know who handles what cycles and what cycles are on the lines. For instance, it is up to the Service Product Officer to be aware of all promotional actions occurring in the org and who is doing them, or if they aren't getting done. He must be aware of what public aren't getting serviced and he ensures those responsible get them serviced. He doesn't do this himself as a serious goof of any Product Officer would be to go down the org board and do the job himself. The Service Product Officer must ensure others get the work done. Otherwise, he would wind up doing everyone's post and not getting anything done. It's actually pretty overwhelming to think of a Service Product Officer as responsible for doing everyone else's post duties. That's the sure-fire way to sink fast. Where a product isn't getting out the Service Product Officer debugs it using HCO PL DEBUG TECH, in order to get production. He is not interested in first finding the person's MU or excuse, he is interested in getting production occurring now. Let the Org Officer and Qual worry about the staff member's MUs.

Divisional Secretaries are the Product Officers for their division per the Product/Organizing Officer system. The Service Product Officer sees that the Product Officers over the whole delivery cycle are getting their products. He coordinates the flow of products from division to division. A Service Product Officer doing his post fully and properly is, in fact, the person that makes the org board work. He sees that products aren't jamming up at one point of the line, but that they continue through the organization.

The Service Product Officer walks into the Tech Div and finds the Tech Sec sitting at his desk, shuffling paper and the pcs are piling high and complaining about no service. The last thing the Service Product Officer would do is start organizing the Tech staff around and scheduling the pcs. No sir, that's a serious offense. The first thing he would do is find out what can **be produced RIGHT NOW**, what auditors can be gotten into session right now and **makes the Tech Sec do it and GET IT DONE**. This all takes about 15 minutes and he gets the area flowing again and then, WHAM! . . . he's out and into his next area. The Service Product Officer would not sit down and just start word clearing or doing Exchange by Dynamics on the Tech Sec. He would unstick the flows and get them moving. Then he would alert HCO and Qual to this serious problem of unhattedness and demand it be handled.

The basic sequence of the Service Product Officer on getting the products flowing off the lines is PUSH, DEBUG, DRIVE, NAME IT, WANT IT, AND GET IT. That's the only way you ever get a product. Products don't happen on their own.

This means he tells the Tech Sec to get Joe Blow there in session now! There is no general "audit these pcs." **You'd** never get a product that way.

The ED/CO has no authority to order the Service Product Officer to perform the total duties of any one post. The Service Product Officer must guard against being stuck into one post after another, doing it all himself. Nor is the Service Product Officer an "expeditor" for the CO/ED.

It is also very important that the Service Product Officer advise seniors that he is going into their areas so as not to create a Danger condition and wind up having to run the entire org. He also does this by getting the seniors to handle their juniors so a product is gotten. He does not walk in and cross-order the seniors of areas but works with them to see that products are produced.

The Service Product Officer is one who comes up with BIG IDEAS on getting public flooded into the org and being serviced swiftly. He is the one who thinks along the line of PRODUCTS PRODUCTS PRODUCTS. By spanning the divisions, he coordinates the product wanted and ensures

each division is aware of its part in getting this product and that their actions are uniform. Where the Service Product

289

Officer spots diversity, or lack of uniformity, he must alert his Org Officer or HCO. By doing the actions of coordination for a product and product demand, the Product Officer creates a team and more importantly sets the pace of the org's production and morale.

ORG LINES AND THE SERVICE PRODUCT OFFICER

There are certain aspects of the organization which the Service Product Officer must be thoroughly trained in to do his job properly.

The Service Product Officer must be fully aware of all the Valuable Final Products (VFPs) of each department and each division of the org. Without this the Service **Product Officer** can create havoc, as he would be ordering Division 6 to recruit or the Reges to supervise. By not knowing cold the org V17Ps, the Service Product **Officer would certainly jam the flows** throughout the org board.

A serious fault in any executive is not knowing the functions of terminals and the relation of one terminal to another. A key function of any executive is that of routing. An executive that misroutes communications and particles will tie his org in knots and wonder why no products are coming out. Therefore, a Service Product Officer must know cold every post function in the org and what particles belong on what lines.

He has got to know where a product comes from and where it goes in order to see it through the lines. A Product Officer's job is to name, want and get a product. However, he must first know where that product is to come from and where it is to go. This is an incredibly fundamental point.

In order for org lines to flow, routing forms (RFs) must be used. A routing form is a full step-by-step road map on which a particle travels. Every point a particle (which could be a student, pc, mail, etc.) must go through to wind up at its destination must be listed on the routing form.

The Service Product Officer's Organizing Officer must ensure routing forms exist and are in use for each and every line in an org he deals in. Both he and the Service Product Officer must know these forms cold and be able to instantly spot when a line is being abused or ignored so as to slam in the correct routing.

A Service Product Officer must fully clay demo all the lines of an organization for each and every product. This must include each particle from entrance to the org and through all lines on which that particle would flow until it leaves the org. Lines are the most fundamental point of administration. To not have a full grasp of these lines would be detrimental to any Product Officer.

SERVICE PRODUCT OFFICER

SEQUENCE OF ACTIONS

It is very easy for the Service Product Officer to become wrapped up in one area while neglecting the others; however, this must not be done as, while products might be getting through in one area, they may well be seriously bogging in others. The Service Product Officer is concerned with promotion, sales, call-in, delivery and re-sign. He begins his product officering in promotion and gets products out there or started and moves on to sales and gets them on to getting their products and so on through call-in and delivery and re-sign. He then returns to the beginning, promotion, and follows up on what he started there and gets even more production out. This is basically how the Service Product Officer moves through the org.

Daily, the Service Product Officer must plan and battle plan out his day. He must list those products he intends to achieve in each one of his areas and then gets them.

The Service Product Officer is not an "information courier" or "data gatherer." He is ahead of the game and *knows* the data. He must know what public haven't been regged in the org yet, he must know who hasn't been taken into session that day, or who

290

has been stuck in Ethics for 3 days, and ensure these things get handled. Therefore he must be quicker and faster than anyone else in the org and run run run.

PROMOTION

Promotion is the first action of the SERVICE PRODUCT OFFICER. He must ensure the many promotional pieces and actions are getting done. Some of these are

1. Selling of books.
2. Staff selling books.
3. Books placed in public bookstores.
4. Selling of books to FSMs, franchises, distributors, retailers and salesmen.
5. Books sold on each public contact.
6. Books advertised in mags, ads, posters, fliers, etc.
7. ASR packs.
8. Info packs.
9. Div 6 handouts for lectures and free testing.
10. Posters on major services in Div 6.
11. Promo to field auditors, FSMs, gung ho groups, Dianetic study groups.
12. Org mags.
13. Flag shooting boards.
14. Promo for future events and tours.
15. The AUDITOR (for SHs).
16. Clear News.
17. ADVANCE! mag (for AOs).
18. SOURCE mag (FSO).
19. 1 WANT TO GO CLEAR CLUB promo (AOs),
20. SHSBC/NED/ INTERNSHIPS /NOTs /GRADES, etc., specified in promo.
21. Promo at points of public inquiry.
22. Free testing ads.
23. Fliers inviting people to buy Scientology books.
24. More-Info-Cards used in books.

25. Ads in newspapers.
26. Questionnaires to detect people's plans for training and processing.
27. Enough letters to public so they come in.
28. All promotional actions per HCO PL 20 Nov 65, PROMOTIONAL ACTIONS OF AN ORGANIZATION.
29. Book seminars, public campaigns and lectures.
30. Public Reception display (books, posters, handouts, etc.).
31. Tours and events, Sunday service.
32. Free testing line.
33. Handling of gung ho groups, keeping FSMs well supplied and supervision of Dianetic study groups and FSMs.
34. Test centers outside the org as an extension.
35. Radio and TV advertisements.
36. Dept 17 services.
37. Reception greeting, handling, routing, chasing up people for appointments and handling incoming calls with ARC and efficiency.
38. Formation of Dianetic counseling groups.
39. Weekly tape and film plays.
40. Promotes the org and standard tech to Auditors Association.
41. Contacts and sees any sign of ARC broken field and alerts Chaplain to clean up the field.

The first thing a Service Product Officer would want to do is get out a large volume of promo to at least get some activity occurring. This would entail Dissern getting any promo laying around the org dug up and sent out to students and pcs. They would get it out in letters and mailings, they would get it handed out to students and pcs, they would pick up the half-completed promo piece, have it fixed up and sent out. They would have promo placed in Reception, in any public inquiry, etc. In other words, the Service Product Officer ensures that the org fully utilizes what promo they do have. He would also have specific promo pieces done to enlighten the field on what services

291

the org has. Where any of this bogged he would push-debug-drive-name it-want it-and get it.

The Service Product Officer, in trying to get in any promotional items, must review what resources he has. For example, is there a Dir Clearing; is there a Receptionist; etc.? He must concentrate on getting those terminals that already exist busy on promotional actions that will create the largest volume of inflow, *while his Organizing Officer works on getting more immediate resources to increase the volume even further.* It would be senseless to have the Dir Clearing running around trying to form up groups in an inactive field, single-handing, when he has FSMs that need to be gotten on to selecting and driving in new public. The Service Product Officer is

concerned with priorities of promotional actions, so must be totally aware of all the promotional items and actions that an org can produce.

Actions such as "improved org appearance," "high ARC handling," and "correct and efficient routing of public" can be put in instantly. If he has 2 people in all of Dissem he still can and must get the particles flowing and products coming off the line.

SALES

The sales lines consist of enlightening the public, having lines to sign people up, getting public into the org and signed up for service.

The following gives you an idea of some of the sales actions and lines in an org:

1. Body Reg phones and schedules public to come in for interview.
2. Use of CF to produce business.
3. Reges who accept advance registrations.
4. D of T procurement of students.
5. D of P procurement of pcs.
6. Receptionist sells to public coming in.
7. SHs in communication with the Class IV Org Tech Secs and Registrars and targeting them for public completing and routing on to the higher org.
8. AO's and SH's case consultant actions.
- 9. AO/SH events to Class IV Org** academies to encourage upper level auditor training.
10. Use of FSMs, Auditors Associations, personal contact, etc., to get public into the org and on to their next service.
11. Fast lines so public are not left waiting to see the Reg.

The lines of routing a public person to the Reg, or from the Reg to a service must be tight so public aren't lost, and the Reg is kept busy continuously with the public. Therefore, the Service Product Officer must police these lines and where he notices any lack of uniformity he gets his Org Officer onto it. Nonuniform or slow routing interferes with the product, so the Service Product Officer gets it speeded up now by push-debug-drive-name it-want it-and get it.

The first actions of the Service Product Officer in the sales area are to get all "in-the-org" public routed to the Reg on breaks or after course end to be further signed up for additional service. He can also have Dissem drilling done with Reges so as to increase sales in the org. His operating procedure is products, products, products, now, now, now. His Org Officer or HCO and Qual can worry about organize, organize, organize.

CALL-IN

Call-in is the action of getting fully paid into the org on to their next service. This also includes getting partially paid fully paid and on to their next service. These functions are of great concern to the SERVICE PRODUCT OFFICER as undelivered services to the public can mess up a field and increase the chance of refunds. The Service Product Officer should see to it that the Call-in Units are given stiff targets and

that their production is not monitored by low auditor hours or low producing training areas. The execution of needed programs to get Call-in Units fully operational is under the Service Product Officer per HCO PL 9 Aug 79 1 CALL-IN: THE KEY TO FUTURE DELIVERY AND INCOME. This same policy also lists out the functions of the Call-in Units. Call-in falls between sales and delivery, as it deals with those either fully or partly paid and needing only to finish payment and be called in and gotten onto service.

DELIVERY

The Service Product Officer must ensure that the service lines of the org are fast and 100% standard, that pcs and students do complete quickly and don't get lost off the lines.

The Service Product Officer is to have an alert line with the public set up whereby if a student or pc's study or auditing is slowed, or if the public person is dissatisfied in any way, he can alert the Service Product Officer so it can be handled.

Some of the actions and lines to be product officered by the Service Product Officer are as follows:

1. Tech Services arranges housing, has the pc met when he is arriving and generally operates as the pc's host while in the org.
2. The many lines such as pc to Ethics, pc to Examiner, student to Ethics, student to Qual, C/S Series 25 line and pc to D of P line must be drilled so they are flawless and handled with ARC.
3. The most senior policy applied to this area is HCO PL 21 Nov 68, SENIOR POLICY "WE ALWAYS DELIVER WHAT WE PROMISE."
4. There must be an adequate amount of auditors, Tech Pages and FESers, Ds of P, Supervisors, Course Admins, etc.
5. The auditing line must be fast so no pcs wait to be serviced.
6. Use of all hands tech terminals in the org auditing when required to handle backlogged service.
7. Getting students through their courses and on to their internship at which point they can audit in the HGC.
8. Proper scheduling so every pc gets in 12 1/2 hours a week minimum.
9. Recovering blown auditors, getting them fixed up and auditing.

The Service Product Officer ensures tech lines are fast. For instance, a pc's folder not getting C/Sed for days, or idle auditors and Ds of P "waiting" for pcs when they can be made to procure pcs, must be spotted and handled by the Service Product Officer.

The Service Product Officer must be kept briefed on what pcs, and students arrive and how they are going to be handled. He must get around to these areas (Training and HGC) to ensure that there are no slows with public or anything that would get in the way of public receiving top quality service.

Service to the public is the reason the org is there and service must be kept fast and 100% standard and plentiful. This is a primary duty of the Service Product Officer; he is there to ensure this occurs.

It is losses on service that keep public away, org income down and staff pay low.

RE-SIGN-UP

The re-sign-up line is also very key to an organization's prosperity. It brings further income, and proves conclusively that the last service received by the public person was of high quality. This is why the Service Product Officer must be very alert to the amount of re-signs. Some of the things that should be watched for are

1. That the Reg is supplied with an upstat cert for his last completed service to present to the student or pc.

293

2. That the Reg knows fully how to handle the public person that won't re-sign (by sending them to Qual).

3. The Reg must be provided with tech estimates, Grade Chart information, etc., so he is aware ahead of time of what the student or pc's next action is.

4. Tech terminals are fully briefed and the line is in that every completion gets routed to the Reg. This must be drilled.

The public person should be serviced in your org until he/she requires upper level service that your org cannot deliver, at which point they should be directed to the next higher org.

PITFALLS

The Service Product Officer can lose his effectiveness if he takes any "hey you" orders or gets stuck in at various points. He is not an expeditor. He is not an information and full-time coordinator terminal. He is an executive, a Product Officer, and he is there to ensure the entire machine runs.

He must be well versed on actions occurring in the org. He must also pay strict attention to completing actions he has started and to carry a handling through to a done. Otherwise he can wrap himself around a pole with incomplete cycles which will ball up the line and prevent the service lines from flowing flawlessly.

Where the Service Product Officer post bogs it is undoubtedly due to a lack of an Organizing Officer, as with the speed in which a Service Product Officer demands products, he requires a fast moving Org Officer. So it is essential this post be provided with an Org Officer as soon as possible.

Those personnel in the org who are responsible for organization, any Esto personnel, etc., are the people who put the units in the org there. It is not the duty of a Service Product Officer to man and hat the org. *Therefore, it is a lot of sweat off the Service Product Officer's brow to have a fully functioning Esto team backing up his actions in getting the flow of products out of the organization.*

SUMMARY

The Service Product Officer ensures all the actions of getting public into, through and out of the org are *accomplished* with high quality results.

It is extremely important that this post be manned in each and every org. It doesn't just make the difference between a poor, empty org and a good org. This post makes the difference between a good org and a booming org.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 14 FEBRUARY 1980

Remimeo

Exec Hats

All Staff Hats

Esto Series 40

Org Series 40

Product Debug Series 9

ORDER versus DISORDER

(Ref: HCO PL 9 Feb 74R ETHICS-CONDITION BELOW

Rev. 17.2.80 TREASON-CONFUSION FORMULA

AND EXPANDED CONFUSION

FORMULA

HCO PL 30 Dec 70 ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL)

I made a breakthrough recently, while investigating low production areas and realized that a good deal more needs to be said on the subject of order and disorder.

Order is defined as a condition in which everything is in its proper place and performs its proper function. A person with a personal sense of order knows *what* the things in his area are, he knows *where* they are, he knows *what* they are for. He understands their value and relationship to the whole.

A personal sense of order is essential in getting out products in an area.

An orderly typist, for instance, would have all the materials requiring typing, she would have ample paper and carbons within arm's reach, she would have her correction fluid to hand, etc. With all preparatory actions done, she would sit down to type with an operational typewriter and would know what that typewriter was and what it was for.

She would be able to sit down and get her product, with no wasted motion or stops.

But let's say you had a carpenter who couldn't find his hammer and he didn't even know what a hammer was for and he couldn't find his chisel because when he picked it up he put it down and couldn't find it again and then he didn't know where his nails were. You give him a supply of lumber and he doesn't know what it's for, so he doesn't categorize it where he can put his hands on it.

How many houses do you think he would build?

The actual fact of the case is that a disordered person, operating in a disorganized area, makes a 10-minute cycle into a 3-week cycle (believe it, this is true) simply because he couldn't find his ruler, lost his eraser, broke his typewriter, dropped a nut and couldn't find it again and had to send off to Seattle for another one, etc., etc., etc.

BASICS

In working with a group of nonproductive technicians recently, I discovered something interesting: out-basics. I actually found a lower undercut to what we generally think of when we say "basics."

These technicians had reportedly researched a key piece of equipment and had it all sorted out. But I found that they didn't even know the basic fundamental of what that machine was supposed to do and what they were supposed to be doing in their area.

That told me at once that they had no orderly files, no research data. They were losing things.

295

Now, if they were losing things, that opened the door to another basic: they couldn't have known where things were. They put down a tool over there and then when they needed it again they would have to look all over the place because they hadn't put it down where it belonged.

Their work was not organized so that it could be done and the tools were not known.

So I checked this out. Were they logging the things they were using in and out so they could find them again? Were they putting things away when they were done with them? No, they weren't.

This is simply the basic admin coupled with the knowledge of what the things one is working with are. It's orderliness and knowing what things are, knowing what they are for and where they are, etc. That's the undercut.

If people don't have a true knowledge of what the things they're working with are, if there are omitted tools, inoperational tools, if they don't know what their tools are supposed to do, if there are no files or if once used, files are not reassembled and put back in the file drawer, if things get lost and people don't know where things are and so on, they will be running around spending 3 or 4 hours trying to locate a piece of paper. That isn't production.

If a person can't tell you what the things he works with are, what they're for and where they are, he isn't going to get out any product. He doesn't know what he's doing.

It's like the carpenter trying to build a house without knowing what he's got to build it with, without understanding his tools and raw materials and the basic actions he must take to get his product. That's what was holding up production in the area: disorderliness. And the basics were out.

This is actually far *below* knowing the tech of the area—the actual techniques used to get the product. The person does not even know what his tools and equipment are or what they're supposed to do. He doesn't know whether they are operational or inoperational. He doesn't know that when you use a tool you return it to its proper place. When you have a despatch you put it in a file where it can be retrieved. It undercuts even knowing the orders and PLs relevant to his hat.

What are the basics that are missing. The basics of sitting down to the table that one is supposed to sit down to, to do the work! The basics of knowing what the tools, materials and equipment he works with are and what he's supposed to do with them to get his product. Those are the basics that are missing.

We are down to a real reason why a person cannot turn out products.

That is what is holding up such a person's production. It is well below knowing the technique of his job.

Out-basics. Does the guy know where the file is? When he finishes with that file does he leave it scattered all over the place or does he put it back together and into the file where it can be found?

Now, a person who's working will have papers all over the place, but does he know where they are and is he then going to reassemble them and put them back in order or is he going to just leave them there and pile some more papers on top of them?

If you find Project No. 2 scattered on top of Project No. 1, you know something about that area. Basics are out.

This is a **little piece of tech and** with **that piece** of tech you've got insight. You would have to have an overall picture of what the area would look like when properly ordered and organized-how it would be organized to get optimum production.

Then you could inspect the area and spot what's going on. You would inspect on the basis of: **how does the area compare** with how it should be organized? You would find out if the personnel didn't know what the things in their area were or what they

296

were for, you would see if they knew the value of things in the area or if there were altered importances, omitted files or filing, actions being done out of sequence, inoperational tools or equipment, anything **added to the scene** that was inapplicable to production, etc.

In other words, you can inspect an area by outpoints against this one factor of orderliness.

This sort of out-basics and disorderliness cuts production down to nothing. There just won't be any production at all. There will be no houses built.

What we are talking about here is an orderly frame of mind. A person with a sense of order and an understanding of what he is doing, sits down to write a story or a report and he'll have his paper to hand, he'll have it fixed up with carbons and he'll have his reference notes to hand. And before he touches the typewriter, he'll familiarize himself with what the scene is. He'll do the necessary preparatory work in order to get his product.

Now someone else might sit down, write something, then dimly remember there was a note someplace and then look for an hour to find where that note was and then not be able to find it and then decide that it's not important anyway and then come back and forth a few times and finally find out he's typed it all up without a carbon.

There is a handling for this. Anyone trying to handle an area who doesn't understand the basics of what they're dealing with and is in an utter state of disorder must get a firm reality on the fact that until the basics are learned and the disorder handled, the area will not produce satisfactorily.

The following inspection is used in determining and handling the state of such an area-

INSPECTION

This inspection is done in order to determine an area's knowledge of basics and its orderliness. It can be done by an area's senior for the purpose of locating and correcting disordered areas. It is also used as part of debug tech as covered in HCO PL 23 Aug 79 DEBUG TECH. It is for use by anyone who is in the business of production and getting products.

The full inspection below would be done, clipboard in hand, with full notes made and *then* handlings would be worked out based on what was found in the inspection (according to the Handling Section of this PL and the suggested handlings given in parentheses below).

1. DOES HE KNOW WHAT ORGANIZATION, FIRM OR COMPANY HE'S IN? DOES HE KNOW WHAT HIS POST OR JOB IS?

This is a matter of does he even know where he is. Does he know what the organization or company he works for is, does he know what the post he is holding is?

(If he is so confused and disoriented that he doesn't even know the company or org he's in or doesn't know what his post is, he needs to apply the Expanded Confusion Formula, HCO PL 9 Feb 74R and then work up through the conditions.

Of course the person would also need to be instant hatted on his post-the organization, his post title, his relative position on the org board, what he's supposed to produce on his post, etc.

If he is doing this handling as part of his Expanded Confusion Formula, simply have him get the instant hatting and carry on with his Confusion Formula.)

297

2. ASK THE PERSON WHAT HIS PRODUCT IS.

Does he know? Can he tell you without comm lag or confusion?

You may find out that he has , no idea of what his product is or that he has a wrong product or that he has confusions about his product. Maybe he doesn't even know he's supposed to get out products.

(If this is the case, he must find out what his product is. If the person's product is given in policy references, he should look these up. If his product is not covered in tech or policy references, he'll have to work out what it is.)

3. CAN HE RATTLE OFF A LIST OF THE BASIC ACTIONS, IN PROPER SEQUENCE, NECESSARY TO GET OUT HIS PRODUCT OR DOES HE HEMANDHAWONIT?

Does he know what to do with his product once it is completed?

He may try to tell you what he does each day or how he handles this or that and what troubles he's having with his post. You note this, but what you're interested in is does he know the basic actions he has to take to get out his product. And does he know what to do with the product once it is complete?

(If he can't rattle off the sequence of actions 1, 2, 3 then he'd better clay demo the basic actions, in proper sequence, necessary to get out his product and then drill these actions until he can rattle them off in his sleep. If he does not know what to do with his product once completed, then he'd need to find out and then drill handling the completed product.)

4. ASK HIM WHAT HIS TOOLS ARE THAT ENABLE HIM TO GET THIS PRODUCT

Note his reaction. Can he name his tools at all? Does he include the significant tools of his area? Does he include his hat pack as a tool?

(If he doesn't know what his tools are, he'd better find out what he's operating with and what it does. A **good workman knows his tools** so well he can use them **blindfolded, standing on his head and with one arm** tied behind his back.)

5. ASK HIM TO SHOW YOU HIS TOOLS.

Are his tools present in the work area or does he have them out of reach, down the hall or in some other room?

(He may have to reorganize his work space to get his tools within easy reach and to get in some basics of organization. The purpose of such organization would be to make production easier and faster.)

6. ASK HIM TO TELL YOU WHAT EACH OF HIS TOOLS ARE.

Can he define them? Does he know what each of them are and what they are for?

(If he doesn't know, he'd better find out.)

7. ASK HIM TO TELL YOU WHAT THE RELATIONSHIP IS BETWEEN EACH ONE OF HIS TOOLS AND HIS PRODUCT

(If he can't do this, have him clay demo the steps he takes to get out his products with each tool he uses, so he sees the relationship between each tool and his product.)

8. ASK HIM TO NAME OFF THE RAW MATERIALS HE WORKS WITH. ASK HIM TO SHOW YOU HIS MATERIALS.

Does he know what his raw materials are? Are they in his work area? Are they in order? Does he know where to get them?

298

(He may have to find out what the raw materials of his post are (by defining them) and where they come from. He should drill procuring and handling them and then run Reach and Withdraw on them.)

9. DOES HE HAVE A FILE CABINET? FILES? ASK HIM WHAT THEY ARE.

Does he know what they are for? Does he know what a despatch is, etc.?

(He may have to be brought to an understanding of what files, file cabinets, despatches, etc., are and what they have to do with him and his product. He may have to clay demo the relationship between these things. He will have to set up a filing system. Ref. HCO PL 18 Mar 72, Esto Series 10, FILES.)

10. DOES HE HAVE A SYSTEM FOR LOCATING THINGS?

Ask to see it. Check his files. Does he have logs? Does he log things out and correct the logs when he puts them back? Are the comm baskets labeled? Does he have a specific place for supplies? Ask him to find something in his files. How long does it take?

Does he have an orderly collection of references or a library containing the materials of his field? Is it organized so as to be usable?

(If he has no system for locating things, have him set one up. Have him establish a filing system, a logging system, label the comm baskets, arrange supplies, etc. Get a reference library set up and organized. Drill using the system he has.)

11. WHEN HE USES AN ITEM DOES HE PUT IT BACK IN THE SAME PLACE? DOES HE PUT IT BACK WHERE OTHERS CAN FIND IT?

He'll probably tell you, yes, of course he does. Look around. Are objects and files lying about? Is the place neat or is it a mess? Ask him to find you something. Does he know right where it is, or does he have to search around? Is there an accumulation of unhandled particles around?

(Have him clay demo why it might be advantageous to put things back in the same place he found them. Drill him on putting things back when he's finished with them. Have him clean up the place, handling any accumulation of unhandled particles.)

12. IF FEASIBLE, ACTUALLY GO WITH THE PERSON TO HIS PERSONAL LIVING AREA.

Is the bed made? Is the area clean? Are things put away? How much dirty laundry does he have? Is it stowed in a bag or hamper or is it strewn about the place? People who had disorderly personal mest, I for I were not getting out any products on post-they had no sense of order.

(If his personal quarters are a mess have him-on his own time of coursestraighten up his personal area and keep it that way on a daily basis. This will teach him what order is.)

HANDLING

Some areas, of course, will be found to be in excellent order and will pass the inspection. These will most likely be high production areas.

Other areas will be found to have only a few points out which would correct easily with the above handlings. These will probably be areas where some production is occurring.

Where personnel have a concept of what order is and why it is important they will usually be eager to correct the points of disorder that have turned up on the investigation and may need no further urging, drilling or correction, but will quickly set about remedying outpoints. For many bright and willing staff members just reading this.policy will be enough to get them to straighten out their areas right away.

299

There is, however, a sector which has no concept of order, and may not have the slightest notion of why anyone would bother with it. You will most likly find them in apathy, overwhelm or despair with regard to their post areas. No matter what they do they simply cannot get their products out in adequate quantity and quality. They try and try and try but everything seems to be working against them.

When you find such a situation, know that the area is in Confusion. You are trying to handle an area which is in a confirmed, dedicated condition of Confusion.

Such an area or individual would require the application of the Expanded Confusion Formula **(HCO PL 9 Feb 74R) including** the handlings above. So if these things confirm in an area you must use the Expanded Confusion Formula and the handlings given above to full completion. Because, frankly, such an area or individual is in a condition of Confusion and will remain in Confusion until the Expanded Confusion Formula including the full handlings from the inspection are applied.

Once out of Confusion the person would have to be brought up through the rest of the conditions.

CAUTION

The condition of Confusion is a very low condition and should never be assigned where it is not warranted. Where one or two points on the above inspection were found to be out in an area, and where these corrected easily, there would be no purpose in assigning Confusion to that area. In fact it may worsen an area to assign an incorrect condition.

But where you have a long-term situation of no or few products combined with a state of disorder, know that the area or individual is in a condition of Confusion and that the application of the

Confusion Formula plus the handlings given in this PL will bring the area out of the muck and up to square one where it can *begin* producing.

NOTE: If the inspection is done on a person or area and some of the points are found to be out and handlings are done but no condition of Confusion is assigned the area must be reinspected about a week later. This way you will detect if an actual condition of Confusion was missed, as the area will have lapsed back into disorderliness or will have worsened.

SUMMARY

A **knowledge of the basics** of an area and having orderliness in an area are essential to production.

When you find a fellow who is a light year away from the basics and doesn't have a clue on the subject of order and he's flying way up in the sky someplace instead of just trying to put together what he's supposed to put together or do what he's supposed to do, you've got your finger on his Why for no production.

With the inspection and handlings given in this policy we can now handle any degree of disorderliness and disorganization.

And order will reign.

Nonproductive areas become capable of producing.

Already-producing areas increase their production.

And production will roll.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:gal.gm Copyright © 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

300

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 27 APRIL 1980

Remimeo

LRH Comm (Modifies HCO PL 9 May 1974 PROD-ORG,

Hats ESTO AND OLDER SYSTEMS RECONCILED)

Esto Hats

Execs

Establishment Officer Series 41

ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER SYSTEM REVITALIZED

Ref- HCO PL 7 Mar 72 Esto Series I R

THE ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER

HCO PL 14 Jul 72 Esto Series 22

ESTO FAILURES

The Establishment Officer system, which has never fully gone in in the past, is hereby revitalized and reconstituted.

It is a well-known fact that a positive way to expand an org is to get the org on-policy and in-tech. It is the most effective way of guaranteeing the expansion of Scientology.

It was the establishment of HCO and strong Department Ones which preceded the growth and eventual boom of the great orgs in 1973 and 1974 and it was the unmock of HCOs and Department Ones that signaled the later downfall and crash of these orgs. Additionally all booms and depressions of an org are due to its being expertly built up and then, having a peak period, it is not maintained in that well-established condition and disintegrates.

The handling for this is the ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER.

KEY TOOL

As the Esto system is a key tool through which the LRH Comm carries out his purpose of seeing that the org is established, the LRH Comm ensures that an Exec Esto is posted.

The HCO of the org is held responsible for getting the Exec Esto appointed.

EXPANSION

The purpose of the Establishment Officer is to ESTABLISH and MAINTAIN the establishment of the org and each division therein.

Therefore, the way to expansion is to get the Esto system truly functioning and guaranteeing the prosperity of the org.

DEPT ONE

The first duty of an Exec Esto is to put a strong Dept One there per Esto Series 22 ESTO FAILURES, and the Exec Esto must roll up his sleeves -and do the work in Dept One if he is to succeed. The Exec Esto and Estos under him should be out in the org actually working in their divisions and coordinating with the execs to back up org production. They are not hidden away behind desks in some ivory tower. They are not the juniors of the org execs. They have project orders, provided by International Headquarters, which they follow and in coordination with org execs achieve their purpose of establishment and thus an expanding org.

301

Once the Exec Esto is chosen and on post he must be rapidly hatted up and drilled on the Esto Series and given project orders to start putting Department One there as per HCO PL 14 Jul 72 ESTO FAILURES. It is the job of the LRH Comm to ensure the Exec Esto follows his project orders and does not get cross-ordered or stopped in his duties of establishing HCO and the org.

All existing Esto tech applies and is valid.

POSITION

The Exec Esto is org boarded in Department 21 in the "Office of the Exec Esto" as per HCO PL 7 Mar 72 Esto Series IR THE ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER. This does not mean he is in the LRH Comm Network but the LRH Comm is the administrative senior of the Exec Esto. This does not lessen the responsibility of the org and execs for seeing that the Exec Esto post is covered and the Esto system goes in, nor does it lessen the responsibility of the Exec Esto to work in coordination with org execs to achieve the needed org establishment.

It is up to the LRH Comm to act as arbitrator on any conflicts regarding any Estos' duties and he sees that the appropriate policy reference from the Esto Series or Esto tapes is followed.

PRECAUTION

The LRH Comm must not become "flap crossroads" for personnel and any and all personnel demands from org terminals are not to be directed to the Office of the Exec Esto or the LRH Comm. On-policy personnel requests are routed on standard lines to HCO and handled per policy. The LRH Comm and Exec Esto must be allowed to get on with their jobs of establishing HCO and the org.

This system properly implemented can take your org to higher and higher levels of expansion and prosperity. It must be put in with a vengeance and not allowed to be unmocked for ANY reason. No Esto in an org can be transferred or removed or disciplined without clearance of International Headquarters and LRH Comms must see that this is rigidly enforced.

SUMMARY

The Esto system fully established will make the true difference in the establishment of the org and each division therein. And you'll see the org take off to greater and greater heights than ever before.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

As assisted by

Msm Barbara Price

LRH Comm International

for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:BP:dr.gm Copyright © 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

302

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 3 SEPTEMBER 1980

Issue I

Remimeo

(The contents of this policy have been taken from an LRH
OODs item of 15 May 71 and are now being issued in policy
form to bring forth the wealth of data formerly issued in the
Flag "Orders of the Day.")

Admin Know-How Series 38

Data Series 50

Esto Series 42

Org Series 42

OUT OF SEQUENCE

Out of sequence is the most common outpost according to a survey of despatches and projects a couple months ago.

The thing which gets most commonly out of sequence is the pattern of the Key Ingredients as covered in HCO PL 14 Sept 69.

The correct sequence for a piece of work would be to plan, obtain materials, and then work.

If this is made into work-plan-materials, everyone works hard but no product will result.

As production is **what morale depends** upon, a smash of morale would occur if the Key Ingredients were thrown out of sequence.

Omitted data runs a close second to out of sequence as the most common outpost.

When the sequence of a work project is thrown out and then data like technology of how to do it is omitted, a group could work itself half to death and have down morale as well from no product.

The right way to go about it is to have the tech of a job, plan it, get the materials. and then do it. This we call *organizing*.

When this sequence is not followed, we have what we call cope. Too much cope will eventually break morale. One copes while he organizes. If he copes too long without organizing he will get a dwindling or no product. If he organizes only he will get no product.

Coping while organizing will bit by bit get the line and action straighter and straighter and with less work you get more product.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY BDCS:LRH:SA:bk.nf
Copyright © 1971, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[Note: The original mirneo copies of this policy letter incorrectly labeled it as "Admin Know-How 36" which has been corrected above.]

303

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 22 SEPTEMBER 1980

Remimeo

(Originally LRH OODs item

of 23 August 1972)

Esto Series 43

Org Series 48

ACTIVITY

We are in the midst of a great deal of activity.

This means a certain amount of disestablishment occurs.

Such times are the times when Dept I has to go FLAT-OUT.

It has to actually produce.

It has to get new people in, org boards revised, hats collected, people on new posts HATTED!

It has to somehow hold the form of the org and keep it producing.

This is no time for Dept I people to sit at a desk doing their in-baskets all day or studying.

This is the time when the org form situation is continually reviewed and beefed up and hatted.

A hat is NOT an explanation. It is a checksheet and pack and it gets DONE right now.

This is the time when you make up for fewer numbers with better utilization. And you make up for increased traffic with greater efficiency on each individual post.

Esto trainees who don't know or can't do these things won't be worth anything in their own orgs.

The question is, can they do it or can't they?

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

Accepted and approved by the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:SA:dr.gm Copyright © 1972, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

304

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 27 SEPTEMBER 1980

Remimeo

(Originally LRH OODs item
of 8 March 1971)

Org Series 43

Esto Series 44

ORG OFFICER

Org Officers think they approach HASes to organize. They don't.

HCO has not formed because Org Officers keep making demands on it instead of doing their job. The organization it takes to get out a specific product is instant stuff. HCO is a long-term build of the establishment. Entering instant organization into HCO of course defeats its purposes and prevents it from the long-haul actions necessary to form a whole org.

If an Org Officer considered himself the Product Officer's expeditor he would begin to get the idea.

We have a Product Officer/Org Officer mission going in to expedite FEBCs. The Product Officer will get the product-a competent graduated FEBC on an airplane going home-being made and fired. The Org Officer will push the materiel and lines into shape to back up the Product Officer. Now, what's *that* have to do with HCO? Nothing.

The Org Officer makes sure there is a pack or tape or recorder or gets them (not by despatch) and the Product Officer checks out, verifies, grooms, solves FEBC problems, pushes cases.

The Course Super goes on supervising, Course Admin goes on admining. What they're doing right with the student gets pushed and done more of. And what organization there is gets more of from the Org Officer.

For instance,

SITUATION: Course numbers building up. You see this in orgs.

HANDLING: Put on a Prod-Org mission to get numbers completed and fired.

The Prod-Org team finds 3 who could be made ready to fire at first glance and gives the order GO-GO-GO, to Action.

The personal cope was fire three NOW. The medium-range was get a mission on it.

That is uptight production.

A Prod-Org team works in *hours* and days. Save an hour, save a day. Do it in hours, do it in days.

By doing it they learn line and materiel outnesses and their reform CSWs of lines and actions are written up when they're completed and that's their first contact with the HAS and HCO.

305

Now with these reforms the general org action will be easier and faster and a product backlog peak won't occur so fast again.

A Prod-Org team that writes despatches and harasses HCO just doesn't know THAT THE PROD-ORG SYSTEM IS TO HANDLE BACKLOGS AND OMISSIONS IN PRODUCTS. *Having handled* they can advise or order or get approval for line changes and new recruitment, etc. These, the HAS can get in for the long haul.

Prod-Orgs WORK, they don't just order.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and edited for issue by Sherry Anderson Compilations Missionaire

Accepted and approved by the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:SA:dr.gm Copyright c 1971, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

306

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 18 SEPTEMBER 1980

Issue III

Rernimeo

(Originally LRH OODs item

of 24 Feb 1970)

Esto Series 45

ESTOs

An Esto has a definite job to do. He is not part of the division's lines. He hats, organizes, trains, sets up files, lines, and does all those establishment actions people need to really establish a division and maintain it.

If you want an Esto to go into gales of laughter, say "I am too busy to get hatted." Those papers and that enmest show that a 2 hours of hatting a day save a year of dev-t nonproduction.

HCO over the world could not establish orgs. It can do its departmental functions. The answer is the Esto.

You'll be seeing a lot of this. Might as well know who these strange people are who keep insisting you find out about comm baskets and things.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:SA:bk.gm Copyright o 1970, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

307

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 21 SEPTEMBER 1980

Issue VI

Remimeo

(Originally LRH OODs item
of I I June 1972)

Admin Know-How Series 40

Esto Series 46

PRODUCT OFFICERS

Worked last evening getting Tech to start shooting them through to completions.

The P/L on Selling and Delivering Auditing (HCO PL 28 Sept 71) tells why you have to audit a pc all at once whole program. Dribbling it out means repairs due to life upsets before the guy made it.

So crowd it on and get a pc *through*. Then we'll have some products for our coins.

A Product Officer has to name, want and get his products.

This means one says, "You there. Joe Blow. Want him completed. All right get it DONE." Product by product. There is no general "Audit these pcs." "Get up the hours." Hell, you never get a product that way.

"You there, **George Thunderbird**. I want you through your Primary and onto and through course and classified. Get going, man, get going. Oh, you were told to weedle the toofle before you woofled by Dorance Doppler. Org Officer? Get that name-to F/MAA, get the cross orders the hell off my lines. Now you George Thunderbird, I want you through your Primary and onto and through course by I July. You got it? You got it now! Good. Well, get with it. Get going!" Note on clipboard: Org Off to get cross order by Dorance Doppler invest and report. "There's your slip." Note on progress bd. Geo Thunderbird HSDA I Jul. Now you Tobler Tomias, what's the tale; how are you going? . . . Well standing there smoking and looking at the scenery isn't going to do anything. If your girl doesn't like you anymore the thing to do is drown your sorrows in the Primary RD. . . . Okay you are to be an Exp Dn. All right, that's fine. I want you completed by 16 July. . . . I don't care if that's a 16-hour day. Let's see, Primary RD by - and Class IV Acad by - and -. Yes that's 16 July AT NOON. Man to hell with your PTPs. Get going, man." And on the progress board. And from the board - "And here's Bill Coal, he should be off the Primary today, where is he. All right Bill-ah, you made it that far. Now you're on schedule. That's great. HSDA. Get with it, man. You completed Primary 20 minutes ago and aren't on the next course. Super!* What the .55

That's the way it goes for a Tech Prod Off. "We are finishing Agnes, Trop and Goshwiler today. Today. Yes today. Certified and off lines. Got it D of T? Well, do it!"

Push, debug, drive. Name it, want it, get it.

That's the only way you ever get a product.

Sad but true.

308

They don't ever happen by themselves.

And all the public relations chatter in the world is not a product. I know this

Product Officer beat-

It's a piece of cake.

But it has to be DONE.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

Accepted and approved by the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:SA:bk.gm Copyright © 1972, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

*Supervisor

[*Note:* The original mitneo copies of this policy letter incorrectly labeled it as "Admin KnowHow 38" which has been corrected in this issue.]

309

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 6 OCTOBER 1980

Issue III

Remimeo

(Originally LRH OODs item

of 24 June 1972)

Personnel Series 35

Esto Series 47

POSTING

I am finding that persons not grooved in on new posts before being asked to act have a high confusion level which is hard on the area. Estos should groove people in hard on the duties and existing scene and if the person is too confused or out-ethics, alert HCO and not place them.

A person needs a day or two to find his feet on the new ground before acting or he'll be nervous and uncertain.

We want certain and competent people on post

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

Approved and accepted by the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:SA:dr.gm Copyright © 1972, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

310

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 17 OCTOBER 1980

Rernimeo Issue 11

(Originally LRH OODs item

of 8 September 1971)

Exec Series 28

Esto Series 48

INSTABILITY

You will find that persons who are having a rough time or giving others one are either just leaving or haven't arrived on the post. In other words they in some way are not actually ON post.

It is also an oddity that those who have to go to point B haven't arrived ever at point A in order to be able to leave for B.

The ability to BE something strongly shows up in post performances. The real stars can BE anything wholly and completely for short or long periods. They ARE what they are being. They aren't just arriving or leaving.

To BE OR UnBe, that is the ability! To not quite be or to WAS is the aberration.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

Approved and accepted by the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:SA:dr.gm Copyright © 1971, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 30 OCTOBER 1980

Rernimeo Issue 11

(Originally LRH OODs item of 22 June 1974.)

Exec Series 30

Esto Series 49

TECH

Every action that results in a product has a certain tech.

One finds out about it or develops it.

When one adopts false tech he will then wind up with confusion as false tech will not deliver a product. It delivers a confusion-like psychiatry.

The more false tech you hold onto or apply the more confusions you will get.

When real tech is invalidated then false tech can enter in. So the test of false tech is does it give a confusion and the test of real tech is does it give a product.

A Mis-U word in real tech then can let false tech in.

If the tech is not available for a certain job one then has to develop it. His development will be correct only if it delivers a real product.

When one busily develops tech where proven tech already exists and is available, one is wasting his time.

Technology is that part of knowledge that is used.

So it is not enough just to know. One also has to apply.

If one *really* knows his tech it is very easy to apply it. When one is uncertain. his application is uncertain.

Life in living forms depends upon real products.

When products take too long to bring about or when they turn out to be overt products then they are not economical to produce. Overdue and overt products are both *very* costly in time and catastrophes.

If you find in any area you are taking too long to produce a product, then it's time to review your tech. (A) Does tech exist? (B) If yes, "Am I applying it?" (C) If no, "Do I have to develop it?"

If it is (C), then one had better get very busy sorting it out. It is easier and less expensive to do that than to go on turning out overt products.

Any product has its tech.

Do you know the tech to produce yours?

(Note: Also see HCO PL 23 August 1979, Issues I and 11, DEBUG TECH and DEBUG TECH CHECKLIST.)

L. **RON HUBBARD Founder** Compiled and issued by Sherry Anderson Compilations Missionaire Accepted by the **BOARD OF DIRECTORS** of the CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA

BDCSC:LRH:SA:nc.gm Copyright o 1974, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

312

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 21 SEPTEMBER 1980

Issue VIII

Remirneo

(Originally LRH OODs item
of 14 May 1972)

Exec Series 22

Esto Series 50

MORALE

Production is the basis of morale.

If one can get a unit producing and actually accomplishing worthwhile production, then their morale will rise.

Thus, it does not matter too much how one starts a unit producing so long as it does get started.

I was given a good example of this with just one person who has been on MO lines. She is actually well now. She is *miserable*. There is nothing wrong with her at all except she is out of the action and is not producing anything.

This has been noted in other fields. The "idle rich" are the most miserable people you ever wanted to meet. "To Have and Have Not" or some such title by Hemingway talks about it for the best part of a book.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

Accepted and approved by the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

[Note: The original mimeo copies of this policy letter incorrectly labeled it as "Esto Series 41" which has been corrected above.]

313

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 3 NOVEMBER 1980

Issue IV

Remimeo

(Originally LRH OODs items of

26 February 1971 and 24 August 1970.)

Org Series 61

Esto Series 51

DRILLS

Drills have several purposes. To groove in a team action is a principal one. To test a system fully. To groove in lines.

Whenever postings are changed, the new post holders have to be grooved in on their posts (hatted and on-post trained) and then the team. itself must be drilled.

The two steps are always needed.

There's a maxim about all training that applies. It is this: **TRAINING MUST INCLUDE ALL THE ACTIONS AND APPROXIMATIONS OF THE ACTUAL.**

This includes of course the whole cycle of an actual sequence of actions. It's the sequence that counts.

The drilling of sequences of actions is a stable series of data that prevents chaos from overwhelming one.

This applies to org lines as well. Dummy runs and dummy bullbait runs serve as the drill.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

Approved and accepted by the

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

of the CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 4 MARCH 1981

Remimeo

(Originally taken from an ED

issued to a special film

project dated 15 January

1979.)

(Amended to remove technical terms.)

Establishment Officer Series 52

MISTAKES

It isn't making mistakes that is actionable, it is failing to learn from them and repeating them.

Four people recently taken out of a special unit of a filming project not only couldn't apply tech standardly on which they were fully hatted but also couldn't learn from their mistakes. As a consequence their redone work contained the same mistakes that were originally made.

A new piece of Esto tech has come into view, those who cannot be hatted also don't learn from their own mistakes and where you have this in a production unit it is better to replace the person rather than just hope.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Assisted and amended by the Sea Org Lieutenant Council's Issue Project

Accepted by the

BOARD OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA

BDCSC:LRH:LCIP:nc.gm Copyright © 1979, 1981 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

315

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 13 SEPTEMBER 1970

Remimeo Issue 11

.Exec Dir Hat

HES Hat *Org Series I*

HAS Hat

BASIC ORGANIZATION

What is organization?

Most people have so many associated ideas with the word "organization" that they think of one as an identity or a being, not as a dynamic activity.

Let's see what one really is.

Let us take a pile of red, white and blue beads. Let's organize them.

Now let us draw the org board.

Let us dump them all on top of in-charge, all mixed up in a confusion.

Obviously in-charge must *route* them to dig himself out. So we get

In-Charge

Red White Blue

Beads Beads Beads

Thus we find out much of what an in-charge does. He routes. He separates into types or classes of thing or action.

This so far is a motionless org.

We have to have products. Let's say its products are drilled beads, strung beads, boxed beads.

We would get

._--Red - Driller - Stringer - Polisher

In-Charge White - Driller - Stringer - Polisher

J::~~Rlile Driller - Stringer - Polisher

Or we would get

___~~Red

In-Charg White~"~ Driller - Stringer Pol

Blue

Or we would get

In-Charge

Bead Bead Bead Bead

Separation Drilling Stringing Polishing

316

It is not particularly important which pattern of org board we use so long as it handles the volume of beads.

If we only have I person in this "org" he would still have to have some idea of organization and a sort of org board.

If we have any volume to handle we have to add people. If we add them without an org board we will also add confusion. The organization without an org board will break down by overload and cross flows and currents. These in conflict become confusion.

All a confusion is is unpatterned flow. The particles collide, bounce off each other and stay IN the area. Thus there is no product as to have a product something must flow OUT.

We can now note two things. We have some stable items. These are posts or locations. And we have flow items. There are things undergoing change.

So an org's positions change flowing particles.

Particles flow *in sequence*.

Things enter an org, get changed, flow out of an org.

An org with one type of item only (red beads) is less complex than one with several types of items.

In-Charge

Red Red Red Red

Clay Bead Bead Bead

Procurer **Molder** Boxer Shipper

Any activity has a *sequence* of actions. It has to have stable points which do *not* flow in order to handle things which do flow.

It is not necessary to have a stable terminal do only one thing. But if so then it also has a correct sequence of actions.

All this is true of an engine room or a lawyer's office or any organization.

In an engine room fuel flows in and is changed to motion which flows out. Somebody runs the machines. Somebody repairs the machines. It may all be done by one person but as soon as volume goes up one has to plan out the actions, classify them and put them on an org board which the people there know and abide by or the place will not operate well.

This is done by dividing operation and repair into two actions, making two activities on the same org board.

Chief E I ngineer

Stores Repair Motormen

and Crew Watches

Fuel

The Chief keeps the flows going and the terminals performing their actions.

317

In a lawyer's office we get different actions as a flow.

Head of Firm

-7

Ambulance Case Court

Contactor Preparation Appearance

would be a flow pattern, possibly with a different person (with a different skill) on each point.

Or we could have a sort of motionless org board.

Head of Firm

Crimina Corporate Trust

Clients Clients Dept.

But if we did that we would have to put the motion in vertically so that flow would occur.

Head of Firm

Criminal Corporate Trust

Dept. Dept. Dept.

|||

Contacts & Contacts & Contacts

Interviews Interviews Inves | tment

||

Case Preparations

Preparation | Vaults

| Services

Court

Appearances

Org boards which only give terminals usually will not flow.

A typical army org board of yesteryear was

General

|

Offi cers

Army

When they got into a lot more men they had to have a flow board.

General

Recruits Equipment Training Army Operations

318

So one *organizes* by

1. Surveying the types of particles.
2. Working out the changes desired for each to make a product.

3. Posting the terminals who will do the changing along the sequence of changes.

The board also must include a *recognition* of the types in 1 which *routes* the types to the *terminals* who *change* them and to a further *routing out* as *products*.

To be practical an org board must also provide for pulling in the materials, disposing of the product and being paid for the cycle of action and its supervision.

A company has various actions.

It is essentially a collection of small org boards combined to operate together as a large org board.

The basic principles you have to know to organize anything are contained in this policy letter.

To plan out *any* action one has to be able to visualize its sequence of flows and the changes that occur at each point. One has to be able to see where a particle (paper, body, money) comes in and where it leaves.

One has to be able to spot any point it will halt and mend that part of the flow or handle it.

A proper org board is a perpetual combination of flows which do not collide with one another and which do enter and do experience the desired change and which do leave as a product.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sb.rd.gm Copyright c 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[*Note*: The first line in paragraph 2 on this page which originally read, "recognition of the types in A" has been corrected to read, "recognition of the types in I".]

319

EN07-

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 14 SEPTEMBER 1970

Remimeo

Exec Dir Hat

HES Hat

HAS Hat

Executive Hat

Org Series 2

COPE AND ORGANIZE

It's perfectly all right to cope. One always must.

But one **MUST** organize things while he copes.

The mounting overload and overwhelm in an area comes entirely from cope-copecope without organizing also.

Example: You have to handle something for which there is no planned organization. Like a mob at a congress. You can cope. But if you don't take the first available instant to grab 3 guys and give them specific duties right then to mind doors and tickets it all just gets worse and worse and the cope catches up as overwhelm.

Any old org bd is better than no org bd at all.

A good org bd well grooved in, duties well apportioned, permits things to smooth out and increase in volume without strain.

In a flood if you can channel the water, you can handle the flood. If you just batter at water you drown.

ORGANIZATIONAL GENIUS IS COMPOSED ONLY OF ARRANGING SEQUENCES OF ACTION AND DESIGNATING CHANNELS FOR TYPES OF PARTICLES. THAT'S ALL IT IS.

Then you can handle flows and prevent stops.

So you must always organize as you cope.

National riots are just the inability of leaders to arrange sequences of action and designate channels for types of particles.

One area which was never organized became just an anthill of do-less, useless motion.

If your in-basket is too high you cope and handle it AND ORGANIZE YOUR LINES for the future.

"I'm absolutely drowning is the same as saying "I can't organize worth a damn!"

ORG BD

Every exec has his own personal org bd. Really it's at least 21 depts.

But you don't have to go that fancy.

320

I had an org bd once that was 8 folders, each representing traffic from a major org, reports placed in it latest on top, a communicator who did the placing, a greeter who handled bodies and an inspector that was me. Just myself and one other. But it was an org. With that "org bd" I handled all the Scientology in the world at that time, lectured, researched and had ample time left over. It reduced full-time cope to a part-time job. Later 100 staff members (WW) replaced me as Exec Dir and I moved off post. They were all very busy but they didn't even know they had an org bd they were on, no individual operated his own personal org bd. Their cope and ignorance took the stats right on down. But they sure were busy coping!

The antithesis (opposite) of an org bd is confusion. The amount of confusion present doesn't add up to production, even though it is totally exhausting. The end product one wants is not exhaustion. The amount of energy expended does not measure production. Production is solely the amount of completed cycles that occur. The more they are planned in sequence and the better the different types are channeled the more production will occur.

So cope by all means but don't forget to organize a little each time you get a chance.

The end product of cope is drown.

The end product of organize is freedom.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:rr.cden.gm Copyright cl 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

321

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 14 SEPTEMBER 1970

Issue 11

Remimeo

Exec Dir Hat

HES Hat

HAS Hat

Org Series 3

URGENT

HOW TO ORGANIZE AN ORG

Let us assume that you have an org to run (or any part thereof).

How would you organize it and get it to function?

1. You would count up and name the different vital actions necessary to functioning.
2. You would count up the persons needed for each function and give them the post names.
3. You would do a checksheet for each post to include its vital data.
4. You would collect the material of each checksheet into a pack.
5. You would recruit the minimal number to begin it, keeping in mind finance and solving that.
6. You would show one of them how to check the others out to get them trained.
7. You would then get the org running.
8. You would expand it by single hatting vital posts.
9. All the while you would cope with things as they came up.
10. You would add to checksheets and packs things learned while operating.
11. You would add posts as they were found needful.
12. You would never drop out the actions of recruiting, checksheets, packs and training.

Naturally the org would have to have a function that was valuable and would have to execute it or produce and be paid or it would not be viable (able to live).

All right. All that seems straightforward enough.

Now let's see how it could go wrong.

Foremost would be a failure to function or produce and a failure to get paid for it. This would cripple the activity and bring in inadequate operating funds, curtailing facilities and pay and making it undermanned, hurting its image and shutting off recruitment.

322

Recruiting to fill a new function could be incorrectly (destructively) done by using the production area as the recruitment pool. Also each time a portion was operating well, it could be used as a recruitment pool and emptied out and unmocked. This would destroy all training effort and injure the viability and reverse organization back to cope.

Or no recruitment could be done at all.

There could be no checksheets or packs.

There could be no training done even when checksheets and packs existed.

The checksheets or packs could be too short or unreal for the post. Or they could be too long or relate to another post.

The head of the org could fail to check out the heads of portions.

The heads of portions could fail to get their juniors hatted and checked out.

The org staff could be unaware of their belonging to the org and be unaware of its purpose and general products.

The problems as listed above could remain obscured and ethics could be substituted as an effort to get up production.

There are ten basic points that could go out. These are (1) recruiting (2) training (3) training on post (4) utilization (5) production (6) promotion of product (7) sale of product (8) finance (9) justice (10) morale.

It is assumed that the activity is worthwhile and the potential production valuable. Given that, the remaining ten points are the points where organization breaks down as these areas are the most aberrated in the society.

The fundamental outnesses, however, would be failure to recruit, to have checksheets and packs for each post, get training done on them and have new people on post serve on it in-training.

Let us suppose the head of an org or division never checked any junior out on anything.

Looking at standard functions, everyone would be posting and routing people except Dept 1, intended for that. Everyone would be handling comm except Dept 2, intended for that. Everyone would be inspecting and handling stats except Dept 3. And so on down the line. The place would be a dog's breakfast of total cope.

All right, let us say one does have a dog's breakfast instead of an org. How would one straighten it out?

One would cope to maintain some semblance of viability.

One would throw together an org board and post it and drill people on it.

One would throw together hats and get them worn.

One would continue to cope but now also force others to help the coping and cope themselves as sernispecialists on their own posts.

Finally one would get checksheets and packs together for each post covering all its actions.

One would then get these checksheets and their packs trained on for each post fully,

323

Thereafter one would insist that executives made sure their juniors had checksheets and packs as their hats.

And one would continue to recruit as by this time the org would be expanding and it would become upset by undermanning and go down hill again.

One would watch the ten aberrated points as they go out very easily.

People gather up all sorts of weird solutions to running a disorganized org. "We need more experienced people"; "We can't produce so should be subsidized," are two common ones.

When people on post do NOT have grooved-in hats they do goofy things. The goofiness is not confined just to their job functions. Lacking a purpose and not conceiving the org purpose they can go utterly astray and do things that are quite mad. Like tearing things up. Like breaking things. Like getting involved in goofy relationships.

You can detect an org where posts are not grooved in by the number of oddball things happening.

The way to put this sort of situation right is to start organizing as given in this rundown.

Working on organization as you cope, it will eventually make it come out right.

When it sags just come back to this rundown and it will all straighten out again.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:rr.eden.gm Copyright 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

324

HUBBARD COMMUNICATI W

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstea

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 22 SEP

Remirneo

Exec Hats

Personnel Hats

Ethics Hats *Personnel Series 9*

Org Series 4

AN URGENT IMPORTANT AND STARRATE PL

HATS

HAT-A term used to describe the write-ups, checksheets and packs that outline the purposes, know-how and duties of a post. It exists in folders and packs and is trained-in on the person on the post.

HAT TECHNOLOGY

"Hats" developed in 1950 for use in Dianetic orgs as a special technology. The term and idea of "a hat" comes from conductors or locomotive engineers, etc., each of whom wears a distinctive and different type of headgear. A "hat" therefore designates particular status and duties in an organization.

A "hat" is a specialty. It handles or controls certain particles in various actions and receives, changes and routes them.

A "hat" designates what terminal in the organization is represented and what the terminal handles and what flows the terminal directs.

Every hat has a product.

The product can be represented as a statistic.

Any job or position in the world could have its own hat. The reason things do not run well in a life, an org, a group, nation or the world is an absence of hats.

The reason why an org runs well when it does is hats.

Any protest of anyone against things not running right can be traced to lack of hats.

Any slump an org goes through can be traced directly and at once to an absence of one or more hats being worn.

HAT CONTENT

A hat must contain

- A. A *purpose* of the post.
- B. Its relative position on the org bd.
- C. A write-up of the post (done usually by people who have held it before relief and when so done it has no further authority than advice).
- D. A checksheet of all the policy letters, bulletins, advices, manuals, books and drills applicable to the post. (As in a course checksheet.)

325

E. A full pack of the written materials plus tapes of the checksheet plus any manuals of equipment or books.

F. A copy of the org bd of the portion of the org to which the post belongs.

G. A flow chart showing what particles are received by the post and what changes the post is expected to make in them and to where the post routes them.

H. The product of the post.

1. The statistic of the post, the statistic of the section, the statistic of the department and division to which the post belongs.

STAFF HAT

There is also a general staff hat.

This hat contains

- (a) The overall purpose of the org, its aims, goals and products.
- (b) The privileges or rewards of a staff member such as auditing, training on post, general training availability, pay, vacations or leave, etc.
- (c) The penalties involved in nonproduction or abuse of post privileges or misuse of the post contracts.
- (d) The public relations responsibilities of a staff member.
- (e) The interpersonal relations amongst staff members including courtesy, cleanliness, attitudes to seniors and juniors, office etiquette, etc.
- (f) The mest of posts generally, its papers, despatches, files, equipment.
- (g) The comm and transport system of the org.

GRADIENT SCALE OF HATS

A "gradient scale" means "a gradual increasing degree of something." A nongradient scale would be telling someone to enter a skyscraper by a 32nd story window.

Thus there is a gradient scale of organizing.

A key to this is found in *Problems of Work's* theory of confusion and the stable datum.

One in actual practice has to cope while organizing.

COPE means to handle whatever comes up. In the dictionary it means "to deal successfully with a difficult situation." We use it to mean "to handle any old way whatever comes up, to handle it successfully and somehow."

IF YOU *REMAIN* IN COPE, THE DEMAND TO COPE INCREASES.

In that you have the key to "exhausted executives" or staff members. You have why the President of the US ages about 20 years in one term of office as you can see by comparing dated photographs of past presidents. He is totally on cope. His government has an org board that looks like a pile of jackstraws. He has no hat. His staff have. no hats. His government departments have no hat. The technologies of economics, law, business, politics, welfare, warfare, diplomacy, have been lost or neglected (they do Axist to some extent).

326

The guy is on total cope. And the post has been on total cope since it was created as an afterthought by the Constitutional Congress that began the post in the 18th century. Even what it says in US civics textbooks is not found in practice.

So "difficult situations" are the order of the day and are handled by special actions and appointments.

The people who *should* handle them haven't got real hats.

This is all catching up with the country at this writing to such a degree that the citizen cannot benefit from a stable society or social order. The country looks more like a war of insurgency.

In other words departures from hats has lead into total cope and it is steadily worsening.

Any organization put in by one political party is knocked out by the next incumbent and who could totally organize a country in four years? (The term of a president.)

Yet it is hanging together some way and some way meeting increasing demands and pressures.

I have stated this in a large example so that it can be seen in a smaller unit.

To handle this one would first have to want to straighten it out and then assemble the tech of admin to straighten it out. And then one would have to begin on a gradient scale of org bd and hats.

A cope sort of hat would be tossed off orders to some other people on staff who have some title of some sort.

Along with this would be a posted org bd that has little to do with duties actually performed and used by a staff that doesn't know what it is.

One begins to move out of cope (as given in other series) by putting an org board together that labels posts and duties and getting people on them to handle the types of particles (bodies, mailings) of the org.

The next action would be brief write-ups of the posts and their duties and checking people out on them.

Actually if you only got to the middle of the last paragraph with an org the executives would remain in cope. So much know-how would be missing in the org's staff that every rough bit would shoot up to the executive for special handling and that is cope.

Hats only in this far is not good enough as it still takes a genius to run the place.

The next gradient scale is to get the hat to contain

- (i) The post write-up itself
- (ii) The theory and practical necessary to run it.

This is done by a preparation of checksheets of data and a pack matching it for key posts.

Naturally the org bd now has to become more real and staff has to be checked out on it.

Then hats as post checksheets and packs are extended to the rest of the staff.

327

The mechanisms of training have to exist by this time.

Seniors have to be made responsible that every junior below them has a hat consisting of write-up, checksheet and pack.

Meanwhile one continues to cope.

Gradually, gradually staff begin to know (through checkouts) their hats.

New staff coming on are grooved in better.

Cope begins to diminish and the organization tends to smooth out.

Here and there competent handlings begin to show up brightly.

Now we find a new situation. With everyone throwing together checksheets and packs for staffs we find nonstandard checksheets. Some messenger has to do the full checksheet of the HCO Division pages and pages long. The HCO Sec has a checksheet with just 10 items on it.

So a central authority has to standardize post checksheets and survey and put in overlooked bits of data.

But that is way up the line. The org long since has become smooth and prosperous.

So that is the gradient scale of getting in hats.

EXPERTS

Here and there you find an area of special expertise in an org where the expertise is so expert in itself that it obscures the fact that the person does not also have a full post hat.

A lawyer would be a case in point. It takes so long to learn law in some law school that an org executive can overlook the fact that the *post* hat is missing. Org policy on legal matters and staff hat remain unknown to this legal post AND JAM IT UTTERLY, This came to light when a whole series of cases was being neglected because the legal staff member, an excellent lawyer, did not know how to make out a purchase order or that one could or should. Investigation found no post or staff hat. Only a legal degree.

Orgs continually do this with auditors. They are technical experts in *auditing*. So they get assigned to posts in the HGC **WITH NO HAT**. Backlogs occur, things goof up. Tech fails. All because it is overlooked that they are PART OF AN ORG and need staff and post hats and need to be trained on them.

Worse than that, a highly classed auditor is often put on an admin post without hat or training for it.

You would not take an admin trained person and without further training tell him to audit. So why take an auditor and tell him to handle an admin division?

Without his post write-up, checksheet and pack FOR THE POST and without training on it, the person just isn't qualified for it no matter what *other* line he is expert in.

It is great to have an expert who has been specially trained in some profession. But lawyer, engineer or public relations, he must have his hat for the org post and be trained on it or he will goof! Yet one won't suspect why that area is goofing because "he's a Class VI isn't he?"

328

UTILIZATION

Personnel can recruit madly, answering every frantic demand for personnel and yet HAVE THEM ALL WASTED for lack of full hats and full training on those hats.

An investigation of blows (desertions) from orgs shows that lack of a grooved-in hat was at the bottom of it.

People come on a job. It is at once a great mystery or an assumption of total know-one or the other.

Either one continued leads them into a state of liability to the org.

People who don't know what they are doing and people who don't but think they do are both NONUTILIZED PERSONNEL.

Pay and prosperity for the rest of the staff will go down unless this is remedied.

The whole org can sag and even vanish under these conditions.

So Personnel has a vested interest in hats being complete and staff trained on them. For Personnel people cannot possibly cope with "no pay so can't hire anyone" and "no people so can't produce."

The answer is H-A-T-S.

And a hat is a write-up, a checksheet and a pack.

And the staff member trained on them.

ETHICS

When a person has no hat he lacks purpose and value,

When he has no purpose and value he not only goofs, he will commit crimes,

It is apparently easier to hit with ethics than to program and give someone a full hat and get him trained on it.

Police action is not a substitute for having purpose and value.

This is so fundamental that one can even trace the unrest of a nation to lack of purpose and value. A huge welfare program guarantees crime and revolt because it gives handouts, not hats.

Even a field Scientologist should have a hat.

By doing only this over the world we would own the planet as in an expanding population, individual purpose and value are the most vital and wanted commodities,

If there are no real hats there will soon be no money of any value and no bread!

SUMMARY

ANY HAT IS BETTER THAN NO HAT according to the way a thetan seems to think.

But be that as it may, the downfall of any org can be traced directly and instantly to no recruiting or no org board, no hats or unreal hats or no training on hats.

The sag of an org can be traced directly to lack of hats and lack of training on hats.

329

The overload of any post can be traced directly to lack of an org bd and lack of hats and no training on hats.

The way out is to organize the org board and hats while you cope.

If you do not your cope will become an overwhelm. If you do your burden will lighten and your prosperity increase.

It took 13 months of hard work and 20 years of org experience to learn that, given a product, lack of HATS was *the* WHY of departures from the ideal scene and that working toward providing full complete HATS was the way to get back toward the ideal scene.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sb.cden.ts.gm Copyright © 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

330

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 26 SEPTEMBER 1970

Issue III

Remimeo Executive Hats

Org Series 5

ORG BD CUTATIVES

The most serious blunder in re-doing org boards is losing past functions off them.

"Cutative" is an invented word to mean the impulse to shorten or leave out or the thing left out.

THE RULE IS: ANY MAJOR FUNCTION, ACTION OR POST LEFT OFF AN **ORG BOARD WILL WRAP ITSELF AROUND THE IN-CHARGE LIKE A HIDDEN MENACE.**

As the function is not *expressed* it is not recognized. But it forces itself upward and can swamp an activity if not done.

Thus we get the laws:

1. Activity functions must all be expressed on the org board.
2. All functions below a personnel on an org bd are the responsibility of that personnel, no matter what size the staff may be.
3. Functions omitted will act as invisible overloads.

EVOLUTION OF ORG BDs

Usually the first org board ever done for an activity is a dream up. It is seldom real but better than no org bd at all.

Experience then refines it.

Some functions on it are not related to it, are unreal.

Some functions not on it rise up to haunt and overload the in-charge.

Actions done by an executive that are not on the org board in departments get posted like small flags opposite the executive's name. (Like legal, VIP greeting, etc.)

After a while these little flags are too many.

A reorganization occurs and the flags are put down into departmental functions. This gets them off the executive's neck and gets them manned up.

So far so good. Now what happens is a catastrophe. A new executive who has no experience with this org bd DREAMS UP A NEW ONE. This is out of sequence in evolution. He is treating the place as though it had NO org bd simply because he doesn't know the existing board.

This gives us the cutative. He drops functions off the board. These now wrap around his neck. The place stalls.

331

YOU HAVE TO KEEP EVERYTHING ON THE ORG BD THAT WAS EVER ON THE ORG BD EVEN IF IT WAS 3000 YEARS.

SALVAGE

It often occurs that one has to do a full, complete salvage of an org bd.

There is absolutely no reason except the org bd writer's laziness not to put everything on an org bd!

There is a rule about posting an org bd. You don't post a name for every post. That is folly. You post by work load.

All the functions below a person are handled by that person. If they are too much you put in a new name and person on a heavy load function.

So why do a cutative? It means no more people. It just means more space and tape. What's saved but elbow grease? What's lost? The whole org can be lost and become nonviable.

Example: SH original board had 10 major divisions on it. They were just functions really. They were the 10 sources of income *before* SH trained or processed anyone. Some years ago I tore the place apart looking for that old org bd. It was evidently thrown away. Today SH does not have but *one* of those income functions! Nine have been lost! It added training and processing, it lost 9 functions capable of supporting it. They should be looked up in the 1959-1960 accounts records, the old invoices analyzed and gotten back and put on the WW org bd and manned. This is regardless of what is already on the org bd.

Other functions lost off that and the SH org bds should be posted back on them and at least held from above or double or triple-hatted.

Example: DC which had the original 6 dept org bd should recover those posts and put them on the 9 div org bd so early policy would make sense.

Example: London should recover its earliest org bds and put their posts and functions on its current org bd,

There comes a time when early org bds have to be salvaged and reposted on existing org bds.

BECAUSE THOSE FUNCTIONS ARE STILL THERE AND MOST OF THEM GONE INVISIBLE.

Example: A Division 2 org bd asked to be redone threw away 50% of its functions and posts, was dreamed up brand new off a division already caved in by loss of performance. The excuse was "other activities now do these." Published, this org bd would have driven its executive mad with omitted duties that would come to him as invisible overloads.

The "We don't do that now" is like what once happened to tech. One could say, "Maybe you think you don't do it now but the function is still there hidden. It was found once. Now you've lost it again."

OLD EMPIRES

The Egyptian, Greek and Roman Empires still try to operate! I've checked it. The late British Empire may be gone on the British org bd but it will still function without expression until it kicks England's head in. The British public shovels money out by the scoopful to an empire that doesn't exist!

Trying to kill an org takes years and years and years and it still tries to survive.

332

When one takes responsibility for a function or area it still tends to persist.

It is an odd phenomenon. The third dynamic track is that way. Changes later on the track (short of auditing individuals) do not change earlier circumstances.

A thetan's intentions get very pale perhaps but a thetan never really gives up.

All this expresses itself on the subject of org bds.

One can also willfully disregard an existing board, dream up a new board that does not express the functions and get into real trouble.

A NEW LOOK

Examining this subject of org bds in the light of very current experience with asking people to redo them, these facts have emerged.

It gives us a new look.

The next full Sen org bd issue you see will have on it all functions of which we have any trace *and* the nine division board we are using.

The new board will have nine divisions. It will also include all past titles and functions in addition to all current titles and functions with the past titles in parenthesis.

Many org bds of other activities have never become expressed at all and have left a tangled history. The US still hangs flags around the Office of the President and one hears "The Executive Branch is usurping the power of Congress." Congress once had all those functions but didn't put them on its org bd. They still do them but lost the titles to the President. Thus an appointee despotism rises in place of a democracy. It all goes back to a lost congressional org bd.

It is necessary for a people or a staff to

(a) Have an org bd

(b) Know the org bd

(c) Have the org bd express the total functions and duties that have ever been held by any post even including the flags of yesteryear duly dated.

Don't cut functions off an org bd. If they have become known they have been found. Why lose them?

One can rearrange flow patterns.

One cannot abandon living functions on an org bd.

It's only the unknowns on an org bd that get anyone overloaded, confused or in trouble.

So why not keep it visible?

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sb.gm Copyright © 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

333

HUBBARD COMMUNICATION

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 27 SEPI

Issue I

Remimeo

Cashiers

Div Ills *Org Series 6*

Pub Div Hats

Div 11 Hats

FSMs CUTATIVE PRICES

F/Os

HCO PL of 27 Apr AD 15 "Organizational Price Engram" is fully valid and must be followed. It explains why price cuts damage orgs.

Price cuts are forbidden under any guise.

1. PROCESSING MAY NEVER BE GIVEN AWAY BY AN ORG.

Processing is too expensive to deliver.

2. BOOKS MAY NEVER BE GIVEN AWAY BY AN ORG OR BY PUBS ORG.

They are too expensive to manufacture.

3. FSM COMMISSIONS MAY NEVER BE PAID ON DISCOUNTED OR CUT-RATE ITEMS.

If an FSM can't sell for full value he does not rate any commission.

4. SCHOLARSHIPS FOR COURSES ARE LIMITED TO INTERNSHIPS, HSDC AND ACADEMY LEVELS.

5. COURSE SCHOLARSHIPS ONLY MAY BE OFFERED FSM ON CONTEST AWARDS.

6. SCHOLARSHIPS ARE ONLY AVAILABLE TO WORKING FSMs OF PROVEN SELECTEE SUCCESSES.

7. ALL SCHOLARSHIPS AND AWARDS OUTSTANDING TERMINATE IF NOT TAKEN BEFORE 1 JANUARY 1971.

8. FSM COMMISSIONS ARE PAID ONLY ON THE ARRIVAL OF A

STUDENT OR PC, NOT ON RECEIPT OF THE FEE.

Adv payments are sometimes refunded.

9. ONLY FULLY CONTRACTED STAFF IS AWARDED FREE SERVICE,
AND THIS IS DONE BY INVOICE AND LEGAL NOTE WHICH BECOMES DUE AND
PAYABLE IF THE CONTRACT IS BROKEN.

10. FSM BONUS AWARDS TO ORGS MAY ONLY BE DELIVERED TO
CONTRACTED STAFF MEMBERS OF THAT ORG.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sb.rd.gm Copyright Q 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

334

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 1 OCTOBER AD 20

Remimeo HC Checksheet

Org Series 7

HATS AND COUNTER-EFFORT

When you are trying to get somebody to do something he should do, you are in effect trying to get him to wear his hat.

In trying to get things done you often feel you are running into "counter-effort." (Contrary action or effort to your action or effort.)

The most usual counter-effort is NOT willfulness or mutiny or out-ethics. Most people consider these are the reasons they get opposition to worthwhile actions.

The most usual counter-effort is *lack of a hat*, defining a hat as a write-up, checksheet and pack on which the person is trained.

It looks like willful stupidity, waywardness, laziness, mutiny, antagonism or what have you.

Whatever the reason for it may be it must include lack of a hat.

The variations are enormous, almost infinite.

Example: Mr. A is trying to get Mrs. A to be a good wife. Mrs. A is in outright mutiny. Now it could be that Mr. A does not have or know his husband hat or Mrs. A has no wife hat or the neighbors or friends don't have neighbor or friend hats or Mr. B has no social hat and is trying to estrange Mrs. A or he has no husband's hat of his own; but whatever it is, it is a matter of hats. **SOMEBODY** (or all of them) in this is not wearing their hat.

I had someone in marital trouble look at me thoughtfully once and say, "I don't have *any* idea what *are* the rights or duties. OF a wife."

Example: A Course Supervisor having trouble getting a student to study. He pleaded and argued and wore himself out.

He never realized this student DID NOT HAVE A STUDENT HAT. He could have saved all his energy spent in arguing and applied it to making up a student hat and getting *it* assembled and studied and would have gotten somewhere.

ORG BD

So we draw up an org board for an activity for several people.

It is all correct as to function and flows.

We put the names of the several people on it where they seem to be fitted.

The activity doesn't go.

So we explain and drill the org board on the people.

It comes up to a flubby sort of cope.

335

The missing point now is HATS. Each one has to have and know his own hat and something about the hats of others.

Things will promptly get much better! The activity and the interpersonal relations and the lives of these people are greatly improved.

Personally they are running into much less cross-flow and confusion. So they have a happier time, less effort and more production.

A badly organized, badly hatted, badly trained group is at each other's throats continually. To get anything done at all they have to operate at the level of correction instead of production.

Any ripple of emergency in such a group operates as a major impact.

PROGRAMS

There is still a missing element when one has org boarded and hatted and specialist trained an activity. This is PROGRAMS.

The sequence of flows and the changes or actions at each point plotted against time are in fact the major sequences and programs of a group.

MANAGEMENT SUCCESS

Given a desired product a fully successful management can only be founded on the actions inherent in

1. A good org bd
2. Hats as write-ups, checksheets and packs
3. Hats trained-in
4. Sequences and programs known and followed.

IT IS FAR FAR EASIER TO WORK ON AND ACCOMPLISH THOSE FOUR THINGS THAN IT IS TO COPE AGAINST THE COUNTER-EFFORT GENERATED WITHOUT THEM.

Naturally while getting this done, anyone has to cope to keep things going.

SINGLE-HANDING

"Single-handing" means to handle things by yourself.

You can single-hand when you are all alone or you can single-hand in a large group that is supposed to be working or helping.

When only one man, senior or junior, is doing all the controlling and work of an activity he is said to be "single-handing."

The term derives from the sea (like so many English words). Single means "one only" and "hand" means a sailor. "Handing" is the verb form of "single-hand."

No other activity expresses so well the idea of "one man working" or "one man controlling."

It is of course derogatory to others who are around and not working.

336

The phenomenon comes about by having non-org-boarded, unhatted and untrained people.

Now the oddity of it is that it can occur (a) when there are other people who are also supposed to be working (b) when there is an org board (c) when there are hats and (d) when programs exist.

This of course looks like "bad morale," "apathy," even "mutiny."

The missing elements usually are

(a) The other people don't know the purpose of the activity or what's really going on.

(b) The org bd is unknown to them even when it exists.

(c) The hats are not checksheets and packs and have not been trained-in.

(d) The sequences or programs that should occur are not drilled in and if they were the no-hat situation would wreck them.

The point is even more amazing when a group with a purpose and an excellent potential product **WILL BE POOR AND WILL FAIL** if org bd, hats and sequences and programs are not fully known and drilled.

Groups are like that.

This is why Man and his activities succeed only in the presence of huge affluences or extraordinary personal leadership.

Lacking org bds, hats, training, programs *that he knows and can do*, Man flounders.

UNHATTED LEADERS

Leaders who are not org boarded, hatted and trained and programmed can make a fantastic mess out of a formerly well-organized group.

It takes some doing. But no one can knock the known org board apart faster than a senior. No one can knock off hats easier than someone in authority who does not himself know they exist.

Nero and his ilk destroyed the whole Roman Empire. That civilization was about as well org boarded and hatted as any civilization on the planet in recent millenia. Nero thought he was a lute player and composer and charioteer. These were the only hats he ever wore aside from that of murderer.

A few emperors like him and that was that.

The Christians had an org board, member hats and staff hats, post hats of a sort and constant training. And that was the end of the Roman Empire and the beginning of the Holy Roman Empire.

Way up in Pope Alexander the Sixth's time (the days of Lucretia Borgia) when bishoprics were for sale and the member hats were forgotten, the Holy Roman Empire failed.

So there is plenty of history and example, even though the full tech was not even developed. You can see the dim counterparts of org boards and hats weaving their way through all Man's yesterdays.

The history of the world is not written by wars and violence. It is written against an unseen background of beneficial products, org board, hats and programs.

337

The fantastic administrative skill of Arthur Wellesley the Duke of Wellington and the rigid org bd of Nicholas of Russia defeated Napoleon whose only skills were military genius and personal leadership and luck.

So when the head of something does not know about org bds and hats and programs he can single-hand things perhaps into temporary power but will wear himself out with cope and soon decline.

One can't just run things. One has to put something there and the something is a desirable product, and org bd hats and programs and see they are grooved in properly.

And looking over history the most valuable product of an executive is holding the form of his org and providing his staff members with hats and programs well grooved in.

It takes so much more time and effort to build up an org in terms of org bd and hats and get it to hold its form that one might not at once see its benefit. Trying to get a result without also building an organization inevitably winds up in single-handing, coping, overwhelm and eventual defeat.

The right answer is single-hand while you train up your people.

For one will wind up single-handing any post he has not org bded and hatted and programmed,

And that is true of even a junior member of a staff. If HE doesn't hammer away to get in org bds and hats and sequences and programs, HE will wind up single-handing all his section-while they stand around making life miserable with inefficiency, goofs and flubs and obvious counter-effort.

It isn't labor against management or the people against government. One or the other or both aren't on org bds and aren't wearing their hats.

And in an interdependent society or a complex activity the final result of no org bd, no hats, no programs known is chaos. And very unpleasant chaos as well.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

[Note: Page 337, paragraph 14 has been corrected to read, "Pope Alexander the Sixth's time." Earlier issues read, "Pope Alexander the Fourth's time."]

338

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 8 OCTOBER 1970

Remimeo

Executives

Org Series 8

ORGANIZING AND PRODUCT

Disorganization gives a poor product.

Organization (providing tech exists to make the product) will produce a good product.

If a product is poor or spotty one must

(a) Organize

(b) Make the tech available and known.

You can literally have mobs of people working and excellent production tech and get a horrible product.

The missing ingredient is organization.

Organization consists of a real and functional org board, hats consisting of checksheets, packs and manuals and training of this material.

The most used org bd is the "hey you! org bd." In other words just tag anyone to do anything.

This guarantees bad production and a lousy product.

One can have an org bd that isn't real and get a "hey you! org bd."

Or one can have a good org bd that isn't known and get a "hey you! org bd" in actual practice.

A whole org can be org bded and hatted and trained and yet shatter when an untrained senior turns it into a "hey you! org bd." This is easily the commonest cause of org collapse.

LOSING AN ORG BD

When an org bd leaves out known vital functions these tend to wrap around the neck of the in-charge as unknown items of irritation.

The commonest fault in re-drawing an org bd is throwing the old one away and without looking at or getting a full inspection of the actual functions being done, dreaming up a brand new board. This produces a delusory situation. It is in fact a disassociation of the real work and the org bd delusion.

MINIMUM FUNCTION

A post tends to dwindle down to the "irreducible minimum function."

A mail clerk will distribute mail as that is visible to others. Logging it is less visible. Properly sorting it is less visible.

339

If "receiving, logging, sorting and distributing" are left off the org bd and "mail distribution" is all that is left on it, the other functions tend to vanish and the post slides to "irreducible minimum" of just grabbing and slinging out mail.

A galley org bd can be deficient and carry only "food," or "cook"; you'll get "food" and that's all. It will possibly be very lousy food as the org bd is down to an irreducible minimum. Says "food" so they just sling out food any old way of any old kind. Bad product. The answer is to organize it. What are the steps in sequence that it takes to get good food served and the place cleaned up? If they are all on the org bd as functions you have the SEQUENCE of actions expressed as functions which can be posted and delegated as duties.

OUT SEQUENCE and OMITTED HATS are the commonest fault in programs and org boards. (See Data Series.)

One person may have 35 separate hats,

If so, he needs 35 hat folders, checksheets and packs and 35 baskets or compartments for the flows.

Further, the hats must be in sequence of flow where they relate to one type of particle.

Thirty-five hats is large but many an executive unknowingly wears more. And the ones he doesn't see are his areas of upset.

The smaller the number of people in an activity, the more hats each has.

One girl holding down seven branches of an office finally got untangled just by having seven baskets, one for each branch, and working a stated time on each one each day. She sorted the inflow into the baskets by branches and then did them in rotation that made an org bd of the baskets. She suddenly got production where she had had just despair and chaos.

SUMMARY

To improve an existing product, ORGANIZE.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sb.rd.gm Copyright cl 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

340

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 28 OCTOBER 1970

Remimeo

Org Series 9

ORGANIZING AND HATS

"Org bd" is actually an abbreviation not for an organization (noun) board but an organizing (verb) board.

The org bd shows the pattern of organizing to obtain a product.

A board then is a flow chart of consecutive products brought about by terminals in series.

We see these terminals as "posts" or positions.

Each one of these is a hat.

There is a flow along these hats.

The result of the whole board is a product.

The product of each hat on the board adds up to the total product.

WORKING IT OUT

When asked to work out an org bd (or when the board there is doesn't work) one might think the task very difficult.

In studying this subject so as to be able to communicate it, I made several small breakthroughs in the subject itself.

Several questions on this can be very easily answered now.

Does an org bd have any value?

Yes. Without an org bd there is no group product, there is only a mob.

Yes. When there is no org bd there is much greater effort involved in getting anything done.

Yes. The waste of people involved in no org bd and the loss of product justify any amount of effort to work out, make known and use a proper org bd.

Man instinctively uses an org bd and protests the lack of one. The rawest recruit walking aboard a ship assumes the existence of an org bd, if not a posted one, at least a known one. He assumes there will be somebody in charge and that different activities will be under different people. When there is no known org bd he protests. He also feels insecure as he doesn't know where he fits into this organization.

Almost all revolts are manned by people who have been excluded out and are not on the country's org bd. This is so true that the ridiculous circumstance recently occurred in the US. The President found he had "professional relief receivers." Certain people had assumed the status of "government dependent" and were giving this as their profession. It was of course a post of sorts. And because it wasn't admitted as a post by the government there were some riots.

341

The effort to belong or to be part of is expressed by an org bd. A person with no post is quite miserable. A person with an unreal post feels like a fraud or a mistake.

Morale then is also considerably affected by the quality of an org bd or its absence.

The overall test for the group, however, is its viability. Viability depends on having an acceptable product. Groups which do not have an acceptable product are not likely to survive.

The volume and acceptability of a product depends in no small measure on a workable known org bd. This is true even of an individual product.

An individual or small group, to get anywhere at all, requires a very exact org bd. The oddity is that the smaller the group the more vital the org bd. Yet individuals and small groups are the least likely to have one. Large groups disintegrate in the absence of an org bd and go nonviable in the presence of a poor one.

The quality of a product, usually blamed on individual skill only, depends to an enormous extent upon the org board. For example, one disorganized mob that was trying to make a certain product was worked to death, harassed, angry at one another and had a wholly unacceptable product at about twice the usual cost; when organized to the degree of a third, still without proper schedules, still largely untrained, they began to turn out an acceptable product at about half the effort-so even *some* organization worked,

The product volume and quality depends utterly and totally upon the org board and hats and their use. You can train individuals endlessly but unless they are operating on a workable org bd they will still have a poor or small volume product.

The traditional reliance of British intelligence on star agents instead of organization cost them (along with misused PR) their empire.

Lack of a known and real org bd can spell failure. And lack of knowledge of the *subject* of organization has to be substituted for by pure genius at every point.

Thus to make anything at all, to improve any product, sustain morale and distribute work equitably and make it count, one has to have a real and a known org bd.

So how do you make one?

HATS

An org bd is made up of hats.

The definition of a hat is the "beingness and doingness that attains a product."

Let us take a train:

The engineer wearing his engineer hat has the title of engineer. That's the beingness.

He accepts orders, watches signals and general conditions, operates levers and valves to regulate the operation of his engine and to start, change and stop. That's the doingness.

He safely and on schedule moves the train passengers and/or freight from one location to another. A moved train and load is the product.

So how do we find out there is a hat called engineer?

342

As people are continually accepting or viewing already existing posts, when you ask them to dream up an org bd they at first may not realize that you are asking them to *invent* the correct posts.

They don't have to invent "engineer." Everybody knows "an engineer runs a train."

So if you didn't know this, you'd have to figure it out.

One would do it this way. One would have to think along these lines.

The idea comes about because of a concept that people and goods have to be moved over distances on land. Or that a new area building up has to have transport of people and goods from and to it.

Ah. This will be viable in an economic framework because people will pay to be moved and pay for their goods to be moved.

Trains do this.

So let's use trains.

Arranging finance (or by prepayment) and obtaining a franchise for a right of way, track is laid, rolling stock and stations and roundhouses are built.

Now it emerges that somebody has to drive the train. So somebody had better be hired to drive the train.

So there comes into view the *post of* engineer.

How do we know this? Because we have to have a *product of* moved people and goods. That was what we were trying to do in the first place.

Therefore, the engineer hat.

So supposing now we did not have any org bd at all.

The engineer hat would be the only hat. So he collects fares, runs stations, fixes his engine, buys fuel, loads the cars, sells stock. . . .

Wait a minute. *If* the engineer did all that the following would happen:

1. He would be exhausted.
2. His temper would be bad.
3. **He would have machinery breakdowns.**
4. He might **have, wrecks.**
5. **The railroad property otherwise** unhandled would disintegrate.
6. He would have a low volume *of* product.
7. His product would be uneven and bad as he could maintain no schedule,
8. There would shortly be no railroad.

Now let's go wog and "solve" this.

Let's appoint a person for each station and say "There we are!"

Well, it would still be a mess.

So let's hire more engineers and more station agents and more engineers and more station agents. . . and wind up with a confused mess, a huge payroll and a lousy product. That's how governments do it. And it is notable that current governments have no product but disaster.

No, we have to solve this in quite another way.

We do not get anywhere and we will not get a sensible org bd and nothing will work or be viable unless WE COUNT THE PRODUCTS CORRECTLY AND DEVELOP HATS TO ATTAIN THEM.

When we have done this we can arrange the hats on an org bd so there is a flow and command channels and communication channels and we've got an org bd.

You cannot work out an org bd until you have counted products!

As volume increases you estimate the products before the final product and hat those.

Quality of final product depends on a real org bd and hats, both complete, real and trained-in and the functions DONE.

Let us see now how you break down a final product into the products which, put together, comprise it.

We have the final product of a railroad-viably moved loads. How many lesser products go into the big product?

There is a matter of machinery here. Any machine has 2 products: (a) the machine itself in good operating condition, (b) the product of the machine. A repairman and machine shop man and a roundhouse keeper each has a product under (a). That is just for the machine, the engine.

Under (b) we have what the machine itself produces (hailed trains in the case of an engine).

Here we have then 2 major products-and these break down into lesser products, earlier in sequence to the final product.

There is even an earlier product to these-bought engines. And an earlier product to that-finance for equipment.

As for the load itself, a delivered load, accepted by a consignee at the end, as you back up the sequence you will find a product-stored freight. And before that-unloaded freight. And before that-moved freight. And before that-loaded freight. And before that-freight assembled for shipment. And before that-freight contracts procured. And before that-advertising placed in public view. And before that-surveys of public freight requirement. And before that-survey for activities requiring freight service.

Each one of these products is a hat.

Surveying this again we see there's no charges or money involved so no economic viability. Thus we have a product, money made. This has earlier hats of course. The bewilderment of some people (and a lot of executives) who gape at a no-dough situation is laughable. They aren't product-minded. They think money falls into a company's lap or out of a TV set. They can't think the product-sequence necessary to obtain money. So they go broke and starve. There are always a lot of prior products to the product MONEY. Fixated people just fixate on money itself, have no product sequence and so go broke or are poor.

Someone has to have a desirable product that is sold for more than it cost to produce and have to sell it and deliver it to have money. Money even makes money. And even a pool of money has to have a product sequence or it vanishes.

Even in socialism or communism the how does it support itself question must be understood, answered, its product sequence identified, org boarded and hatted. In such a moneyless society the org boarding has to be much tighter as money adds flexibility and lack of it as a working factor makes problems that are hard to solve.

ORGANIZING

In order to organize something one only has to

1. Establish what is the final product.
2. Work backwards in sequence to establish the earlier products necessary to make each next product and which all in a row add up to the final product.
3. Post it in terms of vertical greater and greater completeness of product to get command channels.
4. Adjust it for flows.
5. Assign its comm sequence.
6. Work out the doing resulting in each product. Write these as functions and actions with all skills included.
7. Name these as posts.
8. Post it.
9. Drill it to get it known.
10. Assemble and issue the hats.
11. Get these known.
12. Get the functions done so that the products occur.

This is what is called "organizing."

As a comment, because railroads *didn't* fully organize their viability decayed and they ceased to be so used.

Railroads think it's the government or airplane rivalry or many other things. It isn't. They had too many missing hats, were actually too disorganized to keep pace with the society's demands, ceased to fully deliver and declined. In fact there has never been a greater need of railroads than today. Yet, disorganized, badly org boarded and hatted, they do not furnish the service they should and so are opposed, government regulated, union hammered and caved in.

To have a quality product, organize!

To raise morale, organize!

To survive, organize!

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sb.rd.gm Copyright © 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 29 OCTOBER 1970

Remimeo

Exec Hats

Org Series 10

THE ANALYSIS OF ORGANIZATION BY PRODUCT

The different products involved in production are

1. Establishing something that produces. (Product 1)
2. Operating that which produces in order to obtain a product. (Product 2)
3. Repairing or correcting that which produces. (Product 3)
4. Repairing or correcting that which is produced. (Product 4)

Example: A typewriter is manufactured and located on a desk. This is establishing something that produces as in (1). A typist operates or runs the typewriter which thus produces typed sheets, stencils, etc., which are the product produced. This satisfies (2) above. The typewriter from various causes eventually requires repair in order to continue to produce. This satisfies (3). The correction of things typed would satisfy (4).

These are the four basic PRODUCTS involved in production.

Thus there are really four basic products necessary to a production activity.

These are

1. The established machine.
2. The machine's product.
3. The corrected machine.
4. The corrected product.

That makes a minimum of 4 products for any production cycle.

Three major factors govern every product. These are

- A. Quantity
- B. Quality
- C. Viability

Quantity would be an acceptable, expected or useful volume.

Quality would be the degree of perfection of a product.

Viability would be the longevity, usefulness and desirability of the product.

As *each product* in the four listed above has *three* factors in each product, there are then 12 major points (4 x 3) regulating production.

Product I-Establishing the typewriter, contains

- (i) The quantity of typewriters established.
- (ii) The quality of the typewriters established.
- (iii) The viability of the typewriters established.

Product 2-The **product of the typewriter** (typed things) also has three:

- (iv) The quantity of the typed things.
- (v) The quality of the typed things.
- (vi) The viability of the typed things.

Product 3-The repair of the typewriter itself also has three factors:

- (vii) The quantity (amount) of the repair.
- (viii) The quality of the repair.
- (ix) The viability of the repair.

Product 4-The correction of the thing produced.

- (x) The quantity (amount) of the corrected product.
- (xi) The quality of the corrected product.
- (xii) The viability of the corrected product.

Thus to get a product, "typed things," there are actually 12 separate factors.

This applies to all machinery. For instance there is the generator that produces and there is the thing (electricity) produced by the generator. There is the repaired generator. And there is the corrected electricity (such as reducing its voltage or converting it).

Now if you did not know that you were handling 12 factors in producing electricity the tendency would be to "just run the generator" and ignore the actual factors governing production.

The results of this would be total operation only. The generator would soon go to pieces. The electricity furnished would vary all over the place and blow out other equipment. There would be no funds to repair or replace the generator when it broke down. By paying little attention to products (as the wog world often does) or by shifting their importances-giving total importance to running it-there would soon be no viability at all. The end result would be 2 wrong products-scrap metal that was once a generator and no electricity.

Now, surprise, surprise! An organization composed of people is influenced by these same things!

Org Product 1 is putting it there.

Org Product 2 is what the org produces.

Org Product 3 is the repair of the org.

Org Product 4 is the correction of the org's product.

347

If we do not know these products and factors exist, continual mistakes can be made just as bad as just running a generator. Instead of the desired final product, which is offered and sold and delivered, we get scrap paper and insolvency.

To establish an org one has to put one there. This requires a desirable and economic product of the org envisioned, the technology of making the final product, the technology of making and handling the org, the procurement of a location, recruitment, an org bd, hats, and training and the equipment and materiel needed to produce the final product and the obtaining of the raw materiel to make the final product. Thus established. it must be done so that

- (i) The amount of org is created proportionate to its final product demand.
- (ii) The quality of the org itself-shabby, posh, active or lazy, etc.
- (iii) The viability of the org (how long will it last economically, how will it expand, does income exceed out-go, etc.).

The product of the org itself is regulated by

- (iv) The quantity of product produced (which must be of sufficient volume to satisfy demand).
 - (v) The quality of the org's product or products (which must be adequate to satisfy those requiring and paying for the production).
 - (vi) The viability of the org's product (how long does it last and is it adequate for its value).
- The repair of the org itself must be
- (vii) The quantity or amount of repair necessary to make the org functional (which may amount to simply giving it a new letterhead or rebuilding the whole place, nearly the establishing product again).
 - (viii) The quality or **expertness of the repair (a bad one could destroy the place)**.
 - (ix) The viability of the repair (if the right WHY is handled the repair as a product will last a long time and if a wrong reason for decline is handled the place will just cave in again).

The correction of the org's product to obtain a uniformly satisfactory product:

- (x) The quantity (proportion of the org's product that has to be corrected (which might require, if too high, the repair of some part of the org itself).
- (xi) The quality of the correction (expert and can be afforded and itself nondestructive). '

(xii) The viability of the product corrected. (Will it last and be nearly as good as the better produced product?)

All these factors must be consulted.

ANALYSIS

If one understands these factors and realizes they are all present in running an eggbeater or the world's biggest oil company, one will not be groping around in rags.

A checklist of the 12 factors influencing the 4 major products can be made up and each point as it relates to an org can be studied about a particular org.

348

One has here the basics. From these there can arise a near infinity of lesser items.

When one does not know these basics one flounders endlessly while attempting to handle a post, a portion of an org or the whole org. One gets into a frantic correct the errors and outpoints or goes into apathy as he has no guidelines.

However, using these basics, one can easily check them off and so see what he has to do to more closely approach the ideal.

In Dianetics and Scientology, for example, the final pc product of Flag auditors trained on the same HCOBs as field auditors, on *rougher pcs*, is infinitely better than the pc-product elsewhere. This is a puzzle. The clue is not in auditing at all. It lies in an earlier product-training. A Class VI or a Class VIII auditor on Flag was trained (a) more rapidly (amounting to as little as 1/6th of the time in an org), and (b) more honestly, and (c) the Flag auditor is expertly corrected as a product when he begins to audit until the auditing product is perfect. The training (quantity, and lasting quality) on the course is better and the training extends to training on post until the auditor's product (the auditing of the pc and the pc) need little or no product correction. The equivalent used to be required HGC training-on post training-for a staff auditor to become a *staff* auditor. In no org did auditors go fresh from school into auditing with no further training. This went out in some orgs. The product "corrected auditor" became a missing product. Thus Flag auditing produces a better product as *that* product-corrected auditor- exists on Flag.

This is given to show the *use* of the product factors-

Where any of these products or factors are missing, the viability of the whole is shaken. By using them the whole becomes viable.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:rr.rd.gm Copyright © 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

349

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 1 NOVEMBER 1970

Remimeo

Org Series 11

ORGANIZATION AND MORALE

Morale is a large factor in organizing.

An executive is utterly dependent upon the willingness of those who work for him.

(How to Live Though an Executive.)

Willingness, while it is also a factor in morale, is also a manifestation of morale.

Morale, the tone of a group, is the target of "do-gooders," the "one-worlders," the labor agitator, the commie agent, the local minister and a general mixed company of often well-meaning but nevertheless deadly people.

"You poor fellow. They treat you so badly . . . we will take up this great injustice . . . workers should have everything free . . . communist imperialist aggressors against poor working people . . . You poor fellow, God will make you welcome in his heaven from this earthly toil . . . Kill the managers. . . Down with law and order. . ."

Well, it all winds up in revolution eventually and mounds of dead workers and a few dead managers.

So let's look this over.

If you can do something about an ill situation you do. If you can be effective you can at least make the situation easier. If you can't do that you can sympathize.

Sympathy with the abused apparently not only does no good but winds up in revolt!

How?,

You have this young girl, see. She is wearing last year's dress. No new clothes. So you say, "You poor thing wearing last year's dress." Up to now she wasn't worried about it. Now she says, "I wish I had some new clothes." And you say, "You poor thing. Doesn't your mother ever buy you new clothes?" "No." "The beast!" She goes home and revolts.

Get it?

The UN says, "Every worker, he got to have job, house, lotsa dough." Worker says, "Who? Me?" "Yes you poor down-trodden sod." And the UN says, "United States. You rich. You pay!" US pitches out the foreign aid. The countries take the dough and revolt and elect a military junta that chops off heads every hour on the hour.

The one-world do-gooders in the US say, "US, you pay poor fired workers!" US puts out sixty-three billions. You can't walk down a street. Riot and insurrection.

Why?

Sympathy. But not one brain cell worth of organization. 350

People want to be part of things, part of life.

If the clod heads that pass for modern politicians had the ability to organize and handle an economy (in big countries or small) people could easily be part of things and build the place up. It is in fact a highly skilled activity. And currently quite beyond the heads of nations. Or they wouldn't have unemployment, riots, inflation and future death.

Take Russia. (You take her, I don't want her.) She had half a century of growing revolt. The oatmeal brained Romanoffs spent their roubles on war and secret police. Up jumped Lenin, "You poor workers!" Revolt. Dead Czar. Dead Russia. Their "workers paradise" can't feed itself. The Czars were supremely awful. Their commissars weren't even that good. One secret policeman per worker was about the ratio in Stalin's day.

Let's be practical. Who is going to build this UN house for the poor worker? Who is going to pay the billions except the worker?

And if, as we so glaringly see, the end product of all this "poor worker" is riot and civil commotion, insurrection and piles of dead workers then mightn't there be something a bit awry with its morale value?

Sympathy is a morale depressant. And knowingly or not, a morale destroyer.

If the person who sympathized was good enough to do something about it he would.

There's nothing at all wrong with righting evil conditions. Far from it.

But if you want to better things KNOW HOW TO ORGANIZE.

Don't just stir up a revolt that will get workers machine gunned.

If the chronic moaner knew how to throw together an organizing board and groove in the lines, as part of the state or the opposition, he could certainly change **things for the better**.

Organizing is the know-how of changing things.

Good morale is the product of good organization!

If you organize something well and efficiently you will have good morale. You will also have improved conditions.

Wherever morale is bad, organize!

A very careful survey of people shows that their basic protests are against lack of organization. "It doesn't run right!" is the reason they protest things.

Inequalities of work load, rewards unearned, no havingness, these are some of the things that are snarled about.

They are cured by organizing things.

Russia Siberiaed or shot all her managers, thinking managers and capitalists were the same thing. Then she couldn't feed her people.

And you can't even discuss morale as a subject when a country has to be held together with barbed wire frontiers to hold in its own secret policed people!

The only thing I really have against communists is that they know how to make a revolt but not how to make a country.

351

And the only thing I have against the capitalist do-gooder is that all the corn and games in the world will not make a viable country.

Neither system winds up in happiness or high morale.

The physical universe is no rose bed. But it can be confronted and can be lived in by a group.

Whenever you see bad morale, behind it you will see chaotic disorganization.

A nation or an org follows the same laws.

Disorganization from any cause deprives people of wanted beingness, doingness and havingness.

When you deprive people of those things you're going to have pretty awful morale.

And only organization and very good organization will bring about beingness, doingness and havingness.

All three factors must be served. And purpose and reason must exist.

A bum with a handout sandwich is a bum with a handout sandwich. You can't change anyone upward with sympathy. It is a witch's weapon, a devil's curse. But you can change someone upward with organization.

Bad organization = bad morale.

Good organization equals good morale.

And good organization is something worked on by a group. not ordered under pain of death.

The only tops that get blown when effective organization starts going in are those who don't want others to have things and take delight in suppression-in other words good organization is only opposed by those who have reason to fear others. For in organization lies the secret of a group's strength.

A small group thoroughly organized can conquer the disorganized billions. And have excellent morale while they're doing it!

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sb.ka.rd.gm Copyright c 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

352

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 2 NOVEMBER 1970

Issue 11

Remimeo CORRECTED AND REISSUED 7 NOV 70

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 cogwheel type organization with each member of it totally fixed on post, doing only exact duties, with all cogwheels 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,---TheAnalysis 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 *FOR ALL STAFF MEMBER HATS*

LONDON (Issued at Washington)

HCO BULLETIN OF SEPTEMBER 21, 1958

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.

353

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 laborers 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 worklike 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 beirgness 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 US. Select in an election

354

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 US 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 you 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 *yourfault* 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

355

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 DESPATCH SYSTEM

The despatch 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 despatch 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 despatch doesn't get read. Another is *TOO LITTLE* data. That can jam a line but thoroughly. It takes more despatches to find out what goes. Another way is to bypass 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.

356

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

rs:29.9.58 all staff members field offices

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:rrr.rd.gm Copyright © 1958, 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

357

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 13 NOVEMBER 1970

Remimeo

Org Series 13

PLANNING BY PRODUCT

One of the cycles or correct sequences of action is

BE - DO - HAVE

This sequence is often altered in orgs and even in individuals. Be is first in the physical universe, Do is second, Have is third.

By getting it out of sequence a considerable confusion can be generated.

A lot of riddles of human behavior can be solved by realizing this goes out of sequence or gets omissions.

The Spanish peasant and the Spanish officials go to war at the drop of a straw. Their history is jammed with revolts. The peasant knows that if he is a peasant (be) and does his work (do) he should have. The Spanish official is stuck in BE. He *has so* he can *be* and he doesn't have to do anything. Also a degree or title in Spain is a BE and there is no *do*. *So* there is no *have* unless it comes from the peasant. The two altered cycles collide.

Juvenile delinquency and shattered lives in the West stem directly from corruptions of this cycle.

Children in the West are commonly asked "What are you going to BE when you grow up?" It is a silly question and can drive any child up the wall. Because it's the wrong question-hits the wrong end of the cycle. He can't work out his personal org bd easily.

He is also asked "What are you going to DO in life?" That's just as bad. It is quite difficult to answer.

You have to do an org bd backwards-establish the product (have), find out what to *do* to achieve it and only then really can you accurately discover what one has to BE to accomplish this.

A lot of people and businesses fail because they don't do this. A beirigness taken first all too often winds up in a doingness without any havingriess resulting.

If we asked children, "What do you want to PRODUCE in life?" we could probably get a workable answer. From *that* he could figure out what he'd have to do to produce that and from that he could know what he had to BE. Then, with a little cooperation he would be able to lead a happy and valuable life.

Concentrating on BE, one finds him ready to BE all right but then he stands around the next 50 years waiting for his havingriess to fall out of the sky or slide to him via a welfare state.

The above data, missing in society, contributes to juvenile delinquency, crime, the welfare state and a dying civilization.

It is a wrong personal org bd to BE only.

So it is with an activity or company.

What is the desired product that will also be desired by others? is the first question one asks in organizing. It must be answered before one can adjust or arrange finance or any org bd,

358

Then one asks what has to be *done* to produce that? And there may be a lot of dones figured out and put in sequence.

Now one can work on BE,

Thus you would have the basic ingredients of an org bd.

Here is a common altered cycle:

Mr. A has a truck-HAVE. He tries to figure out what to DO with it. He works it around to try to make money. He would usually go broke. As he supposes he already has a product-a truck, and he needs a product-" money," he rarely backs it up to a BE.

Some people's "think" gets all involved in altered sequences or omissions of the BE - DO - HAVE cycle.

An activity has several final products. All of them must be worked out and considered. Then one can work out the sequence of DOs (each with a product) in order to accomplish the final products. Only then can one work out the BE.

By omission or fixations on one of these points a person or an org can fail or perhaps never even get started.

Fixation on DO without any product in view leads to bored wandering through life.

Mothers even know this one. "Mama, what shall I do?" is a long drawn refrain. Smart mamas often say "Make a cake" or "Make mud pies" or "Make a house." Dumb ones say "Go and play and stop bothering me!"

Armies, with guard or death "products," get obsessed with DO to a point where officers and noncoms will state, "Get those men busy!" No product. Meaningless, often frantic and useless DO.

It could be said that any developed traffic (dev-t) comes from people who have no product.

Immense bureaucracies can build up where there are no realized or stated products.

Target policies and practice are successful because they state the desired product.

Unless one organizes from the final product the organization can get unreal and useless.

Even Russia could learn this one. Their "workers" are all trying to get to the university where they can BE. The Russian government was recently pleading with young people to become workers. But of course that's just another BE that implies DO. Russia has yet to realize her product was and is revolution. It's no wonder their main problem is how to feed and clothe and house their people.

Unless an org or a person knows exactly what the final product is for the org or a post, there'll be a lot of busyness but not very much havingness for anyone.

The answer is to figure out the final product and work back through the do of subprojects and you will then materialize a real org, a real beingness.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sb.rd.gm Copyright © 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

359

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 14 NOVEMBER 1970

Remimeo

Org Series 14

THE PRODUCT AS AN OVERT ACT

When a product is nonexistent or bad it can be classified as an overt act against both the org and any customer.

You can estimate what the existing scene of a post really is by looking at its product.

When a flubby product is observed, you can at once approximate the existing scene.

The time it takes to achieve the product is also an estimation. A long time to achieve a small flubby product gives one a good idea of the existing scene.

This also estimates the amount of "noise" in an area.

Example: Post X is supposed to sort ruddy rods. There are no sorted ruddy rods ready. That's an omitted action. The post has to be ordered to sort ruddy rods. That's ordering someone to wear his hat which is altered sequence as he should have been wearing it already. The post must be a false terminal as it isn't wearing its hat. The product so far is no sorted ruddy rods. You order them sorted. You get bent tangled ruddy rods furnished after a long time period filled with dev-t. Estimate of existing scene-psychotic and an awful long way from any ideal scene. Actual quality of product-an overt act.

When several org members are furnishing a poor individual product, the org becomes difficult to handle as the person in charge is operating as correction not as establishment and org product.

Wherever an org's product is low in quantity and quality one must recognize that it contains several members who unconsciously furnish overt acts in the guise of post products and begin to straighten things out accordingly.

The road to sanity for such a person or org is a good grasp of organizing and products, making known the technology needed to produce a product, getting it properly done so that the person can then wear his hat.

If this still doesn't occur, personal processing is necessary as the personnel may well be dramatizing overt acts (harmful acts) by turning out a bad product.

The final product of an org is the combined products of all the members of that org directed to accomplish the final products of that org.

Stupidity, lack of a worked out org bd, lack of recognition of what the final org products should be, lack of training, lack of hats, can produce poor final products. In an activity not doing well the poor final product or its lack of any product is the compound errors in subproducts. An org where the product is pretty bad or nonexistent contains many elements-posts-in it which have as *their* individual "post products" not products at all but overt (harmful) acts.

Pride of workmanship is pride in one's own product.

Every post has some product. If the products of all posts in an activity are good and the product sequence is good then the final products of the org will be good.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sb.rd.gm Copyright c 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

360

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 20 NOVEMBER 1970

CORRECTED AND REISSUED 29 AUGUST 1974

Remimeo

Personnel Series 12

Org Series 15

ORGANIZATION MISUNDERSTOODS

By Scientology study technology, understanding ceases on going past a misunderstood word or concept.

If a person reading a text comes to the word "Felix Domesticus" and doesn't know it simply means HOUSE CAT, the words which appear thereafter may become "meaningless," "uninteresting" and he may even become slightly unconscious, his awareness shutting down.

Example: "Wind the clock and put out the Felix Domesticus and then call Algernon and tell him to wake you at 10:00 A.M.," read as an order by a person who didn't bother to find out that "Felix Domesticus" means "house cat" or "the variety of cat which has been domesticated" will not register that he is supposed to call Algernon, will feel dopey or annoyed and probably won't remember he's supposed to wake up at 10:00 A.M.

In other words, when the person hit a misunderstood word, he ceased to understand and did not fully grasp or become aware of what followed after.

All this applies to a sentence, a book, a post or a whole organization.

Along the time track a crashing misunderstood will block off further ability to study or apply data. It will also block further understanding of an organization, its org board, an individual post or duties and such misunderstands can effectively prevent knowledge of or action on a post.

ALL THIS IS THE MOST COMMON CAUSE OF AN UNACCEPTABLE POST PRODUCT, OR NO PRODUCT AT ALL.

The difficulties of an organization in functioning or producing stem from this fact.

Personal aberration is the cause of products that are in fact overt acts.

Scientology technology today easily handles the personal aberration part of the problem, **IF IT IS USED AND PROPERLY APPLIED**. Leaving an org unaudited or being unable to figure out how to run a viable org so that it can afford to audit its staff members is asking for post or org products that are overt acts.

Employing persons of the Leipzig, Germany, death camp school (psychologists, psychiatrists) to handle personal aberration is like throwing ink in water to clean it up. Governments stupidly do this and wonder why their final product as an organization is riot, war and a polluted planet. The point is not how bad psychology and psychiatry are, but that one does have to *handle* personal aberration in an organization and these schools were too vicious and incompetent to do so.

Those who are personally very aberrated are not about to produce anything but an overt act. They are difficult to detect as they are being careful not to be detected. Things "just sort of go wrong" around them, resulting in a product that is in fact an overt act. But these constitute only about 10 or 20 percent of the population.

361

The remaining 80% or 90% where they are nonfunctional or bungling are so because they do not understand what it's all about. They have in effect gone on by a misunderstood such as what the org is supposed to do or the admin tech they use on their posts or where they are or what their product is.

Earth organizations like governments or big monopolies get a very bad repute because of these factors:

1. Personal aberration of a few undetected and unhandled.
2. Inadequate or unreal basic education technology and facilities.
3. Inadequate or unknown organization technology.
4. Noncomprehension of the individual regarding the activities of which he is a part.
5. Noncomprehension of the basic words with which he is working.
6. Purposes of the post unclear.
7. Admin of the post not known or comprehended.
8. Technology in use not fully understood.
9. A lack of comprehension of products.

Out of these nine things one gets organizational troubles and the belief that it takes a genius to run one successfully. Yet all the genius in the world will fail eventually if the above nine things are not handled to some degree.

The common methods currently in use on the planet to handle these things are very crude and time-consuming as the items themselves are either dimly comprehended or not known at all.

IA. Personal aberration is met by torture, drugs or death when it is detected. Yet only the very serious cases who are obviously screaming, muttering or unconscious are singled out whereas the dangerous ones are neither detected nor handled at all and become with ease generals

or presidents or dictators, to say nothing of lesser fry. Ten percent to 20% of any organization is stark staring mad, doing the place in so adroitly that only their actual product betrays them.

2A. Basic education as well as higher general education has become a massproduced area crawling with bad texts and noncomprehension and used mainly by hostile elements to overturn the state or pervert the race and its ideals.

3A. Organizational technology is so primitive as to change national maps and leading companies many times a century, an extremely unstable scene for a planet.

4A. Very few individuals on the planet have any concept of the structure entities such as their country or state or company. Persons surveying the public in the US, pretending to advise acceptance of "new measures" already in the Constitution were threatened for being revolutionaries. Hardly anyone knew the basic document of the nation's organization much less its rambling structure.

5A. The basic words of organization are glibly used but not generally comprehended-words like "company management," "policy." Vocabularies have to be increased before comprehension and communication occur and misunderstandings drop out.

6A. Post purposes are often glibly agreed with while something entirely different is done.

362

7A. Administrative actions involving posts are often only **dimly comprehended and seldom** well followed but in this matter of communication, despatches, etc., the planet is not as deficient as in others except that these functions, being somewhat known can become an end-all-tons of despatches, no actual product. In some areas it is an obsession, an endless paper chain, that is looked on as a legitimate product even when it leads to no production.

8A. The planet's technology is on the surface very complex and sophisticated but is so bad in actual fact that experts do not give the planet and its populations 30 years before the smoke and fumes will have eaten up the air cover and left an oxygenless world. (The converters like trees and grass which change carbon dioxide to oxygen are inadequate to replace the oxygen and are additionally being killed by air impurities coming out of factories and cities.) If the technology destroys the base where it is done-in this case the planet-it is not adequate and may even be destructive technology.

9A. The whole idea of "product" is not in use except in commercial industry where one has to have a car that sells or a washing machine that actually washes.

THE HARD ROAD

It is against this primitive background that one is trying to run an organization.

If it were not for improvements made on each one of these points the task could be hopeless.

I have gone to some length to outline the lacks in order to show the points where one must concentrate in (a) putting an org together and (b) keeping it viable.

In these nine areas we are dealing with the heart of it in running orgs.

Enthusiasm is a vital ingredient. It soon goes dull when insufficient attention is paid to resolving and getting in these nine points.

Bluntly, if they are not gotten in and handled, the task of living and running a post or an org will become so confused that little or no production will occur and disasters will be frequent.

THE WORDS

The by-no-means-complete list of words that have to be fully cleared and understood just to talk about organization as a subject, and to intelligently and happily work in an org EVEN AS ITS LOWEST EMPLOYEE is

A company A board of directors Top management Policy Management Programs Targets Orders Technology Know-how Org bd Post Hat Cope Purposes Organize Duties A checksheet

363

- checklist
- comm channel
- command channel
- relay point
- stable terminal

Double-hatted

A product

Aberration

VIABILITY

This is key vocabulary. One could draw up a whole dictionary for these things and no one studying it would be any wiser since it would become salted with other words of far less importance.

The way to do this list is sweat it out with a meter until one knows each can't mean anything else than what it does mean.

Out of a full understanding of what is implied by each, a brilliantly clean view is attained of the whole subject of organization, not as a fumble but as a crisp usable activity.

Unless one at least knows these words completely so that they can be used and applied they will not buffer off confusions that enter into the activity.

Glibness won't do. For behind these words is the full structure of an activity that will survive and when the words aren't understood the rest can become foggy.

We do know all these needful things. We must communicate them and use them successfully.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:kjm.rd.ts.gm Copyright c 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[Note: The 29 August 1974 reissue corrected the word *test* to *text* in the second paragraph of this HCO PLJ

364

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 25 NOVEMBER 1970

Remimeo (CORRECTED AND REISSUED 27 NOV 1970)

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.

365

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 embrasive 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 Copyright c 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

368

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 1 DECEMBER 1970

Remimeo

Org Series 17

REALITY OF PRODUCTS

The character of the VALUABLE FINAL PRODUCTS OF AN ACTIVITY is something which must be established EXACTLY.

Example: Ajax Ball Bearings Ltd. did well for a while and then went into a decline. The exact change point into the decline coincided with a change to new stockholders and considerable executive and staff turnover. At first glance the WHY would have seemed to be so many transfers-musical chairs. However, a complete survey shows that the definitions of Ajax valuable final products were changed from "useful ball bearings sold in quantity at a profit" to "world acceptance of Ajax." The big ad campaigns, internal shop and accounting policy shifts to accomplish this, the new fuzzy ideas about it and failure to spot the WHY took Ajax down. Traced further it was found that the new advertising manager had originated this policy and the new board had only a foggy notion of its duties and knew nothing of "valuable final products." The whole company started "manufacturing" acceptance instead of ball bearings. The production shop got more and more idle, more and more neglected, had fewer and fewer men in it. Admin got more and more people and down down down went the stats.

A survey of any activity, requesting a list from each member of the company answering the **question, "What are the valuable final products of this company?"** can reveal much and can show that many are setting policies and doing things in the company name which have no real relation to what the company is doing and therefore drive the activity in contrary and conflicting directions.

After all it is the crew, staff members and workers who do the work. When they have to set their own policy and use their own ideas of the valuable final products, you can get a lot of conflicts and upsets which should never exist.

Make no mistake: An activity can be totally unmanageable and become nonviable over just these points. Possibly all labor-management upsets come from them.

1. Policy is set by top management after experience and agreed upon by others. Where policy is needed it should be requested from the top, not set independently by the supervisors or workers.

2. The valuable final products of an activity must be very carefully surveyed, established and clearly released at policy level AS POLICY.

Anarchy appears to fail (as it did before the Spanish revolution 1936) and strong central management succeeds around this one point of policy. Everyone sets his own in an anarchy. Businesses succeed only on that point and the precise establishment of valuable final products.

When the exact valuable final products are known and agreed upon, only then does successful group action become possible.

The car industry looks easy. The valuable final product is a car. But automotive labor and unions have not agreed to that. Their "valuable final product" is "a big pay check." This one point damaged and may have irreparably destroyed the US economy in 1970 when General Motors, the country's largest industry, had a walkout and layoff.

369

Failing to handle this one point GM management was failing duty as management (they lost their general manager last year due to a Ford maneuver of hiring him over, then firing him). Labor in this case ruined their future pay checks and lost thousands of jobs.

Forty years ago a similar inability to set policies and establish valuable final products began to wipe out the coal industry in the US. Under a John L. Lewis, the miners made coal mining economically impossible. Management, mostly absentee and careless, half a century before that had begun to make errors, run unsafe mines and look on an appearance in society pages as a valuable final product. Today "Appalachia" is a ruined poverty area. And oil is the fuel-of which there is little compared to US domestic coal.

So do not discount these two points. They are capable of wicked backlashes when not done right. They are the WHY of not only organization failures but also the failures of civilizations.

PRECISE WORDING

The valuable final products of any activity small or large must be very precisely and totally listed and totally continually posted.

The valuable final products of a division should be on the org board under the division and the valuable final products of the org should be on the org board in a glaring red list.

Let us take a college. US colleges and others are so clouded up with "government projects" and "scientific findings" and "published papers" and "sport wins" and "general public awe of their greatness", that they have pretty well forgotten a "welltrained and successful student in the field of his major." So the student body product becomes "revolt." And the college product becomes "???" in the public mind. I do not speak idly. The very last thing a college wants in a student is one who is an individual success. A downtrodden anonymous member of some industrial team or an underpaid professor is about as high as a college will tolerate from their student bodies according to surveys. For several hundred years, since Francis Bacon (1561--1626) in fact, there has been no renowned philosopher who has not been eased carefully out of his college long before graduation. The list exceptions are tame sellouts like Dewey, part of the Leipsic death camper crew.

So here is civilization at risk. The valuable final product of its educational institutions is not stated and is neglected in favor of a multitude of false or valueless products. They are not known by their students but by their arrogance and political connections. This is not idle data. Failure to understand this fact of valuable final products began around 1862 the downfall of imperial Russia, spearheaded by its college students. Having no real valuable final product, clearly stated and agreed upon, opens the door to conflict not only in the company but in the state and the entire civilization. (Granted, imperial Russia stank, which is my exact point. So did Stalinism.)

Studying back and forth over history, poking about in old ruins, remembering, adding it up, the apparent causes of organizational decay are

(a) Failure to have an informed, trained top management capable of setting real policy in accordance with the need of the organization.

(b) Failure of top management to set policy.

(c) Company members, supervisors and workers setting their own policy out of agreement with or in ignorance of the needs of the organization and themselves.

(d) Failure of top management to wisely, completely and precisely establish the valuable final products of the activity.

370

(e) Ignorance of or disagreement with the valuable final products by workers and company members.

In a much more general sense we would have

A. Unwise or unset policy.

B. Unreal or unstated or undone valuable final products.

These apply to any organization of any size. The most flagrant offenders are governments. I have never met a political leader or police officer who had a clue about valuable final products of the

state. You or I might feel that "public safety" was a **valuable final product of** police, but the police don't say so.

In amongst psychiatry I have worked for hours trying to make numerous psychiatrists state what they were trying to accomplish. I have never even gotten one to hazard even a suggestion of why he was doing what he was doing, much less say "a cured patient" or "a safeguarded society."

The confusion on these points of valid policy and valuable final product is so great in the world of this writing as to be intolerable.

So do not feel strange that in our early organizations it has been hard to handle things-they were cheek by jaw with a society that believed itself a jungle and where "moral" standards were being set by the psychiatrists who gave the world Hitler and twelve million exterminated Germans.

When the society goes in this direction (war, murder, psychiatry) it conceives its valuable final product to be dead men.

Thus it is very, very important for us to get these hitherto obscure or unidentified principles up into the light where they belong and to USE them.

1. The beings of top management must be fully informed and capable of setting or knowing and publishing policy according to the need (including viability) of the organization which will be agreed upon by the whole activity. This means an informed, trained top management and includes org management.

2. Top management and managers must KNOW policy and be able to set or request policy where it is unknown or nonexistent.

3. All members (top management, managers, supervisors, technicians, workers) must understand the mechanisms of setting policy, how to get it set, know policy that is set and know what is valid policy and who sets it.

4. The valuable final products of an organization must be known to, precisely and completely established, and defined by top management.

5. The valuable final products of an activity must be known fully to and agreed upon by all beings in the organization including why, and the abandonment of random products which are being done but which do not in any way add up to valuable final products.

ECONOMICS

The economics of any group is such that it cannot tolerate offbeat products and remain sound. This is true of any political or commercial form, group or commercial company.

All of the activities of a group in some way must add up to known valuable final products of a group or it will, as an entity, shatter.

371

Even in a "moneyless state," a barter economy, this remains factual.

Western civilization and Eastern alike have decayed on the altars of war gods. Diplomatic and political incompetence have squandered their efforts and brought them to inflation and then dust. A socialism where the population goes unshod or a capitalism where a barrowload of bucks will not buy a loaf of bread are paying for ignorance of their actual valuable final products and the squandering of funds and effort on side issues.

One cannot appropriate or apportion funds without an intimate knowledge of the valuable final products of the activity.

One cannot handle property unless one knows the valuable final products of the activity.

One cannot assign personnel without huge waste of manpower unless one knows the valuable final products.

Therefore *one must* be able to list and know the valuable final products of an activity before one can

- i. Do financial planning.
- ii. Arrange, buy or sell property.
- iii. Allocate spaces assigned for different functions.
- iv. Assign personnel.

If one tries to do these things first and discover final products later, all efforts to organize will be canceled.

CENTRAL AUTHORITY

The valuable final products must be agreed upon and issued as policy and additions to the list must be referred to the policy-making level of the group before being confirmed as valid.

The aimless meanderings of contemporary societies show the absence of such lists. It some time ago began to be stated and believed that society "just took in each other's washing"; and the joke, Parkinson's Law, in which bureaucracy multiplies automatically, both give evidence that society is believed not to have any valuable final products even as faint as "a good life."

Individual members of a group or society must know the valuable final products of the activity and must be in some agreement with them to have a successful group.

SURVEYS

Surveys of what should be the valuable final products show mainly the spirit of the matter. It should not be believed for a moment that a standard survey would apply: a standard survey being the adding up of the answers and taking the majority as useful.

Such a survey measures willingness concerning **types or directions** of activity.

Given this, setting the exact *things* the group can or should produce and wording them exactly requires a lot of looking and a lot of work.

What products of the group are economically *valuable*? This is the key point that will be overlooked.

372

What, in short, can this group exchange with other groups or society that will obtain things the group does *not* produce? This is the heart of economics. The law of supply and demand applies.

This is too hard-headed an approach for a whole group to decide upon without a great deal of personal work.

If the group has a past to assess, then it will previously have produced products from time to time that did demonstrate economic value. A search for and a list of these is of primary value.

If the group has no past, it has some experience available from the society which it can employ.

It can be taken as a rule that group members will not identify or phrase the valuable final products. And it can be taken as another rule that it will in the course of time lose those products from its production that were valuable.

Final is another word that will probably escape grasp. Subproducts leading to final products will be given equal billing with the final product.

So three surveys have to be done.

What does the group think its final product should be? This gives willingness and direction.

What have been the previous valuable final product successes of the group? (That did exchange with other groups so the producing group can obtain things it does not produce.) This in a new group would be a survey of what similar groups have produced.

There would then be a period of intense and expert work by or for central policy authority where questions like: Have times changed? Were these items every thoroughly offered? What was the relative value in light of their cost? Is recosting necessary due to money value changes? Which ones really brought value back to the group from others? Can we still produce these? Thus a list is drawn up, precisely worded.

Then the final (3rd) survey can occur. This is the issue of the reworked list above to the group to get them to look at it from their viewpoint and see if it is feasible and any points missed and any expert opinion taken amongst the experts in the group.

The final list of valuable final products could then be drawn and issued as policy.

A special watchdog production tally officer could then be appointed to make sure *these* valuable final products are being prepared for and produced.

Yes, it would take all that to get the list of valuable final products of an activity.

The valuable final product list does not come wholly from top management.

The list does not come only from the group.

Major social and business catastrophes occur when (a) no list is set (b) top management only sets the list or (c) the group sets the list up.

Phrases like "a better world" or "a big car" or "lots of customers" are quite incomplete and unreal. Even the words "an auditor" or "a release" are correct but are not fully enough described to be good statements of a valuable final product.

A notable example of all this occurred in the car industry when Edsel Ford, ten years ago, did not survey past products and current demands and produced---The

373

Edsel." Henry Ford half a century earlier had established the company products as a cheap, small rugged automobile that would put America on wheels and a big, expensive car to hold up the company image. "The Edsel" went in between and millions were lost and scores of dealers were wiped out. No survey. No precise product.

If all this seems commercial, remember that in any civilization a group has to buy or acquire those things it does not produce. This is true in capitalism, communism or tribal barter. There is no Santa Claus and even a corn and games welfare state can go broke and always has.

Thus the *valuable* final product of a group must be valuable to another group or individuals in society around it and sufficiently so that it can receive in return things it wants or needs but does not produce. And it must DELIVER its valuable final product, a point most often missed.

A group of knights in a castle on a hill had protection for the peasant as a valuable final product. When they ceased to deliver and used only threat and robbery the peasant eventually invented a longbow whose arrow could penetrate armor and knighthood was no longer in flower.

All this is really quite simple. It is even in the Factors.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:rr.rd.gm Copyright 10 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

374

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, nonproduction 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.

375

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 Misunderstands 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

IDEALSCENES

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.

376

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 counterpolicy. 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 downright 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?

377

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 LIOs 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.

378

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.gm Copyright © 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

379

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 14 DECEMBER 1970

Remimeo

Personnel Series 14

Org Series 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 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 380

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 NONFACTUAL PROMOTION.**

7. SALES

Sales actions are unreal or out of balance. Clumsy or nonfunctioning 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 cutbacks 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.

381

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. Rumors are accepted as evidence. Police forces and power are used to ENFORCE the injustices contained I 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 I 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 to 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.

382

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 (1861-65) 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 11. 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 nonsurvival practices and overcome their gruesome group past.

383

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 way point 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 personnel 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 reoriented.

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 take 12 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.

384

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.

Optimally 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 unapprenticed 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 lightheartedness 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 subproducts 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.

388

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 subproducts which result in a final valuable product. Hope all you want to. When you omit the subproducts 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 subproducts 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 adds up to nondelivery.

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.

389

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 subproducts 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 *E500* a week that should make *E5000* a week in potential is losing the finance people *E4500* 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.

390

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 wellaligned, one with the next, and honest sane endeavor to achieve a final goal for all.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:ms.rd.ts.gm Copyright © 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

391

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 oneself 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.

392

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 behavior. 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 behavior 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 reestablished 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.

393

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.gm Copyright © 1970 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

394

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 19 JANUARY 1971

Remirneo

Personnel Series 17

Org Series 21

DUPLICATING FUNCTIONS

All you have to do to run out of personnel, finance and get no production is to duplicate the same functions that give the same product in an org.

Take three orgs side by side under the same management. Only if each division of each org had entirely different products would this be possible.

Now let's do it wrong. Each of these 3 orgs has an HCO and full personnel duties. Each separately promotes. Each has its own finance office, each has its production div producing the same products. Each has its own correction div-the place in general would be very overmanned, yet each div would be undermanned for its full functions. The product would be terrible if it existed at all. Morale would be ghastly, inter-org collisions continual.

The right way would be to work out the different products and then assign them to one or another of these orgs. One org would have to be the source org that produced the other two. One org would have all the finance with liaison only in the other two orgs. One org would have to hire, hat and train with only liaison in the other two. The orgs would have org bds which *had* the function but under it would be the note "Liaison with ¹⁵ **source org**."

In the impatience and emotion of organizing one org tends to individuate and establish a duplicate function because "it can't get service." This begins the catastrophe. Now they'll all begin to go broke while having men bulging out of the windows.

In looking over potential insolvency, look over duplicate functions.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:mes.gm Copyright © 1971 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

395

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 25 JANUARY 1971

Remimeo

Org Series 22

SQUIRREL ADMIN

When a squirrel is given a circular wheel he will run in it 'round and 'round and 'round. He gets nowhere,

When persons in an organization do not know organizing or their org board or hats, they go 'round and 'round and 'round and get nowhere.

There is no valuable production. There is no money.

When you have an organization that has no valuable production you know that the people there go 'round and 'round and 'round and get nowhere.

They are squirrel administrators.

STANDARD ADMIN

There are right ways to handle a group. This is the single fact which most often escapes people attempting to handle groups.

Also, for every correct solution there can be an infinity of wrong solutions.

The right way is a narrow trail but strong. The wrong ways are broad but all lead into a bog.

You could "fix" a radio by hitting it with a sledge hammer, putting a hand grenade in it or throwing it out of a 155th story window. The number of wrong ways you could "fix" it would be infinite.

Or you could find out what was wrong with it and replace the part or properly correct it.

The difference between the wrong way and the right way is that the radio, wrongly "solved," doesn't work. The radio correctly solved works.

So the test of the wrong way or the right way is whether or not the radio then worked.

This is the basic test of all administrative solutions. DID THEY WORK?

When experienced persons, working from basic theory, have evolved a technique for handling a situation which routinely now handles that situation, we have now a STANDARD ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION.

When that situation appears, we apply that solution and the matter gets handled.

The test is, did the solution work?

Solutions that work and are therefore routinely used to handle the situation to which they apply are then called STANDARD ADMIN.

A multitude of these correct solutions are used in STANDARD ORGANIZING. The org board, the hats, comm lines, comm centers, comm baskets, despatch forms, routing forms, inspection actions, promotion actions, central filing, customer or visitor handling, selling, collecting income, paying bills, inventorying, doing finance reports,

396

handling raw materials, training persons to handle and properly change materials, correcting or improving staff competence, correcting organizational form, inspecting reviewing and handling failed products, handling contacting and converting the publics, establishing and using field distributors and salesmen, providing public services, maintaining contact with the original and basic technology, handling rivals and opposition, and running the organization in general all have standard actions.

Now, glancing over the above rough list, you see we have hit the high spots of a 21 department, 7 division org bd.

Each is a standard solution to continuing and recurring problems.

Each contains numerous standard solutions to the recurring problems associated with them.

Underneath all this is basic theory and around it is survival and potential success.

USE OF STANDARD ACTIONS

The difference between a successfully viable organization with cheerful and cared for staff and a limping scene is standard and squirrel administration.

If standard admin is successful then why is it sometimes not used?

First the data has to exist, be available and known.

Next the data has to be used.

At first glance this may seem so clear-cut that it cannot go wrong. But one must look a bit further.

One is dealing with a variable called Man. One is working in a world full of noise and conflict.

Certain personalities do not want the group or the organization to succeed (see HCOB 28 Nov 1970 Psychosis). This problem has been so great amongst men that every historical culture-each one an organization-has died. About ten to twenty percent of mankind, at a broad guess, fit into this category.

In this universe it is easier to destroy than to construct. Yet the survival of life forms depends on construction.

To overcome this Man has developed technology and the cooperative effort known as organization.

The forces of the physical universe can be channeled and used only with technology.

The forces inherent in life forms can succeed only when channeled and aligned with one another.

Therefore, to succeed, a group must have the technology it uses available and known to it. And then use it.

From this one obtains the agreement and alignment necessary to generate the group action and production which brings about success.

NONCONFRONT

When a group member has the data, the bar to his using it would be his own disagreement with the group succeeding or, more frequently, his inability to confront things.

EXAMPLE: Two group members are quarreling. A third group member seeks to handle it. Even though he knows the technique (third party law), his own inability to confront people makes him fail to use the correct solution and he backs off.

397

In backing off he thinks of some nonconfront nonstandard "solution" such as firing them.

He has become a squirrel administrator.

EXAMPLE: The plant machinery is in bad shape. It is deteriorating to such an extent that it soon will cease to run. The mechanics plead for money to repair. The plant manager unfortunately cannot confront machinery-he not only "doesn't know about it" but it frightens him. He does not

financially plan its full repair on a gradient back to an ideal scene. He simply dreams up the vague hope a new type will be invented. He does nothing. The machinery now costs more to run than it produces. The plant fails. The plant manager was a squirrel administrator.

So we have various causes of failure:

1. A secret desire to destroy.
2. The nonexistence of technology.
3. Nonavailability of the technology.
4. Ignorance of the technology even when available.
5. Failure to apply the technology even when available and known because the being cannot or does not confront the people or the portions of the physical universe concerned.

The existence of any of these things brings a group toward squirrel administration.

Natural cataclysms or political or social catastrophes or upheavals are the other two points which can bring about a failure but even these can be planned for and to some degree handled. The future possibility of these must also be confronted in order to be circumvented.

Any successful organization will be fought by the society's fancied rulers or enemies. This is something which should be taken in stride. The ability to confront these discloses that standard administrative actions exist for these two.

DRILLS

Thus an administrator or staff member, even when the group's tech is available and known, must be able to confront and handle the confusions which can occur and which invite a turn away and a squirrel solution.

Even this situation of the inabilities to confront and handle can be solved by third dynamic (group) drills and drills on the sixth dynamic (physical universe).

The drills would be practices in achieving general awareness-and confronting and handling the noise and confusions which make one oblivious of or which drive one off and away from taking standard actions.

COMPETENCE

Competence is increased in the individual and the group by successes.

Successes come from anticipating the situation and handling it.

Standard admin is the key to competence and successes in an organization.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:mes.rd.gm Copyright © 1971 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

398

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 16 FEBRUARY 1971

Issue II

Remimeo

Org Series 23

LINES AND TERMINALS

There is a scale concerning lines and terminals.

ASSOCIATED TERMINALS

Handling flows and correctly changing particles.

GROUPED TERMINALS

LINES

PARTICLES

SIGNIFICANCES

FALSE TERMINALS

MISDIRECTED LINES

WRONG PARTICLES

FALSE SIGNIFICANCES (RUMORS)

MYSTERIOUS TERMINALS

CHAOTIC LINES

MENACING PARTICLES

DANGEROUS IMPRESSIONS

NONEXISTENT TERMINALS

NONEXISTENT LINES

NONEXISTENT PARTICLES

UNCONSCIOUS IMPULSES

THE CHAOS OF UNHAPPY NOTHINGNESS

Any organization and any individual staff member thereof is somewhere on this scale.

The trick of the scale is the awareness factor. At a position on the scale, the being or org is NOT AWARE of the scale levels above him.

Thus an organization *at* "mysterious terminals" is unaware of "false significances" or anything else above "mysterious terminals." Thus an org or individual *at* "mysterious terminals" is unaware of any falsity or any oddity in significances or ideas.

Any level is the effect of any level ABOVE IT.

Any level is slightly at cause over any level below it.

Thus a well-organized group is not at effect and can make an effect upon any group below it in awareness on the scale.

CAUSES

There are several causes for lower positions on the scale.

The first cause is degree of *personal aberration* where a personnel is willfully throwing the terminals, lines, particles and significances into disarray. Show me how he regards terminals, handles particles or routes and I will know how sane or crazy he is. The significances given to terminals, handling particles and lines is a direct index of sanity.

399

The second cause is *unawareness*. Drills on lines and terminals were once thought to *improve* awareness. This is no longer held to be true. Drills have to be done to BRING ABOUT awareness. People are not naturally aware of other people, lines, various particles or ideas. Due to a century of psychological instruction from childhood that they are animals and after thousands of years of the "upper classes" regarding them as such, people tend to favor a dangerously low or nonexistent awareness. A sort of jurisprudence has been in effect that it is safer to be unaware as then one is "not guilty." A humanoid who has just run over a child has a first response of "I didn't see him." This is highly nonsurvival. If one never notices safes about to fall on him he is soon dead. And painfully so. Unawareness is a sort of blindness where the person looks like he is looking but sees nothing. Degrees of this exist. One can make a terrible lot of errors with this. Mr. A appears to the observer to be noticing, smelling things and hearing whereas he *registers* no sights, has a blind nose and tunes out all sound. "Did you read it?" "Yes." "What did it say?" And you hear a lot of things then that weren't on the paper. There are even degrees of registry. A person appears to see and yet doesn't. A person appears to see and on being asked will say what he saw but can be unaware of seeing, registering or saying he saw! This drives teachers quite mad. One has the glib student who can parrot but cannot apply. This is a surface registry without awareness. Thus drills such as the Admin Training Drills or dummy runs on lines are needed to bring about awareness. A few very sane fortunate fellows can see, register, understand and handle correctly without any drills at all. Others need drills to bring about awareness below a superficial response. To unaware people, terminals, lines, particles and significances just don't exist.

The third general category is *delusion*. One sees A and believes it to be G. This is a lower band of self-protection. Some workers (an awful lot of them) will only take jobs which are mechanical "so they can daydream." Their concept of a terminal is an altered terminal. A line goes somewhere else. A particle is something else. And an idea is really another idea. Such people are incapable of duplication. Say "I see the cat," they hear "Cars are dangerous." They aren't really crazy. They just register alterations of what they perceive.

The person who can attain the state of awareness of terminals as they are, lines as they should be, particles as they exist and significances that are the intended significances are very valuable people. An ideal group can be made up of such people.

CONSTRUCTIVE ACTIONS

An organization consists of terminals, lines, particles and significances.

An AGREEMENT factor has to be established and the group has to be aware of it and use it.

This agreement factor would consist of

1. Purposes of the group.
2. A list of the hats including a short statement of the purpose and function of each post.
3. A full list of the particles handled by the group and the changes expected at each point of flow.

4. The flow lines of the particles being handled and changed.

5. The significances (technologies) of the group to form, flow and change particles.

If an Org Officer does not compile these five things and make them fully known and agreed to by all in the group, no organization will form or work.

Thus the PLAN of the group has to be laid out and drilled and known or no organization will form.

400

One will just have a group of individuals colliding with each other with no production.

The greatest source of confusion in a group are intermediate seniors who knock hats off faster than they can be gotten on and lines out before they can flow, all simply out of ignorance of the general plan of the organization.

Those who cannot perceive one or more of the above five points or bodies of data have to be drilled into awareness of them and dummy run.

Those who are quite crazy will frantically fight the hatting, stringing of lines and changing of particles and will inject mad significances into it all.

So the answer to how to make a group into an organization is to handle the insane one, prepare the five layouts named above, drill and dummy run *everyone* in the group on its *entire* pattern and expertly hat the specialist actions required at each point of change.

Then one has an organization that can produce and be viable.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.rd.gm Copyright © 1971 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

401

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 6 MARCH 1971

Remimeo

Prod OTg Hats *Org Series 24*

Tech Hats

Qual Hats

LINE DESIGN

HGC Lines, An Example

The present lines for the HGC in any org are the subject of HCOB 5 March 71, C/S Series 25, "The Fantastic New HGC Line," which is to be considered part of this policy letter.

This modifies early Tech org boards to some extent.

The old line in '65 policy did not include a Case Supervisor as such and shunted failed pcs to Qual Review.

Today Tech does its own pc repairs and Qual concentrates on cramming HGC auditors as well as students. Qual can also cram the Tech C/S.

It is completely amazing that a statistic ceiling on well-done auditing hours delivered could not have exceeded 250-300 well-done hours a week no matter how many auditors were hired or posted. The post of the C/S overloaded and the D of P post could not function well without overload.

The new line is capable of a statistic ceiling of 600 to 800 well-done hours a week. After that a new second HGC is manned fully and given new space.

The importance of a properly formed line, traveling in correct sequence is then driven home.

An improper line will reduce the statistic ceiling by 1/2 to 1/3 of what can be achieved by the same number of people.

The overload of seniors usually occurs because of improperly set up lines.

Lines are invisible to most people and they are unable to conceive of them until given full drills.

Unless this new C/S line is used you will not be able to average more than 250 well-done hours a week no matter how many auditors you put in the HGC. The auditors will be idle, confused and causing upsets.

If an org cannot get more than 250 well-done hours a week, it will find that it cannot really make money from processing.

Thus the new line will give volume, quality and viability in processing pcs.

Advantages of the line are that one HSST can handle up to 30 auditors. The earlier ceiling was eight or ten auditors.

With higher volume, backlogs vanish rapidly.

The admin personnel in the line can be afforded.

Line design, then, is a strong and unsuspected cause of low statistic ceilings.

Product and Org Officers must be intimately familiar with this HGC line. And they must be aware of the fact that faulty line design can cripple an org's income and overload its posts and excellent line design can double the stat ceiling in any department while lightening the load.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:mes.rd.gm Founder

Copyright © 1971

by L. Ron Hubbard

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

402

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 16 MARCH 1971

Issue IV '

Remimeo

Org Series 25

Personnel Series 19

LINES AND HATS

It will be found that in organization there are *MANY* major factors involved.

The following three, however, give the most problems:

1. Personnel
2. Hats
3. Lines.

Technology is a subdivision of both personnel (who may have to be specially trained before they can be considered personnel) and hats (which are mainly admin technology and line functions).

To solve any problem, one has to recognize what the problem is. One cannot solve problem A by trying to solve problem B or C. Example: Problem: broken-down car. You cannot fix the car by repairing the kitchen lino. Example: You cannot floor the kitchen by fixing the car.

All this may seem obvious when obviously stated. But there is a more subtle version. **ANY PROBLEM THAT DOES NOT SOLVE IS NOT THE PROBLEM.** There must be some other problem.

Locating and isolating situations (problems) in an organization is the technique of the Data Series. That technology will find for one the problem that should be solved.

As there are three major organizational factors these then also form the core of all organizational situations (or problems, same thing).

Each one of these is its own zone-personnel, hats, lines.

Each one has its own problems. There are situations in personnel. There are situations in hats. There are situations in lines.

They *are* related. They are not identical.

You will find you cannot wholly solve a problem in lines by solving personnel. You cannot wholly solve a problem in hats by solving lines. You cannot wholly solve a problem in personnel by solving the other two.

Example: Production hours are down. Fifteen new personnel are added to the area. Production stays down. It was a problem in lines.

Example: Confusion reigns in the pipe shop. The lines are carefully straightened out. Confusion still reigns. It was a problem in hats.

Example: Broken products are wrecking org repute. Hats are carefully put on. Products continue to be broken. It was a problem in personnel.

Example: The org stays small. Executives work harder. The org stays small. It was a series of problems in personnel, hats *and* lines, none addressed at all.

You will see symptoms of all this in various guises. The test of whether or not the right problem was found is whether or not production increased in volume, quality and viability.

In actual practice one works on all three of these factors constantly-personnel, hats and lines-when one is organizing.

You will find with some astonishment that failure to have or know or wear or do a *hat is* the commonest reason why lines do not go in. That personnel is hard to procure and train because hats and lines are being knocked out. That hats can't be worn because lines or personnel are out.

Situations get worsened by solving the wrong problem instead of the real problem. In the Data Series this is called finding the right Why.

Organizational problems center around these three things in the broadest general sense. More than one can be present in any situation.

Production problems are concerned with the particles which flow on the lines, changed by the hatted personnel, with consumption and general viability. So to make a full flow from organization through to distribution, one would add raw materials, changed state of materials and their consumption. Organization is not an end-all. To have value it must result in production.

But when personnel, hats and lines are not solved, production is very difficult. Therefore to get production one must have an organization to back it up. And personnel, hats and lines must exist and be functional. If these exist, the rest of the factors of establishment can be brought into being.

It goes without saying that organization involves other problems like space, materiel, finance, etc. These and many more also enter into "Whys" of no production. But dominating others are problems in personnel, hats and lines. Others tend to solve if these are handled and organized.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:mes.sb.rd.gm Copyright © 1971 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

404

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.

405

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.

406

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 Copyright © 1971 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

407

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFIC

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 JULY 1971

Remimeo

HASes Starrate

FEBC Grads *Org Series 27*

Starrate

FEBC Checksheet

Starrate

HCO ESTABLISHMENT FUNCTIONS

HCO means **HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE**.

The elementary and very simple actions of HCO are contained in this:

It is really hCo.

C = Communications.

To have Communications you have to have **TERMINALS**.

Flows can **ONLY** occur when terminals are rock steady and **STABLE**. There can be **NO** flows and **NO** power without steady terminals. Hence, comm cannot occur without stable terminals.

The **ORG BOARD** is the pattern of the terminals and their flows. So you have to have an org bd. And the org bd must in truth be a representation of what is in the org.

The org bd shows where what terminals are located in the org so flows can occur.

HCO has recruitment which means it gets people from **OUTSIDE** the org to be placed as terminals in the org = posts.

HCO has the posting of the org bd and designating the spaces in the org so that flows can occur.

Hatting is a prime function of HCO because otherwise the terminals won't know what they are supposed to be doing or what flows they handle or how.

HCO has **INSPECTION** to see that the flows are going right and that terminals are functioning.

Ethics exists to handle gross outnesses in flows.

Then routing can occur.

Then production can occur.

In essence that is **ALL** there is to an HCO.

If it realizes its key is C for communications and that comm requires terminals and an org bd so that flows can occur then HCO will function.

This action of putting in terminals is called **ESTABLISHING**

Thus HCO is the establishing division.

DISESTABLISHING

If HCO does not know this and if it makes numerous errors or alters importances away from this, it DISESTABLISHES the org.

DIS = Take apart.

ESTABLISH = Put there.

DISESTABLISH = Take apart what is put there.

Thus disestablish means to take out terminals and tear things up.

In using the org itself as a source of personnel, then an "HCO" tears things up far faster than it puts things there.

408

HAS

The HCO Area Secretary, HAS, has the function of ESTABLISHING THE ORG.

That means to find, hat, train, apprentice persons from OUTSIDE the org, to locate them in the org and on the org bd and then route the raw materials (public people in this case) along the line for production, which means changing particles into a final product.

If HCO *establishes* the org then all will be well.

If it fails to recruit or hat or org bd or route or distribute comm or police the lines, the org will stagger or fail.

The HAS is responsible for seeing that HCO establishes the org.

An HAS who is doing anything else is DISESTABLISHING.

HCO EXTERNAL

HCO has the incoming and outgoing flow lines as well.

This gives it Address. This means the *location* of the terminals OUTSIDE the org that the org contacts.

This in itself is an org bd.

The HAS must insist that the outside terminals are also established.

This gives an international network of flows amongst terminals.

WHAT is produced and WHAT flows on the lines is the business of other terminals outside HCO unless these threaten the functions of HCO.

SIMPLICITY

Now if you think there is anything more to it than this, work and work and work to do it in clay, clean up the misunderstood words and become thus able to envision and handle it.

Many policies exist about HCO. There is a lot of admin tech connected with an HCO but ALL OF IT is entirely and completely concerned with *how* to establish an HCO and an org.

This P/L should be known, known, known and any further confusion would be plainly the result of personal aberration such as an inability to conceive of a terminal or a space or a thirst for confusion only found in very batty places.

The functions of an HCO and the duties of an HAS are so elementary and so plain that they cannot be misunderstood even by experts.

HCO establishes the org.

That is the basic thing to know.

The techniques of how it is done are well recorded and broadly issued.

HCO does NOT disestablish the org.

HCO does NOT leave an org unestablished.

HCO ESTABLISHES THE ORG.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.rd.gm Copyright c 1971 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

409

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 29 JULY 1971

Remimeo

Org Series 28

Personnel Series 21

WHY HATTING?

A few days ago when I found that musical chairs and flubbed hatting had unstabilized some areas, I wondered whether or not this might stem from some social aberration that was very general in the societies in which we are working.

And it seems to have been the case. I worked on it a bit and found this:

LAW: THE POWER OF A THETAN STEMS FROM HIS ABILITY TO HOLD A POSITION IN SPACE.

This is quite true. In Scn 8-80 the base of the motor is discussed. It holds two terminals in fixed positions. Because they are so fixed, power can be generated.

If a thetan can hold a position or location in space he can generate POWER.

If he cannot, he cannot generate power and will be weak.

We have known this for 19 years. It applies here.

Observation: MODERN SOCIETY TENDS TO CONFUSE AND UNSTABILIZE PERSONS WITH ITS HECTIC PACE.

Observation: BEINGS WHO ARE AFRAID OF STRONG PEOPLE TRY TO WEAKEN THEM.

Observation: PERSONS WHO ARE PUSHED AROUND FEEL THEY CANNOT HOLD A POSITION IN SPACE.

Observation: PEOPLE HATE TO LOSE THEIR POSTS AND JOBS. THEY FIND IT DEGRADING.

In processing picking up this chain of lost positions achieves very good gains and rehabilitates a person's ability to hold a job.

LAW: BY GIVING A PERSON A POST OR POSITION HE IS SOMEWHAT STRENGTHENED AND MADE MORE CONFIDENT IN LIFE.

LAW: BY LETTING A PERSON RETAIN HIS POST HE IS MADE MORE SECURE.

LAW: BY HATTING A PERSON HE IS GREATLY STRENGTHENED AS HE IS HELPED TO HOLD HIS POST.

A basically insecure person who feels he is unable to hold his position in space, is sufficiently strengthened by hatting to feel secure enough to do his job.

LAW: HAVING A HAT, BEING HATTED, AND DEMONSTRATING COMPETENCE MAKES A PERSON FEEL CAPABLE OF HOLDING HIS POSITION IN SPACE AND HE BECOMES MORE STABLE, CONFIDENT IN LIFE AND MORE POWERFUL.

410

LAW: UNHATTED PERSONS ON A POST CAN BECOME CRIMINAL ON THE POST BECAUSE THEY FEEL INSECURE AND BECOME WEAK.

When a person is secretly afraid of others he instinctively will not hat them or hats them wrongly and tends to transfer or move them about.

When a person is insecurely posted and insufficiently hatted he can try to weaken others by trying to prevent their hatting and trying to get them transferred or even dismissed.

This is apparently the social aberration at work.

The answer to a sane org and a sane society is not welfare and removal. It is

Recruit them Train them Hat them Apprentice them Give them a post.

This is so strong in truth it would de-aberrate the bulk of the crime out of a society.

And it sure will put an org in POWER.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.rd.gm Copyright c 1971 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

411

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 11 AUGUST 1971

Issue III

Remimeo

Org Series 29

INFINITE EXPANSION

There is no reason whatever to ever contract or reduce the size of an org except covert destruction.

In theory there is no limit to the size of an org.

The 1967 org bd is capable of expanding to 200,000 staff members!

For our purposes, there is no real limit to expansion.

So long as property purchase does not commit future income dangerously and so long as HASes keep the admin staff in a ratio of two to one technical staff, there is no limit to expansion.

So long as cash-bills is kept more cash than bills there is no limit to expansion.

So long as the staff produces what their posts call for there is no limit to expansion.

So long as you DELIVER in quality what you SELL there is no limit to expansion.

So long as you keep standard on admin and keep standard on tech, there is no limit to expansion.

So don't get frightened, don't fire people, don't cut back. Understand the above and the *whole* of this policy letter. And there is no limit to expansion.

So EXPAND.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sb.gm Copyright 10 1971 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

412

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 14 JULY 1972

Issue 11

Remimeo

Establishment Officer Series 22

Executive Series 14

Org Series 30

ESTO FAILURES

For several months I have been studying the Esto system in operation and have finally isolated the exact points of any failures so they can be turned to successes.

PUTTING IN THE SYSTEM

An Esto returning to an org can crash it.

The exact reasons for this are

A. The execs who heretofore did organizational work say, "Ali, here's the Esto system at last," and promptly drop their organizational and personnel actions.

Yet here is this lone E Esto, no divisional Estos, no one trained to support him.

The right answer is when an E Esto goes into an org where there are no Estos or only a TEO or QEO, he must gather up the execs and tell them it will take him weeks to recruit and train Estos and that **THEY MUST CONTINUE ANY ORGANIZATIONAL ACTIONS THEY ARE DOING** and that **HAS IS STILL ESTABLISHING THE ORG.**

Otherwise they let go their lines.

B. The new E Esto takes key production personnel from the divisions to be Estos and they crash.

The answer to this is to **RECRUIT** the new Estos.

This is easier than it looks if you recruit idle area *auditors* to be Estos.

If you do this remember that they went idle as auditors because they had out-ethics, were PTS, had misunderstands and out TR 0. To get them you do a 3 May 72 P/L, a 5 April 72 P/L, Method 4 on their courses and make them do *real* TRs, especially Zero. And they'll be ready.

You get a list of area auditors and contact them and do the above on them and you'll have Estos who are half-trained already.

Failing this or in addition to it just plain recruit.

C. The first post a new E Esto should take is Dept 1.

He does NOT "hat the HAS" or "just do programs." He rolls up his sleeves and **WORKS** as director of Dept 1.

He recruits, he posts up Dept 1. He hats the hell out of Dept 1.

He makes a Department I that really really flows in personnel, puts up org bds and hats.

WHEN he has a Department I **FUNCTIONING** he can begin to recruit Estos as well as other org staff.

If he can't get a Dept I whizzing he has no business being an Esto, does he?

413

He does NOT put in Dept 2 or act as Dept 3. He makes the HAS handle these.

With a *strong, working* Dept 1, an Esto system can then go. in.

D. Musical chairs is the commonest reason any org collapses.

A "new broom sweeps clean" complex will wreck any org.

An E Esto on arrival, taking over Dept 1, FREEZES ALL PERSONNEL TRANSFERS. He does not permit even one transfer.

The only exception would be where a musical chair insanity has just occurred. If this was followed by a stat crash then one REVERTS THE ORG TO THE UPSTAT PERIOD and *then* FREEZES PERSONNEL TRANSFERS.

But before one reverts one must evaluate the earlier period by stats to be sure it WAS the upstat period.

By freezing personnel one protects what he is building.

Almost all musical chairing is the work of a suppressive except when it is the work of an idiot.

E. Anyone trying to hold Dept I in a personnel-starved org is holding a hot seat as any HAS or Personnel Director can tell you.

Body traffic to this dept in any medium-sized org defies belief.

It looks like Grand Central Station at the rush hour.

"I have to have " "Where is my Course Super etc.,
etc., etc., is the constant chant.

You can spend the whole day interviewing staff execs and get nothing done.

There is a right way to do all these things and a billion wrong ways.

Obviously the answer to all their problems is to get and train new people. Yet how can one in all the commotion?

Ninety percent of these requests are from people who are not hating and using the people they already have.

The right way is on any new personnel demanded one gets Dept 3 to do an Inspection and Report Form for people in the area of the exec doing the demanding. You will find very often unhatted, untrained and wasted personnel and many outnesses.

You hold the line on personnel by saying: "Handle these unutilized or halfworking staff or these outnesses. You are here on my procurement board as entitled to the (give priority, 3rd, 8th) person we hire or recruit."

And get industrious in recruiting, using all standard actions for that is the only way things can be solved.

Most orgs would run better on less people because the personnel are not hatted or trained. One org, two years before this writing, made four times as much money on *half* the personnel it now has.

Unhatted, the staff is slow and uncertain. Unproducing, the div heads demand little.

But they sure can scream for more personnel!

No org ever believes it is overmanned.

F. Some divisions (like the usual Treasury or Dissem) can be undermanned. Key income posts most often are empty.

When one mans up an org one sets priorities of who gets personnel.

This is done by PRODUCTION paralleling. One mans up against production.

414

New people come in through Div VI. They are signed up by Div 11. Delivery is done by Div IV. Money is collected by Div 111. That gives you a sequence of manning up.

You man income and delivery posts with new hirings.

The E Esto is trying to get in a Dept I so of course he gives this a priority as well.

Until the income is really rolling in and the delivery rolling out. one does very little about other areas.

Having gained VOLUME, one now begins to man up for quality. This means a Cramming and a WC Section in Qual. It means more HCO.

One now hits for future quantity by getting auditors in training, more upper execs in training.

When the org is so built and running and viable it is time the whole Esto system got manned up.

G. Every 5th person hired on an average should be put in Dept I as a *Dept I* extra personnel who does Dept I duties and trains part-time as an Esto.

This gives the E Esto additional personnel in Dept 1.

It also begins an Esto right.

His most essential duties as an Esto are Dept I type duties.

You eventually have a bulging Dept 1. You have a basic Dept I that functions well and will continue so. You have the Esto trainees who are working in Dept I as Dept I personnel. And you have of course some new people who are HCO Expeditors until they get in enough basics for real regular posting.

This makes a fat Dept I and proves one can Esto!

SUCCESS

If an E Esto introduces the Esto system exactly as above and in no other way, he will be a success.

Like an auditor varying processes or altering HCOBs, a new E Esto who varies the above will bring about disaster.

Where E Estos have gone into orgs other ways or where the system has been varied, stats have crashed.

By going in this way, as above, it can be a wild success.

How fast can you put in an Esto system? It takes months of hard work. It depends really on how good the E Esto is at recruiting, org bding and hatting.

If he's good at these things the time does not stretch out to forever.

For comparison, it took half a year each to build DC, Johannesburg and SH to their highest peaks. They were all built from a Dept I viewpoint of recruiting, org bding and hatting hard enough to get production.

So this is the oldest pattern we have-Dept I evolves the org.

When the org gets too big Dept I loses touch. You extend it into each div and you have the Esto system. And you have Estos.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.rd.gm Copyright © 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

415

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 23 JULY 1972R

Remimeo REVISED 20 DECEMBER 1978

(Revisions in this type style)

Establishment Officer Series 23R

Executive Series 15R

Org Series 31R

THE VITAL NECESSITY OF HATTING

On a graph analysis of past stats, my campaign on hatting where a hat was a checksheet and pack apparently introduced a steady rise of the international gross income.

Studying this further I discovered a new basic, simple fact:

HATTING = CONTROL

A person who is hatted can control his post.

If he can control his post he can hold his position in space-in short, his location. And this is power.

When a person is uncertain, he cannot control his post, he cannot control his position. He feels weak. He goes slow.

If he can control his post and its actions he feels confident. He can work effectively and rapidly.

The key is CONTROL.

Control is the ability to START, CHANGE and STOP.

When he is hatted he knows the tech of HANDLING things. Thus he can control them. He is at CAUSE over his area.

If you have an org composed only of weak wobbly posts, they tend to collapse in on each other. There is no POWER.

The org then cannot be CAUSE over its environment because it is composed of parts which are not cause. The whole is only the sum of its parts.

If all the parts are each one at cause, then the whole will be at CAUSE over its environment.

Only an org at CAUSE can reach and CONTROL.

Thus a fully hatted org can be at cause over its environment, can reach and control its fates and fortunes.

THUS THE PRIMARY TARGETS OF AN ESTO ARE

A. ESTABLISHED ORG FORM and

B. FULLY HATTED PERSONNEL.

BASIC SEQUENCE OF HATTING

1. Recruited or hired. Signs contract

416

2. Posted in HCO Expeditor pool or division if divisional recruit (per HCO PL 2 Sept 74R RECRUITING AND HIRING).

3. In SO new recruit goes directly onto Product Zero in the Estates Project Force and upon graduation from EPF goes to HCO Expeditor pool (Ref. FO 372 7 PRODUCT TRAINING LINE-UP).

4. Staff Status Zero.

5. Eligible for student auditing but must have a stat and demonstrated he has produced on post

6. Staff Status 1.

7. Staff Status //.

8. Posting as other than an HCO Expeditor.

9. Full hatting with a checklist and pack with Word Clearing M6, M7 and M4.

10. Method 1 Word Clearing, Primary Rundown or Primary Correction Rundown.

11. Administrative or tech training (OEC or auditing).

No one should have any other training much less full-time training before Step 10 in the above. Flag Orders in the Sea Org may change this line-up slightly but it is basically the same.

There are time limits placed on how long it takes to do SSI and SSII. A person who can't make it is routed to Qual where he is offloaded with advice on how to get more employable. (In the SO it is Fitness Board.)

TIME-TESTED

The above is the route that has been tested by time and found good.

Other approaches have NOT worked.

Granting full-time training at once is folly. The person may get trained but he'll never be a staff member. This is the biggest failure with auditors-they don't know the org. Admin training with no org experience to relate it to is a waste of time.

This was how we built every great org. And when it dropped out the org became far less powerful.

Old-timers talk of these great orgs in their great days. And they will tell you all about the org boarding and hating that went on. How the Hating Officer in HCO and the Staff Training Officer in Qual worked as a team. And how fast the lines flew.

The above steps have stood the test of time and are proven by stats.

RECRUITING AND HIRING

You never recruit with a promise of free courses or free auditing. Not even HASes or HQSes. You recruit or hire somebody to be part of the team.

OPEN GATE

If *any* opinion or selection is permitted as to who is going to be let on staff, *all* recruitment and hiring will fail.

By actual stats when you let *anyone* say "No! Not him! Not her!" the gate shuts, the flow stops. And you've had it.

Requirements and eligibili , tyJail. The proof is that when they have existed in orgs, the org wound up with only PTSes and no-case-gains!

417

The right answer is FAST FLOW hiring. Then you have so many that those who can't make it drift low on the org board or off. You aren't trying to hold posts with unqualified people "who can't be spared."

In a short-staffed org "looking only for the best people" the guy nobody will have gets put on an empty "unimportant" department. He's now a director!

It only happened because you didn't have dozens.

The answer is NOT lock the gate or have requirements. The answer is HAT.

An org that isn't hatted goes weak and criminal.

Don't be selective in hiring or recruiting. Open the gates and *HAT!*

Follow the steps given above and you have it.

Don't spend coins like training or auditing (or travel) on people until they have proven their worth. No bonuses or high pay for anyone until they have reached and attained Step 8 (a good stat). The cost of such fast flow hiring is not then a big factor.

The only trouble I ever had with this was getting div heads to UTILIZE their staff. A **FIRST JOB FOR AN EXECUTIVE IS TO GET THINGS FOR HIS PEOPLE TO DO. AND KEEP THEM BUSY AT PRODUCTIVE THINGS.**

So I used to have to go through the org that did FAST FLOW HIRING regularly and get people to use their new people. And to move off those who could not work.

This was ALL the trouble I had with the system.

And until I enforced FAST FLOW HIRING there was always some effort by someone to close the gate.

ALL the great executives in Scientology came up in such orgs.

With a flow of people the best move on up. The worst, if any, drop off.

Only orgs **with restricted hiring or recruiting give trouble.**

IN A FAST FLOW HIRING ORG THE HAS AND ESTOs MUST BE ON THE BALL. THE BREAKDOWN OCCURS WHEN THEY DO NOT *HAT* AND KEEP ON TOP OF THE PERSONNEL SCENE.

Fast flow hiring only breaks down and,,gets protested where HCO and Estos are not doing a top job. They have to really *hahdie* the personnel, post them, hat them, keep the form of the org.

A fully formed org in a heavily populated location would need hundreds of staff. It would make hundreds of thousands.

But only if it is fast flow hiring, hatting, holding the form of the org, and only then could it produce.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Revision as assisted by

Arden Hansen

FMO 2025 I/C

LRH:AH:ntjk.gm Copyright c 1972, 1978 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

418

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 28 JULY 1972

Remimeo

Establishment Officer Series 26

Executive Series 16

Org Series 32

ESTABLISHING

HOLDING THE FORM OF THE ORG

If a person who could not play a piano sat down at a piano and hit random keys, he would not get any harmony. He would get noise.

If the head of a division gave orders to his staff without any regard to their assigned posts or duties, the result would be confusion and noise.

That's why we say a division head "doesn't know how to play the piano" when he knows so little about org form that he continually violates it by giving his various staff members duties that do not match their hats or posts.

But even if one could play the piano, one would have to have a piano to play.

SPECIALISTS

Each org staff member is a specialist in one or more similar functions. These are his specialties.

If he is fully trained to do these he is said to be HATTED.

The combined specialties properly placed and being done add up to the full production of an org.

The org form is then the lines and actions and spaces and flows worked out and controlled by specialists in each individual function.

These specialists are grouped in departments which have certain actions in common.

The departments having similar functions are grouped into divisions.

The divisions combine into the whole org form.

It is far less complex than it looks. It would be very complicated and confusing if there weren't divisions and departments and specialized actions. Without these you would get noise and very limited production and income, and at great strain.

Take a theater as an example. There are people who advertise it; these are the public relations people; they are hatted to get publicity and make people want to come to the play; call them the PR Division. There are the producers and directors; they are hatted to present a performance and make it occur; call them the Production Division. There are the actors and musicians; call them the Artists Division. There are the property men; they are hatted to get costumes and items needed; call them the Property Division. There are the stage hands and electricians and curtain and set men; call them the Stage Division. There are the ticket sellers and money handlers and payroll and bills payers; they are hatted on money and selling; call them the Finance Division.

419

There are the people who clean the theater and show people to seats and handle the crowds; call them the House Division. And there are the managers and playwrights and score writers and angels (financiers); call them loosely the Executive Division.

Now as long as they know their org board, have their flows plotted out, are hatted for their jobs and do a good job, even a half-good play can be viable.

But throw away the org board, skip the flows, don't hat them and even a brilliant script and marvelous music will play to an empty house and go broke.

Why? Because an org form is not held. Possibly an untrained unhatted producer will try to make the stage hands sell tickets, the actors write the music, the financiers show people to their seats. If he didn't know who the people were or what their hats were he might do just that.

And there would be noise and confusion even where there was no protest. People would get in one another's road. And the general presentation would look so ragged to the public they'd stay away in droves.

ESTO ACTION

Now what would an Esto (or an Executive Director) have to do with, let us say, an amateur, dilettante theatrical company that was about to bog.

Probably half the people had quit already. And even if there were people in the company they would probably need more.

The very first action would be to Esto Series 16 the top men to make money quick.

The first organizing action would be to kick open the hiring door. This would begin with getting out hiring PR and putting someone there to sign people up who came to be hired (not to test and audition and look at references, but just to sign people up).

The next action would be to do a flow plan of public bodies and money. So one sees where the org form reaches. Then a schedule.

The next action would be to do an org board. Not a 3-week job. (It takes me a couple hours to sketch one with a sign pen for posting.) AND GET IT POSTED.

One then takes the *head* of each of these divisions and *hats* him on what his division is supposed to do and tell him to do it. NOW.

You make and post the flow plan, org bd and terminal location plan where the whole company can see them.

Chinese drill on a flow plan to show them what they're doing and what has to be done.

Chinese drill on the org board including introducing each person named on it and getting it drilled, what he does and who he is.

You Chinese drill the terminal locations where each of these persons (and functions) is to be found.

You get agreement on schedules.

You now have a group that knows who specializes in what and what's expected of each.

You get the head of the whole company to work with and hat the heads of his divisions.

420

Now you get the heads of divisions to hat their own staffs while you help.

And you get them busy.

You then put the polishing touches on your own Dept I (personnel PR, personnel hiring, personnel placement, org bds, hat compilations, hat library and hatting hatting hatting).

And by hatting and insisting on each doing his specialized job and getting seniors to HOLD THE FORM OF THE ORG by ordering the right orders to the right specialists and targeting their production and MAGIC! This amateur theatrical company gets solvent and good enough to wind up on Broadway. It's gone professional!

You say, yes, but what about artistic quality? What about the tech of writing music and acting.
...

Hey, you overlooked the first action. You kicked the door open on hiring and you hatted and trained. And you let go those who couldn't get a stat.

Eventually you would meet human reaction and emotion and would put in a full HCO and a full Qual particularly Cramming. But you'd still do that just to be sure it kept going.

Yessir, it can't help but become a professional group IF you, the Esto, established and made them HOLD THE FORM OF THE ORG and produce while they did it.

An Executive Director can do all this and produce too. The great ones do things like this. But here it is in full view.

A Scientology org goes together just like that. Which could be why, when we want to get something started, we say:

"Get the show on the road!"

But there is no show until it is established and the FORM OF THE ORG is held.

You are luckier than the amateur theatrical company's Esto. You have policy for every post and a book of it for every division and all the tech besides.

So there is no valid reason under the sun you cannot establish and then hold the form of the org,

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.bh.ts.gm Copyright © 1972 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

421

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 13 JULY 1974

Issue I

Remirneo

Org Series 33

PRODUCTION BUGS

An analysis of failures to produce in several fields showed this fault:

EXPERIMENTING ON A STANDARD

PRODUCTION LINE.

Example: A cook can cook 30 dishes of various types successfully. Instead of retaining these as they are and seeking on the side to create or find new dishes, the cook experiments with and changes her 30 standard dishes. The result is failed production.

Example: A musical group has 15 finished pieces of repertoire. Instead of developing totally new pieces, they rewrite their existing repertoire. The result is a failure to do good shows.

Example: An org is doing well with a standard CF letter writing campaign. This personnel is pulled off onto phones only as an experiment. The org stats crash. The correct action would be a pilot phone program using new personnel and leaving the standard actions in.

In all cases the right thing to do is maintain without variation the standard production line and if experimenting or change is to be done: pilot it on the side with people or actions that do NOT impede standard production.

There is always a better model in the research lab than there is on the production line. The only bug occurs when the incomplete and unknown model is shoved over *as* the standard production.

If on test and experience a new action, properly piloted, is better, then *and only then is it *added* to the standard line.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

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

422

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 13 JULY 1974

Issue II

Remimeo

Org Series 34

WORKING INSTALLATIONS

Never unmock (take down or destroy) working installations.

A working installation is something that is operational.

The most flagrant violation of this is tearing up Div A to create Div B.

Division A is working. Somebody orders Division B to be strengthened.

A stupid or suppressive personnel person will tear up Div A to get personnel for Div B.

The correct action is to find extra or new people for the new action.

MUSICAL CHAIRS (transfers of persons around an org) is **THE SINGLE MOST DESTRUCTIVE ACTION TO AN ORG'S STATS.**

A failure to recruit and train new- people leads one tow9rd the destruction of working installations.

Whenever a new unit has to be made up, the failure to recruit and train shows up vividly. Essential people are ripped off their posts to form the new unit and the destruction of working installations by this action shows up at once in production stats.

It takes a great deal of work to find, hat and post people and get them experienced enough to produce. It takes a lot of work to make a working installation. But in one swoop some irresponsible personnel transfer can destroy it.

In mechanical matters the same thing applies. It takes a lot of work to make something operational. If for a while it is not used, a mechanic may rob its parts to set up something else instead of getting new parts for the something else. Then when the working installation is needed,

it doesn't function and a great deal of trouble and expense is put in setting it up again. The trouble and expense is far more costly than getting the parts elsewhere.

NEVER UNMOCK A WORKING INSTALLATION.

It will be far more costly than going to a lot of trouble and expense to get the people or parts elsewhere.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

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

423

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 20 SEPTEMBER 1976

Remimeo

All Staffs

Org Series 35

Executive Series 17

THE STAT PUSH

WHAT exactly is a stat push?

The danger in talking about this subject at all is that someone can do an immediate make-wrong by saying, "This means don't try to raise any stats."

So to understand this subject at all, one must have a pretty clear idea of exactly what is meant by "Don't push stats." 4

First of all one has to know precisely that STATISTICS ARE AN INDICATOR; THEY ARE NOT AN OBJECT.

WHEN YOU PUSH THE INDICATOR YOU DO NOT OBTAIN THE OBJECT IT REPRESENTS.

PRODUCTION IS COMPLETED CYCLES OF ACTION, NOT JUST NUMBERS.

The figure " I " in "I apple" is not the apple.

Therefore pure, raw, naked stat pushing is an outpost called "wrong target."

Pushing a stat without doing anything to bring about the stat is therefore an aberration.

Demanding a stat without doing anything to see that it occurs or putting anything there to make it or correcting anything that is preventing it is an aberration built out of either psychosis or ignorance of what should really be done.

It is quite true that stats must be kept up. But unless they are kept up by putting something there or correcting something that is there and getting all the cycles of action done by all those who should do them, the stats will DECREASE and eventually vanish.

An order, a telex, a yell to the effect "GET THE STATS UP" is so much wasted time.

Further, such an order or telex or yell in any form has a very deteriorating effect. Individuals or staffs look at it in a properly weird light. They are there, they are doing what they can, they have problems and tangles and barriers. And telling them to "Get the stats up" causes various reactions, none of them very good. Essentially, it gives them neither help nor direction and even subtly informs them that the person ordering either does not know or does not care what is going on and is not about to help. The eventual reaction can become an ignoring of that command channel.

There are some specialized actions in stat pushing. Chief amongst them is the "GI push."

The usual indicator of this is a neglect or abandonment of staff or caring about staff. One sees no real effective attention on recruitment, training, apprenticing, hatting, future execs. And when one sees this it usually follows that there is a "GI push" going on somewhere in the executive strata. Why this indicator? Well, you see, it only takes a small handful of people to get in GI and where executive attention is fixated on a "GI push" the various production staff, HCO and the rest of the org aren't "necessary." You find this with EDs who reg instead of getting Registrars and putting an org there, with EDs who go for credit unions and odd financial deals. And you will

424

also find they have the biggest number and amount of refunds and the biggest backlogs AND a shrinking and unhappy org. Unfortunately, they soon also get a crashing GI for none of the support actions are being done across the divisions.

The reason "GI pushing" happens so often is the structure of the society itself. The only real crime for which one can be punished by the governments of today is lack of money. In other crimes if one has the huge sums necessary to hire lawyers one can often get off. But the crime of having no money is the only crime one cannot get out of. There are even laws which cause the arrest on the street of persons who do not have so much money in their pockets or wallets: it is called "vagrancy." So with the whole aberrated society on a big "GI push," with Wall Street measuring values only in how much something costs, with wages and prices soaring, at this writing, to total social disaster, it is no wonder that short-sighted and untrained or even aberrated executives get into a "GI push."

The answer to not having money is, of course, to make more money. And there is nothing whatever wrong with that. BUT that is *not* done with a "GI push." It is done with putting a whole org there, every part of it functioning and delivering with all the bugs out of its lines, *and* making a lot, lot, lot more money. Fifty trained staff producing everything an org is supposed to produce will make far more money than five guys concentrating on GI only and letting the rest of the org go to blazes. The GI made by the fifty will go on increasing. The GI made by the five (and not backed up by the rest of the org) will decrease week by week and then crash.

Let us take some examples of "stat pushing":

The room is cold and the staff is wearing overcoats and using blankets. Mr. Stat Pusher walks over to the thermometer on the wall and sees that it reads very low. So he yells at the thermometer, "Get the stat up!" Nothing happens of course; it still says 15*, so he yells at the staff, "Get that stat up!" Now, in this instance, having a stat pusher around, the org has no Treasury Div and so there was nobody to pay the bills and the fuel company has refused to deliver further fuel. The janitor is missing because there is no HCO to hire one or keep one on post so there's no one to light the furnace even if it had fuel. And due to an unhatted Financial Planning Committee, that also doesn't meet or exist, no new boiler was ordered when the old one blew up last year. The stat pusher seems incapable of observing these facts, and is too unskilled to bring them to rights. So he **continues to yell "Get the**

stat up" and the staff wears more and more coats and blankets until at last it is just a quiet scene of solid ice.

If the letters out stat is down, this is a **bad INDICATOR**. It is vital that one keeps stats and observes when one goes down. It is extremely hard to manage on one's post or in an org unless one has a stat. But, in going down, WHAT is being indicated? A lack of letters out. So what does one do? Does he yell "Get the letters stat up" or does he look into this? If he looked into it he could find the real Why, handle it and the letters stat would go up. He might find that the Letter Reges were all sacked so as to increase the unit pay one week and that he has somehow gotten a nut onto a personnel or finance post (whose R/Ses make even his head jerk back and forth). He might find that the typewriters had broken down. He might find that Dept 5 people were all being used by Div 5 to handle their files. At the very least he will find something aberrated or ignorant going on which has to be handled before the letters can be flooded out again. WHEN this is found and handled, THEN the letters out stat will go up.

So Mr. Stat Pusher is essentially operating on a short circuit. He cannot or will not look.

And there is another variety of stat aberration which comes about after a lot of "Get the stat up" has failed. This is Mr. Stat Ignorer.

Mr. Stat Ignorer is driving along in a car and he looks at the speedometer. It says 15 m.p.h. He glares at the needle for a moment and then handles it. He pastes a piece of paper over it so it can't be seen. And sits back and drives contentedly. If he'd looked, he would have found he had three flat tires and an engine about to run out of oil and explode.

Then there is also Mr. Stat Faker. He knows that he will get in trouble if his STAT is down. So he simply dreams up a figure and puts it on graph paper. He is encouraged

425

and rendered confident in this because he is sure that no senior will come around and notice the towers of unanswered letters or the huge backlogs of cramming orders or the mobbed waiting room of unhandled public or the mountain of uncorrected and unfiled address plates. He is confident because no senior has in the last year or two. And he can say "I'm an upstat" when the Ethics Officer tries to hit him for keeping the front door to the org obstructed with his motorcycle. And he is recognizable by a caved-in case, low morale and a hunted look of glee as he creeps through the org.

There is one common denominator the stat pusher, the stat ignorer and the stat faker have. And that is AN ABSENCE OF SKILLED MANAGEMENT.

We have investigatory tech. It is there for use. We have the Data Series evaluation tech. It is there for use. We have administrative tech. And it is all published and there for use. And further, when it is known and used, proven times without number now, production and prosperity occur AND show up as statistics which INDICATE that production and prosperity are occurring.

Yes, it is very, very true that an org or a manager or an auditor or file clerk gets in trouble if his stats are down.

Yes, it is true that stats should exist and be used.

But it is equally true that the way to get a stat is to put something there that can get something done and get the lines debugged and the scene handled.

The fate of the stat pusher, the stat ignorer and the stat faker is to look around one day and find no org.

It's a very long way between yelling or telexing or writing "Get the stat up" and handling things and getting production cycles completed so that the stat WILL go up.

The stat, properly stated and honestly kept, IS a vital indicator of the scene. If you know how to use them you can get the areas that have to be handled. And if you know your policy and tech you can find the real Whys and get real handlings and get things whizzing.

We mean to have all the stats going up because this INDICATES a bettering state of affairs for everyone.

The job of the Product Officer is NOT to yell "Get the stats up." The Product Officer is there to notice and order things like "Get those letters answered so they get answers." And the job of the Org Officer is to carry out the handlings the Product Officer finds necessary to get production rolling.

A fire-breathing Product Officer is worth his weight to every staff member IF he is trying to get and is getting production which results in bettered conditions, better products, better prosperity and THIS will incidentally show up in the stats.

It's a world of things that have to be done and coordinated before the stats go up.

We are in the business of people, we are in the business of a bettered world. We have to have completed cycles of action. And these are shown in stats.

We are also in a world of exchange and would be no matter what ideology we lived under. We have to "make GI" and we have to have "the stats up."

But our success is measured in terms of the ACTIONS we do, for only those show up in the indicators called statistics.

So, okay. Let's go about it the right way. And find what is holding the stats down and handle and correct those things and so, honestly and swiftly, become upstat.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:lf.gm Copyright © 1976 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

426

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East **Grinstead, Sussex**

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 20 SEPTEMBER 1976-1

ADDITION OF 17 APRIL 1977

Remimeo

All Staffs (Reissued 5 Dec 1977, to clarify the point that this PL

only clarifies HCO PL 20 Sept 76, THE STAT PUSH

and does not cancel it.)

Org Series 35-1

Executive Series 17-1

STAT PUSH CLARIFIED

This policy letter is revised. The second paragraph of the original said that it was dangerous to talk about the subject because somebody could do an immediate makewrong by saying "This means don't try to raise any stats."

Well, exactly that happened. There was a heavy campaign run into all Flag Operations Liaison Offices and to orgs designed to discredit asking for raises in stats. (The person who did it and failed to push production quotas is suspended and under Comm Ev.)

The whole point seems to have been missed. It was this: You can't ask for a NUMBER, you CAN and MUST ask for a SOMETHING.

That something is a product. It is a thing, a tangible item.

Right at this minute, as a result of a mission, HCO PL 16 Nov 76 "Production Quotas" has now been provided with thoroughly researched subproducts one has to push in order to get the PRODUCTS. These are the real tangible actions you have to take to get a number of actual products. In other words, by getting many exact minor products, you then can achieve the valuable final product.

STATISTICS are those numbers which simply count the products attained or obtained.

Stat management is the only kind of management you can do on a production scene. Management by statistics was brought to a fine art in Scientology admin tech. To discredit it is, of course, to court failure.

Abusing statistical management is also something of a crime. It has been done by some managers who said "Get the stats up" without ever saying what subproducts you had to get that would then make up the product.

Stat management is a valuable tool and has gotten us over the years. To discredit it first by saying first just "Get the stats up" without saying how or what or why was one side of the pendulum. Then the pendulum swung clear to the extreme and people were being made guilty for even watching stats or demanding or working to raise them.

So let's get a little middle swing of the pendulum now.

It is perfectly all right to demand that stats rise so long as one says what subproducts and products make up those stats and gives some indication of what people should do to get the stats rising.

It is perfectly all right to do stat management.

427

And it is perfectly okay to come down hard on people or orgs who fail to get their stats in viable range.

So long as you give them some idea of what small products (subproducts) they have to get to make up the real products, you are NOT doing a stat push.

So long as you give people some direction and guidance, you can yell for stat increases all you want.

And you better.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:lf.kjm.gm Copyright © 1976, 1977 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

428

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead,

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 14 NOVE

Remimeo Flag Bu All Orgs

Ext HCO FB *Admin Know-How Series 36*

Org Series 36

Executive Series 18

Personnel Series 28

MANNING UP AN ORG

The Sequence of Posting Depts and Divs

You need an org bd first and an allocation board.

The sequence in which an org is manned up is roughly:

- Dept I
- Dept 11
- Reg and Body Routers and Intro people in Div 6
- Dept 12 (enough auditors and C/Ses to approach 2 admin to I tech in org)
- Dept 6
- Dept 7
- Dept 3
- SSO and Supers in Qual to train staff
- Dept 5 for CF Address and Letter Reges
- Dept 4 for promo
- Dept 21 (LRH Comm)
- Dept 10
- Dept 20
- FR & execs
- Full Div 6
- Full Div I
- Full Div 4
- Full Div 2

- Full Div 5

- Full Div 7

- Full Div 3

(Note, an AO always mans up the AO dept or div along with the SH one in each case.)

Wrong sequence of manning is Dept 6, Dept 12, Dept 6, Dept 12, Dept 6, Dept 12, as you wind up with a stuck clinic that won't expand.

Wrong sequence will contract an org while trying to expand it as the org will go out of balance, bad units, noisy and unproductive.

If manned in a correct sequence its income has a chance to stay abreast of its new staff additions.

Emphasis on GI without comparable emphasis on delivery and organization can throw an org into such a spin only a genius can run it.

Manned in proper sequence, and hatted as it goes, an org almost runs itself.

429

Single-handing from the top comes from longstanding failures to man or man in sequence, from earlier noncompliance with explicit orders or from not understanding orgs in the first place.

An unhappy org that doesn't produce has usually been manned only partially and out of sequence.

The trick is planned manning, ignoring the screams of those who know best or demand personnel; just manning by posting those who have been screamed for the loudest is a sure way to wind up with no people and total org problems instead of a total org that is prosperous and producing.

Incidentally, this is a rough approximation of the sequence of hats the ED gradually unloads as his org takes over.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:nt.gm Copyright © 1976 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

430

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 16 NOVEMBER 1976

Remimeo

All Staffs

Org Series 37

Executive Series 19

PRODUCTION QUOTAS

Ref.- HCO PL 8 Feb 72 Issue 11

Mgmt Series Vol 2

In a recent pilot, executed at my orders by the Staff Captain, it was found that:

WHERE A STAFF MEMBER DOES NOT KNOW THE SUBPRODUCTS WHICH GO TO MAKE UP A GROSS DIVISIONAL STATISTIC THE GDS WILL SUFFER AND FALL.

And it was also found:

WHERE SUBPRODUCTS ARE NOT GIVEN A QUOTA, QUOTAING A GDS FAILS.

The report on the pilot follows and is given in full as it is an excellent example of what a Product Officer or executive runs into and how it is solved.

" During the last two weeks, while running the FSO, I've had a lot of experience with the above subject, and thought that the data that I have on it might be useful to you.

" When first going into the org I pushed for actual products along with quotaing of the GDSes.

"This went over very well, however, the day you sent a telex *to quota the products that make up the stat*, things really started moving much better.

"Your telex really opened the door for me as to how to go about getting an org to work on products and get stats up.

"Here is the best example. The week before last on Monday or Tuesday the student points were heading for bad downstats for the week. The D of T was more or less tearing her hair out about how she could meet her quota. She and the Tech Sec were trying to figure out what had changed.

"This was right after I had read your telex referred to above, so what I did was to tell them how they had to work on the products that make up the stat.

"The next step was *to list out what the subproducts were that made up the stat*. I just made a very simple list, not necessarily a complete one, of:- (1) course starts, (2) F/Ning students, (3) students that are on target, (4) students that increase their production daily. Then made sure the D of T would understand how these made up the stat.

"The next step after that was to change 1-4 above into 'number of.'

"This brought about what one could call instant sanity, and exclamations of realizations of how the area could be handled.

431

"This was followed up by making the D of T work on each of these products. It took a lot of work and figure out how to do, as far far from all students were F/Ning, etc. It took actions like finding every bogged student and debugging him on a flat-out basis.

"The end result was that the stat did not crash, but went up some, and this week went up even more.

"Other actions were required in the area, such as the Qual Sec and Chief Off sorting out the TRs Course, the D of T doing TRs, and more, but it worked for sure.

"After this, we made this the pattern for the dept heads to follow: i.e. work on the products and subproducts that make up the stat, list them out, quota them, make the quotas, make your GDS quotas.

"It has also been put in on Dept 18 lines, so that Tours and external Reges are no longer pushed on GI and bodies only. There is a pilot project with Flag Service Consultant WUS since a few

days which puts in a whole subproduct system and quotaing and reporting on it, which was very well received.

"However, what I also wanted to tell you, is that *this does not go in automatically*, we're still catching bugs on it.

"These are the bugs that have been run across:

" 1. Dir Reg had a bunch of subproducts and products beautifully quotaed, but when asked what his quotas were for 'closes' and 'completed Reg cycles,' he dropped his jaw as he had not thought about that.

"He immediately quotaed these and production increased right away.

"2. The Dir Procurement (Dissem Sec HFA) had not set any quotas for CF/Address as she stated that 'that area would not be possible to quota.' Her M U was that she thought she had to quota every single area of Addresso, rather than the part they were working on at the moment. She had a major win on this.

"She also kept her quotas in her head as she 'hated to have papers lying around.' She since has them all in a book and is very happy.

"3. The Dist Sec could not think of the subproducts that would produce NNCE

"4. The Dir Income was working on subproducts in such a way that they did not add up to his GDS, or rather, that they did not result in his GDS quota being met, and tried to justify this,

"Several others required close personal contacts to list out what the products would be that made up their stat.

"MUs are still coming up, but it sure works! It's brilliant, Sir.

"My picture of an org that operated on this basis with every staff member should be incredible.

"Now, I have looked at the trouble an executive would run into implementing the order to quota products that make up stats, and I can see lots, unless you know exactly how to do it.

"This is what I see on it:

"You would have to **keep the GDS quota there** and in mind constantly, as if you don't, things can slack off too easily.

432

"You would have to bring the terminals concerned to an understanding of the cycle of working on products that make up the stat.

"You would have to get a list of what the products and subproducts are, without making it miles long

"You would have to make sure that the list is complete, per policy and actually makes up the stat.

"You would then have to make sure that the list is quotaed.

"You would then have to make sure that the quotas are met, and you would have to watch out for anyone using it wrongly so the GDS quota is not met.

"On most of these you would have to make sure that there are proper 'figure out how to do's,' on how to go about getting the products.

"The above actually, now that I look at it, fits in exactly with your PLs on Name, Want and Get the Products.

"I think also what is of importance is that you really break down what it takes to get the products: i.e. if the DTS here was told to get 10 fully paid into the org, she would be 'blank,' until you broke it down into-make up the list of them, make so many contacts, get so many ETAs, etc.

"Pressure is still required to get a momentum and keep it going.

"Another example is getting out over 100,000 pieces of promo in one week. It takes incredible detailed planning that covers everything; when what has to be through I/A and on the assembly line, what checks have to be gotten when, what has to be addressed when and franked, what all hands are needed and when, etc. I had to force through exact planning on this with targets assigned, etc., and then push like mad.

"The use of HCO PL Exec Series 7 is also very important in all this."

Therefore these conclusions can be considered valid and vital:

EVERY GDS MUST BE BROKEN DOWN INTO SUBPRODUCTS AND THE STAFF MEMBERS MUST KNOW THEM IN **ORDER TO ATTAIN A GDS.**

And:

EVERY SUBPRODUCT MUST BE QUOTAED FOR A GDS QUOTA TO BE ATTAINED.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:nt.gm Copyright © 1976 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

433

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 20 JULY 1978

Remimeo

Org Series 38

HELD FROM ABOVE

DOUBLE-HATTING

There are two types of double-hatting.

One of these, we all know about and is very common and quite permissible. This is what might be called "*level*" double-hatting. In this, for example, Mimeo Files is also Mimeo Files Equipment. So long as one does not have a hat in each of separate divisions and the hat is all in one division (and in a large org all in one department) not too much strain and trouble will result.

The other type of double-hatting can be called "*vertical*" double-hatting. In this, the head of an area *also* holds an 1/C hat in his own area.

We see this in "H17X" on org boards. "Held from above" is very common. A Tech Sec is also D of P.

Well, in a small org that isn't making any money and isn't delivering, this would be usual. Probably the Tech Sec would also be the only auditor.

But we are talking here about busy areas that produce where we condone too much "HFA."

Vertical double-hatting is a sure way to be under stress.

Example: The Artillery Officer, 1 C of all artillery, takes on the hat of "Ammunition Inventory 1/C." Well, he's so *tiMp* in counting shells he omits to notice-as he should as Artillery Officer 1/C-that they just lost their guns. Result-lost battle, court-martial. And all because he was vertical double-hatted.

When a person occupies two points of different level on a command channel he is asking for trouble. He is busy on the lower point, usually because it is a full-time doingness, and so neglects many other sectors that should be supervised from the higher point.

When I see "D of P" marked as HFA by the ED, I don't have to look at stats or future Ethics Orders for that org. I know *exactly* what they will be. The D of P post might be being done but the org will be in a shambles for lack of active supervision. The ED will soon be the subject of a mission.

Yes, one can do it for a week-even a month at times. BUT if one does not straighten it out he'll be on the aspirin route.

Advice to any 1/C who is vertical double-hatted is

1. Recruit
2. Train
3. Hat

the lower post quick and see that it produces.

CRAWL BACK UP THE ORG BOARD.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:ab.dr.gm Copyright c 1978 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

434

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 9 AUGUST 1979R

Remimeo Issue 11

All Orgs REVISED 19 NOVEMBER 1979

All Staff

(Revisions in this type style)

Establishment Officer Series 39

Org Series 39

SERVICE PRODUCT OFFICER

(This HCO PL has been revised in order to show the importance of the Product/Organizing Officer and Establishment Officer systems in relation to the Service Product Officer. These systems are totally valid and should be in full use in organizations.)

References:

The Flag Executive Briefing Course tape lectures

The Org Series

The Establishment Officer Series

HCO PL 9 Aug 791 CALL-IN: THE KEY TO FUTURE

DELIVERY AND INCOME

HCO PL 7 Aug 76 1 NAME YOUR PRODUCT

HCO PL 7 Aug 76 11 WANT YOUR PRODUCT

HCO PL 7 Aug 76 111 TO GET YOU HAVE TO KNOW HOW

TO ORGANIZE

HCO PL 20 Nov 65 THE PROMOTIONAL ACTIONS OF

AN ORGANIZATION

HCO PL 28 Jul 74 ADDITIONS TO PROMOTIONAL

ACTIONS OF AN ORGANIZATION

HCO PL 28 May 72 BOOM DATA

HCO PL 15 Nov 60 MODERN PROCUREMENT LETTERS

HCO PL 14 Feb 61 THE PATTERN OF A CENTRAL ORG

HCO PL 21 Nov 68 SENIOR POLICY

HCO PL 28 Feb 65 DELIVER

HCO PL 23 Aug 79 1 DEBUG TECH

HCO PL 23 Aug 79 11 DEBUG TECH CHECKLIST

HCO PL 9 Aug 79 111 SERVICE/CALL-IN COMMITTEE

HCO PL 10 Jul 65 LINES AND TERMINALS ROUTING

The post of SERVICE PRODUCT OFFICER is hereby established in the Office of the CO/ED, Dept 19, of all Class IV and Sea Org orgs. His direct senior is the CO/ED.

Until such time as a SERVICE PRODUCT OFFICER is posted the responsibilities and duties are covered by the Service/Call-in Committee as fully laid out in HCO PL 9 Aug 79 1, CALL-IN: THE KEY TO FUTURE DELIVERY AND INCOME and HCO PL 9 Aug 79 111, SERVICE/CALL-IN COMMITTEE.

The VALUABLE FINAL PRODUCTS of this post are (1) flawlessly serviced and
435

completed paid pcs and students who re-sign-up for their next service, and (2) high quality promotional items in the hands of volumes of public who come in, sign-up and start an org service.

The main statistics for the SERVICE PRODUCT OFFICER are

(1) Number of pcs and students completed and re-signed on to their next service. (This includes those actually routed on to the next upper org for services and who do re-sign.)

(2) Number of public in and started onto a service.

Completion: By completion is meant those actions completed and attested at C & A and accompanied by an acceptable success story.

Re-sign: By re-sign-ups are meant pcs and students who, after completion of a service, see the Registrar to sign up *again* for another service while in the org.

Promotional Items: Those items which will produce income for the organization. By promotional items are meant those things which make Scientology and our products known and will cause people to respond either in person or by written reply to the result of receiving Scientology commodities. These are tours, book outlets, Sunday services, events, upstat image, fliers, info packs, handouts, books, ASR packs, specified service promotion, etc.

There are of course many other stats that reflect the SERVICE PRODUCT OFFICER'S subproducts and these are VSD, TOTAL GI, INTENSIVES COMPLETED, BULK MAIL OUT, NUMBER OF PROMOTIONAL ACTIONS OF THE ORG IN, NUMBER OF FULLY AND PARTIAL PAIDS GOTTEN INTO THE ORG AND ON TO THEIR NEXT SERVICE. These are very important parts of the SERVICE PRODUCT OFFICER HAT, as they reflect his subproducts which lead to his valuable final product.

SERVICE PRODUCT OFFICER

RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES

The purpose of an organization is to deliver service to the public. The primary functions which add up to delivery to the public are promotion, sales, call-in, delivery itself and re-sign. The Service Product Officer is responsible for the flow of PRODUCTS through these areas. He is a PRODUCT OFFICER. He names, wants and gets products in these areas and thus ensures that the organization is accomplishing its purpose of service to the public.

The full technology of Product Officers is explained in the Flag Executive Briefing Course lectures, where the ProductlOrg Officer system was developed. This system is still fully valid and is, in fact, the tech of the Service Product Officer. He is solely interested in products. When the Service Product Officer comes across a situation that requires organizing, he gets his Organizing Officer to handle it. The 0/0 (Organizing Officer) should actually be operating a few steps ahead of the Service Product Officer at a/1 times-organizing for immediate production, per the ProductlOrg system. A full study of the ProductlOrg system, as contained in the FEBC tapes, the Org Series and Esto Series 33, 34 and 35, NAME, WANT AND GET YOUR PRODUCT, is recommended in order to attain a thorough understanding of the actions of the Service Product Officer and his Organizing Officer.

The Service Product Officer is not a stopgap at any point of the promotion, sales, call-in, delivery and re-sign lines, where executives have failed to post and hat staff This would be the responsibility of the Exec Establishment Officer per Esto Series 1. Establishment

Officers see that short and long-range establishment are occurring in the organization in the form of recruiting, hatting and training of staff The Esto system is a necessary and very vital tool for the Service Product Officer and the organization and should definitely be in full use.

436

The Service Product Officer has the authority to directly order or work with any terminal involved in the promotion, sales, call-in, delivery or re-sign areas so long as he maintains direct liaison with their seniors.

The Service Product Officer must be fully aware of every post in the org and what their jobs consist of. He must know who handles what cycles and what cycles are on the lines. For instance, it is up to the Service Product Officer to be aware of all promotional actions occurring in the org and who is doing them, or if they aren't getting done. He must be aware of what public aren't getting serviced and he ensures those responsible get them serviced. He doesn't do this himself as a serious goof of any Product Officer would be to go down the org board and do the job himself. The Service Product Officer must ensure others get the work done. Otherwise, he would wind up doing everyone's post and not getting anything done. It's actually pretty overwhelming to think of a Service Product Officer as responsible for doing everyone else's post duties. That's the sure-fire way to sink fast. Where a product isn't getting out the Service Product Officer debugs it using HCO PL DEBUG TECH, in order to get production. He is not interested in first finding the person's MU or excuse, he is interested in getting production occurring now. Let the Org Officer and Qual worry about the staff member's MUs.

Divisional Secretaries are the Product Officers for their division per the Product/Organizing Officer system. The Service Product Officer sees that the Product Officers over the whole delivery cycle are getting their products. He coordinates the flow of products from division to division. A Service Product Officer doing his post fully and properly is, in fact, the person that makes the org board work. He sees that products aren't jamming up at one point of the line, but that they continue through the organization.

The Service Product Officer walks into the Tech Div and finds the Tech Sec sitting at his desk, shuffling paper and the pcs are piling high and complaining about no service. The last thing the Service Product Officer would do is start organizing the Tech staff around and scheduling the pcs. No sir, that's a serious offense. The first thing he would do is find out what can be produced RIGHT NOW, what auditors can be gotten into session right now and makes the Tech Sec do it and GET IT DONE. This all takes about 15 minutes and he gets the area flowing again and then, WHAM! . . . he's out and into his next area. The Service Product Officer would not sit down and just start word clearing or doing Exchange by Dynamics on the Tech Sec. He would unstick the flows and get them moving. Then he would alert HCO and Qual to this serious problem of unhattedness and demand it be handled.

The basic sequence of the Service Product Officer on getting the products flowing off the lines is PUSH, DEBUG, DRIVE, NAME IT, WANT IT, AND GET IT. That's the only way you ever get a product. Products don't happen on their own.

This means he tells the Tech Sec to get Joe Blow there in session now! There is no general "audit these pcs." You'd never get a product that way.

The ED/CO has no authority to order the Service Product Officer to perform the total duties of any one post. The Service Product Officer must guard against being stuck into one post after another, doing it all himself Nor is the Service Product Officer an "expeditor" for the CO/ED.

It is also very important that the Service Product Officer advise seniors that he is going into their areas so as not to create a Danger condition and wind up having to run the entire org. He also

does this by getting the seniors to handle their juniors so a product is gotten. He does not walk in and cross-order the seniors of areas but works with them to see that products are produced.

The Service Product Officer is one who comes up with BIG IDEAS on getting public flooded into the org and being serviced swiftly. He is the one who thinks along the line of PRODUCTS PRODUCTS PRODUCTS. By spanning the divisions, he coordinates the product wanted and ensures each division is aware of its part in getting this product and that their actions are uniform. Where the Service Product

437

Officer spots diversity, or lack of uniformity, he must alert his Org Officer or HCO. By doing the actions of coordination for a product and product demand, the Product Officer creates a team and more importantly sets the pace of the org's production and morale.

ORG LINES AND THE SERVICE PRODUCT OFFICER

There are certain aspects of the organization which the Service Product Officer must be thoroughly trained in to do his job properly.

The Service Product Officer must be fully aware of all the Valuable Final Products (VFPs) of each department and each division of the org. Without this the Service Product Officer can create havoc, as he would be ordering Division 6 to recruit or the Reges to supervise. By not knowing cold the org VFPs, the Service Product Officer would certainly jam the flows throughout the org board.

A serious fault in any executive is not knowing the functions of terminals and the relation of one terminal to another. A key function of any executive is that of routing. An executive that misroutes communications and particles will tie his org in knots and wonder why no products are coming out. Therefore, a Service Product Officer must know cold every post function in the org and what particles belong on what lines.

He has got to know where a product comes from and where it goes in order to see it through the lines. A Product Officer's job is to name, want and get a product. However, he must first know where that product is to come from and where it is to go. This is an incredibly fundamental point.

In order for org lines to flow, routing forms (RFs) must be used. A routing form is a full step-by-step road map on which a particle travels. Every point a particle (which could be a student, pc, mail, etc.) must go through to wind up at its destination must be listed on the routing form.

The Service Product Officer Organizing Officer must ensure routing forms exist and are in use for each and every line in an org he deals in. Both he and the Service Product Officer must know these forms cold and be able to instantly spot when a line is being abused or ignored so as to slam in the correct routing.

A Service Product Officer must fully clay demo all the lines of an organization for each and every product. This must include each particle from entrance to the org and through all lines on which that particle would flow until it leaves the org. Lines are the most fundamental point of administration. To not have a full grasp of these lines would be detrimental to any Product Officer.

SERVICE PRODUCT OFFICER

SEQUENCE OF ACTIONS

It is very easy for the Service Product Officer to become wrapped up in one area while neglecting the others; however, this must not be done as, while products might be getting through in

one area, they may well be seriously bogging in others. The Service Product Officer is concerned with promotion, sales, call-in, delivery and re-sign. He begins his product officering in promotion and gets products out there or started and moves on to sales and gets them on to getting their products and so on through call-in and delivery and re-sign. He then returns to the beginning, promotion, and follows up on what he started there and gets even more production out. This is basically how the Service Product Officer moves through the org.

Daily, the Service Product Officer must plan and battle plan out his day. He must list those products he intends to achieve in each one of his areas and then gets them.

The Service Product Officer is not an "information courier" or "data gatherer." He is ahead of the game and *knows* the data. He must know what public haven't been regged in the org yet, he must know who hasn't been taken into session that day, or who

438

has been stuck in Ethics for 3 days, and ensure these things get handled. Therefore he must be quicker and faster than anyone else in the org and run run run.

PROMOTION

Promotion is the first action of the SERVICE PRODUCT OFFICER. He must ensure the many promotional pieces and actions are getting done. Some of these are

1. Selling of books.
2. Staff selling books.
3. Books placed in public bookstores.
4. Selling of books to FSMs, franchises, distributors, retailers and salesmen.
5. Books sold on each public contact.
6. Books advertised in mags, ads, posters, fliers, etc.
7. ASR packs.
8. Info packs.
9. Div 6 handouts for lectures and free testing.
10. Posters on major services in Div 6.
11. Promo to field auditors, FSMs, gung ho groups, Dianetic study groups.
12. Org mags.
13. Flag shooting boards.
14. Promo for future events and tours.
15. The AUDITOR (for SHs).
16. Clear News.
17. ADVANCE! mag (for AOs).
18. SOURCE mag (FSO).
19. 1 WANT TO GO CLEAR CLUB promo (AOs).

20. SHSBC/NED/INTERNSHIPS/NOTs/GRADES, etc., specified in promo.
21. Promo at points of public inquiry.
22. Free testing ads.
23. Fliers inviting people to buy Scientology books.
24. More-Info-Cards used in books.
25. Ads in newspapers.
26. Questionnaires to detect people's plans for training and processing.
27. Enough letters to public so they come in.
28. All promotional actions per HCO PL 20 Nov 65, **PROMOTIONAL ACTIONS OF AN ORGANIZATION.**
29. Book seminars, public campaigns and lectures.
30. Public Reception display (books, posters, handouts, etc.).
31. Tours and events, Sunday service.
32. Free testing line.
33. Handling of gung ho groups, keeping FSMs well supplied and supervision of Dianetic study groups and FSMs.
34. Test centers outside the org as an extension.
35. Radio and TV advertisements.
36. Dept 17 services.
37. Reception greeting, handling, routing, chasing up people for appointments and handling incoming calls with ARC and efficiency.
38. Formation of Dianetic counseling groups.
39. Weekly tape and film plays.
40. Promotes the org and standard tech to Auditors Association.
41. Contacts and sees any sign of ARC broken field and alerts Chaplain to clean up the field.

The first thing a Service Product Officer would want to do is get out a large volume of promo to at least get some activity occurring. This would entail Dissem getting any promo laying around the org dug up and sent out to students and pcs. They would get it out in letters and mailings, they would get it handed out to students and pcs, they would pick up the half-completed promo piece, have it fixed up and sent out. They would have promo placed in Reception, in any public inquiry, etc. In other words, the Service Product Officer ensures that the org fully utilizes what promo they do have. He would also have specific promo pieces done to enlighten the field on what services

439

the org has. **Where any of this bogged he would push-debug-drive-name it-want it-and get it.**

The Service Product Officer, in trying to get in any promotional items, must review what resources he has. For example, is there a Dir Clearing; is there a Receptionist; etc.? He must concentrate on getting those terminals that already exist busy on promotional actions that will create the largest volume of inflow, *while his Organizing Officer works on getting more immediate resources to increase the volume even further*. It would be senseless to have the Dir Clearing running around trying to form up groups in an inactive field, single-handing, when he has FSMs that need to be gotten on to selecting and driving in new public. The Service Product Officer is concerned with priorities of promotional actions, so must be totally aware of all the promotional items and actions that an org can produce.

Actions such as "improved org appearance," "high ARC handling," and "correct and efficient routing of public" can be put in instantly. If he has 2 people in all of Dissem he still can and must get the particles flowing and products coming off the line.

SALES

The sales lines consist of enlightening the public, having lines to sign people up, getting public into the org and signed up for service.

The following gives you an idea of some of the sales actions and lines in an org:

1. Body Reg phones and schedules public to come in for interview.
2. Use of CF to produce business.
3. Reges who accept advance registrations.
4. D of T procurement of students.
5. D of P procurement of pcs.
6. Receptionist sells to public coming in.
7. SHs in communication with the Class IV Org Tech Secs and Registrars and targeting them for public completing and routing on to the higher org.
8. AO's and SH's case consultant actions.
9. AO/SH events to Class IV Org academies to encourage upper level auditor training.
10. Use of FSMs, Auditors Associations, personal contact, etc., to get public into the org and on to their next service.
11. Fast lines so public are not left waiting to see the Reg.

The lines of routing a public person to the Reg, or from the Reg to a service must be tight so public aren't lost, and the Reg is kept busy continuously with the public. Therefore, the Service Product Officer must police these lines and where he notices any lack of uniformity he gets his Org Officer onto it. Nonuniform or slow routing interferes with the product, so the Service Product Officer gets it speeded up now by push-debug-drive-name it-want it-and get it.

The first actions of the Service Product Officer in the sales area are to get all "in-the-org" public routed to the Reg on breaks or after course end to be further signed up for additional service. He can also have Dissem drilling done with Reges so as to increase sales in the org. His operating procedure is products, products, products, now, now, now. His Org Officer or HCO and Qual can worry about organize, organize, organize.

CALL-IN

Call-in is the action of getting fully paid into the org on to their next service. This also includes getting partially paid fully paid and on to their next service. These functions are of great concern to the SERVICE PRODUCT OFFICER as undelivered services to the public can mess up a field and increase the chance of refunds. The Service Product Officer should see to it that the Call-in Units are given stiff targets and

440

that their production is not monitored by low auditor hours or low producing training areas. The execution of needed programs to get Call-in Units fully operational is under the **Service Product Officer per HCO PL 9 Aug 79 1 CALL-IN: THE KEY TO FUTURE DELIVERY AND INCOME.** This same policy also lists out the functions of the Call-in Units. Call-in falls between sales and delivery, as it deals with those either fully or partly paid and needing only to finish payment and be called in and gotten onto service.

DELIVERY

The Service Product Officer must ensure that the service lines of the org are fast and 100% standard, that pcs and students do complete quickly and don't get lost off the lines.

The Service Product Officer is to have an alert line with the public set up whereby if a student or pc's study or auditing is slowed, or if the public person is dissatisfied in any way, he can alert the Service Product Officer so it can be handled.

Some of the actions and lines to be product officered by the Service Product Officer are as follows:

1. Tech Services arranges housing, has the pc met when he is arriving and generally operates as the pc's host while in the org.

2. The many lines such as pc to Ethics, pc to Examiner, student to Ethics, student to Qual, C/S Series 25 line and pc to D of P line must be drilled so they are flawless and handled with ARC.

3. The most senior policy applied to this area is HCO PL 21 Nov 68, SENIOR POLICY "WE ALWAYS DELIVER WHAT WE PROMISE."

4. There must be an adequate amount of auditors, Tech Pages and FESers, Ds of P, Supervisors, Course Admins, etc.

5. The auditing line must be fast so no pcs wait to be serviced.

6. Use of all hands tech terminals in the org auditing when required to handle backlogged service.

7. Getting students through their courses and on to their internship at which point they can audit in the HGC.

8. Proper scheduling so every pc gets in 12 1/2 hours a week minimum.

9. Recovering blown auditors, getting them fixed up and auditing.

The Service Product Officer ensures tech lines are fast. For instance, a pc's folder not getting C/Sed for days, or idle auditors and Ds of P "waiting" for pcs when they can be made to procure pcs, must be spotted and handled by the Service Product Officer.

The Service Product Officer must be kept briefed on what pcs and students arrive and how they are going to be handled. He must get around to these areas (Training and HGQ to ensure that there are no slows with public or anything that would get in the way of public receiving top quality service.

Service to the public is the reason the org is there and service must be kept fast and 100% standard and plentiful. This is a primary duty of the Service Product Officer; he is there to ensure this occurs.

It is losses on service that keep public away, org income down and staff pay low.

RE-SIGN-UP

The re-sign-up line is also very key to an organization's prosperity. It brings further income, and proves conclusively that the last service received by the public person was of high quality. This is why the Service Product Officer must be very alert to the amount of re-signs. Some of the things that should be watched for are

1. That the Reg is supplied with an upstat cert for his last completed service to present to the student or pc.

441

2. That the **Reg knows fully how to handle the public person that won't** re-sign (by sending them to Qual).

3. The Reg must be provided with tech estimates, Grade Chart information, etc., so he is aware ahead of time of what the student or pc's next action is.

4. Tech terminals are fully briefed and the line is in that every completion gets routed to the Reg. This must be drilled.

The public person should be serviced in your org until he/she requires upper level service that your org cannot deliver, at which point they should be directed to the next higher org.

PITFALLS

The Service Product Officer can lose his effectiveness if he takes any "hey you" orders or gets stuck in at various points. He is not an expeditor. He is not an information and full-time coordinator terminal. He is an executive, a Product Officer, and he is there to ensure the entire machine runs.

He must be well versed on actions occurring in the org. He must also pay strict attention to completing actions he has started and to carry a handling through to a done. Otherwise he can wrap himself around a pole with incomplete cycles which will ball up the line and prevent the service lines from flowing flawlessly.

Where the Service Product Officer post bogs it is undoubtedly due to a lack of an Organizing Officer, as with the speed in which a Service Product Officer demands products, he requires a fast moving Org Officer. So it is essential this post be provided with an Org Officer as soon as possible.

Those personnel in the org who are responsible for organization, any Esto personnel, etc., are the people who put the units in the org there. It is not the duty of a Service Product Officer to man and hat the org. *Therefore, it is a lot of sweat off the Service Product Officer~3 brow to have a fully functioning Esto team backing up his actions in getting the flow of products out of the organization.*

SUMMARY

The Service Product Officer ensures all the actions of getting public into, through and out of the org are *accomplished* with high quality results.

It is extremely important that this post be manned in each and every org. It doesn't just make the difference between a poor, empty org and a good org. This post makes the difference between a good org and a booming org.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:dr.gal.gm Copyright c 1979 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

442

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 14 FEBRUARY 1980

Remimeo

Exec Hats

All Staff Hats

Esto Series 40

Org Series 40

Product Debug Series 9

ORDER versus DISORDER

(Ref- HCO PL 9 Feb 74R ETHICS-CONDITION BELOW

Rev. 17.2.80 TREASON-CONFUSION FORMULA

AND EXPANDED CONFUSION

FORMULA

HCO PL 30 Dec 70 ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL)

I made a breakthrough recently, while investigating low production areas and realized that a good deal more needs to be said on the subject of order and disorder.

Order is defined as a condition in which everything is in its proper place and performs its proper function. A person with a personal sense of order knows *what* the things in his area are, he knows *where* they are, he knows *what* they are for. He understands their value and relationship to the whole.

A personal sense of order is essential in getting out products in an area.

An orderly typist, for instance, would have all the materials requiring typing, she would have ample paper and carbons within arm's reach, she would have her correction fluid to hand, etc. With all preparatory actions done, she would sit down to type with an operational typewriter and would know what that typewriter was and what it was for.

She would be able to sit down and get her product, with no wasted motion or stops.

But let's say you had a carpenter who couldn't find his hammer and he didn't even know what a hammer was for and he couldn't find his chisel because when he picked it up he put it down and

couldn't find it again and then he didn't know where his nails were. You give him a supply of lumber and he doesn't know what it's for, so he doesn't categorize it where he can put his hands on it.

How many houses do you think he would build?

The actual fact of the case is that a disordered person, operating in a disorganized area, makes a 10-minute cycle into a 3-week cycle (believe it, this is true) simply because he couldn't find his ruler, lost his eraser, broke his typewriter, dropped a nut and couldn't find it again and had to send off to Seattle for another one, etc., etc., etc.

BASICS

In working with a group of nonproductive technicians recently, I discovered something interesting: out-basics. I actually found a lower undercut to what we generally think of when we say "basics."

These technicians had reportedly researched a key piece of equipment and had it all sorted out. But I found that they didn't even know the basic fundamental of what that machine was supposed to do and what they were supposed to be doing in their area.

That told me at once that they had no orderly files, no research data. They were losing things.

443

Now, if they were losing things, that opened the door to another basic: they couldn't have known where things were. They put down a tool over there and then when they needed it again they would have to look all over the place because they hadn't put it down where it belonged.

Their work was not organized so that it could be done and the tools were not known.

So I checked this out. Were they logging the things they were using in and out so they could find them again? Were they putting things away when they were done with them? No, they weren't.

This is simply the basic admin coupled with the knowledge of what the things one is working with are. It's orderliness and knowing what things are, knowing what they are for and where they are, etc. That's the undercut.

If people don't have a true knowledge of what the things they're working with are, if there are omitted tools, inoperational tools, if they don't know what their tools are supposed to do, if there are no files or if once used, files are not reassembled and put back in the file drawer, if things get lost and people don't know where things are and so on, they will be running around spending 3 or 4 hours trying to locate a piece of paper. That isn't production.

If a person can't tell you what the things he works with are, what they're for and where they are, he isn't going to get out any product. He doesn't know what he's doing.

It's like the carpenter trying to build a house without knowing what he's got to build it with, without understanding his tools and raw materials and the basic actions he must take to get his product. That's what was holding up production in the area: disorderliness. And the basics were out.

This is actually far *below* knowing the tech of the area-the actual techniques used to get the product. The person does not even know what his tools and equipment are or what they're supposed to do. He doesn't know whether they are operational or inoperational. He doesn't know that when you use a tool you return it to its proper place. When you have a despatch you put it in a file where it can be retrieved. It undercuts even knowing the orders and PLs relevant to his hat.

What are the basics that are missing? The basics of sitting down to the table that one is supposed to sit down to, to do the work! The basics of knowing what the tools, materials and equipment he works with are and what he's supposed to do with them to get his product. Those are the basics that are missing.

We are down to a real reason why a person cannot turn out products.

That is what is holding up such a person's production. It is well below knowing the technique of his job.

Out-basics. Does the guy know where the file is? When he finishes with that file does he leave it scattered all over the place or does he put it back together and into the file where it can be found?

Now, a person who's working will have papers all over the place, but does he know where they are and is he then going to reassemble them and put them back in order or is he going to just leave them there and pile some more papers on top of them?

If you find Project No. 2 scattered on top of Project No. 1, you know something about that area. Basics are out.

This is a little piece of tech and with that piece of tech you've got insight. You would have to have an overall picture of what the area would look like when properly ordered and organized-how it would be organized to get optimum production.

Then you could inspect the area and spot what's going on. You would inspect on the basis of how does the area compare with how it should be organized? You would find out if the personnel didn't know what the things in their area were or what they

444

were for, you would see if they knew the value of things in the area or if there were altered importances, omitted files or filing, actions being done out of sequence, inoperational tools or equipment, anything added to the scene that was inapplicable to production, etc.

In other words, you can inspect an area by outpoints against this one factor of orderliness.

This sort of out-basics and disorderliness cuts production down to nothing. There just won't be any production at all. There will be no houses built.

What we are talking about here is an orderly frame of mind. A person with a sense of order and an understanding of what he is doing, sits down to write a story or a report and he'll have his paper to hand, he'll have it fixed up with carbons and he'll have his reference notes to hand. And before he touches the typewriter, he'll familiarize himself with what the scene is. He'll do the necessary preparatory work in order to get his product.

Now someone else might sit down, write something, then dimly remember there was a note someplace and then look for an hour to find where that note was and then not be able to find it and then decide that it's not important anyway and then come back and forth a few times and finally find out he's typed it all up without a carbon.

There is a handling for this. Anyone trying to handle an area who doesn't understand the basics of what they're dealing with and is in an utter state of disorder must get a firm reality on the fact that until the basics are learned and the disorder handled, the area will not produce satisfactorily.

The following inspection is used in determining and handling the state of such an area.

INSPECTION

This inspection is done in order to determine an area's knowledge of basics and its orderliness. It can be done by an area's senior for the purpose of locating and correcting disordered areas. It is also used as part of debug tech as covered in HCO PL 23 Aug 79 DEBUG TECH. It is for use by anyone who is in the business of production and getting products.

The full inspection below would be done, clipboard in hand, with full notes made and *then* handlings would be worked out based on what was found in the inspection (according to the Handling Section of this PL and the suggested handlings given in parentheses below).

1. DOES HE KNOW WHAT ORGANIZATION, FIRM OR COMPANY HE'S IN? DOES HE KNOW WHAT HIS POST OR JOB IS?

This is a matter of does he even know where he is. Does he know what the organization or company he works for is, does he know what the post he is holding is?

(If he is so confused and disoriented that he doesn't even know the company or org he's in or doesn't know what his post is, he needs to **apply the Expanded Confusion Formula, HCO PL 9 Feb 74R and then work up through the conditions.**

Of course the person would also need to be instant hatted on his post-the organization, his post title, his relative position on the org board, what he's supposed to produce on his post, etc.

If he is doing this handling as part of his Expanded Confusion Formula, simply have him get the instant hatting and carry on with his Confusion Formula.)

445

2. ASK THE PERSON WHAT HIS PRODUCT IS.

Does he know? Can he tell you without comm lag or confusion?

You may find out that he has no idea of what his product is or that he has a wrong product or that he has confusions about his product. Maybe he doesn't even know he's supposed to get out products.

(If this is the case, he must find out what his product is. If the person's product is given in policy references, he should look these up. If his product is not covered in tech or policy references, he'll have to work out what it is.)

3. CAN HE RATTLE OFF A LIST OF THE BASIC ACTIONS, IN PROPER SEQUENCE, NECESSARY TO GET OUT HIS PRODUCT OR DOES HE HEM AND HAW ON IT?

Does he know what to do with his product once it is completed?

He may try to tell you what he does each day or how he handles this or that and what troubles he's having with his post. You note this, but what you're interested in is does he know the basic actions he has to take to get out his product. And does he know what to do with the product once it is complete?

(If he can't rattle off the sequence of actions 1, 2, 3 then he'd better clay demo the basic actions, in proper sequence, necessary to get out his product and then drill these actions until he can rattle them off in his sleep. If he does not know what to do with his product once completed, then he'd need to find out and then drill handling the completed product.)

4. ASK HIM WHAT HIS TOOLS ARE THAT ENABLE HIM TO GET THIS PRODUCT

Note his reaction. Can he name his tools at all? Does he include the significant tools of his area? Does he include his hat pack as a tool?

(If he doesn't know what his tools are, he'd better find out what he's operating with and what it does. A good workman knows his tools so well he can use them blindfolded, standing on his head and with one arm tied behind his back.)

5. 4 SK HIM TO SHOW YOU HIS TOOLS.

Are his tools present in the work area or does he have them out of reach, down the hall or in some other room?

(He may have to reorganize his work space to get his tools within easy reach and to get in some basics of organization. The purpose of such organization would be to make production easier and faster.)

6. A SK HIM TO TELL YOU WHAT EACH OF HIS TOOLS ARE.

Can he define them? Does he know what each of them are and what they are for?

(If he doesn't know, he'd better find out.)

7. ASK HIM TO TELL YOU WHAT THE RELATIONSHIP IS BETWEEN EACH ONE OF HIS TOOLS AND HIS PRODUCT

(If he can't do this, have him clay demo the steps he takes to get out his products with each tool he uses, so he sees the relationship between each tool and his product.)

8. ASK HIM TO NAME OFF THE RAW MATERIALS HE WORKS WITH. ASK HIM TO SHOW YOU HIS MATERIALS.

Does he know what his raw materials are? Are they in his work area? Are they in order? Does he know where to get them?

446

(He may have to find out what the raw materials of his post are (by defining them) and where they come from. He should drill procuring and handling them and then run Reach and Withdraw on them.)

9. DOES HE HAVE A FILE CABINET? FILES? ASK HIM WHAT THEY ARE.

Does he know what they are for? Does he know what a despatch is, etc.?

(He may have to be brought to an understanding of what files, file cabinets, despatches, etc., are and what they have to do with him and his product. He may have to clay demo the relationship between these things. He will have to set up a filing system. Ref. HCO PL 18 Mar 72, Esto Series 10, FILES.)

10. DOES HE HAVE A SYSTEM FOR LOCATING THINGS?

Ask to see it. Check his files. Does he have logs? Does he log things out and correct the logs when he puts them back? Are the comm baskets labeled? Does he have a specific place for supplies? Ask him to find something in his files. How long does it take?

Does he have an orderly collection of references or a library containing the materials of his field? Is it organized so as to be usable?

(If he has no system for locating things, have him set one up. Have him establish a filing system, a logging system, label the comm baskets, arrange supplies, etc. Get a reference library set up and organized. Drill using the system he has.)

11. WHEN HE USES AN ITEM DOES HE PUT IT BACK IN THE SAME PLACE? DOES HE PUT IT BACK WHERE OTHERS CAN FIND IT?

He'll probably tell you, yes, of course he does. Look around. Are objects and files lying about? Is the place neat or is it a mess? Ask him to find you something. Does he know right where it is, or does he have to search around? Is there an accumulation of unhandled particles around?

(Have him clay demo why it might be advantageous to put things back in the same place he found them. Drill him on putting things back when he's finished with them. Have him clean up the place, handling any accumulation of unhandled particles.)

12. IF FEASIBLE, ACTUALLY GO WITH THE PERSON TO HIS PERSONAL LIVING AREA.

Is the bed made? Is the area clean? Are things put away? How much dirty laundry does he have? Is it stowed in a bag or hamper or is it strewn about the place? People who had disorderly personal mess, I for I were not getting out any products on post—they had no sense of order.

(If his personal quarters are a mess have him on his own time of course straighten up his personal area and keep it that way on a daily basis. This will teach him what order is.)

HANDLING

Some areas, of course, will be found to be in excellent order and will pass the inspection. These will most likely be high production areas.

Other areas will be found to have only a few points out which would correct easily with the above handlings. These will probably be areas where some production is occurring.

Where personnel have a concept of what order is and why it is important they will usually be eager to correct the points of disorder that have turned up on the investigation and may need no further urging, drilling or correction, but will quickly set about remedying outpoints. For many bright and willing staff members just reading this policy will be enough to get them to straighten out their areas right away.

447

There is, however, a sector which has no concept of order, and may not have the slightest notion of why anyone would bother with it. You will most likely find them in apathy, overwhelm or despair with regard to their post areas. No matter what they do they simply cannot get their products out in adequate quantity and quality. They try and try and try but everything seems to be working against them.

When you find such a situation, know that the area is in Confusion. You are trying to handle an area which is in a confirmed, dedicated condition of Confusion.

Such an area or individual would require the application of the Expanded Confusion Formula (HCO PL 9 Feb 74R) including the handlings above. So if these things confirm in an area you must use the Expanded Confusion Formula and the handlings given above to full completion. Because, frankly, such an area or individual is in a condition of Confusion and will remain in Confusion until the Expanded Confusion Formula including the full handlings from the inspection are applied.

Once out of Confusion the person would have to be brought up through the rest of the conditions.

CAUTION

The condition of Confusion is a very low condition and should never be assigned where it is not warranted. Where one or two points on the above inspection were found to be out in an area, and where these corrected easily, there would be no purpose in assigning Confusion to that area. In fact it may worsen an area to assign an incorrect condition.

But where you have a long-term situation of no or few products combined with a state of disorder, know that the area or individual is in a condition of Confusion and that the application of the Confusion Formula plus the handlings given in this PL will bring the area out of the muck and up to square one where it can *begin* producing.

NOTE: If the inspection is done on a person or area and some of the points are found to be out and handlings are done but no condition of Confusion is assigned the area must be reinspected about a week later. This way you will detect if an actual condition of Confusion was missed, as the area will have lapsed back into disorderliness or will have worsened.

SUMMARY

A knowledge of the basics of an area and having orderliness in an area are essential to production.

When you find a fellow who is a light year away from the basics and doesn't have a clue on the subject of order and he's flying way up in the sky someplace instead of just trying to put together what he's supposed to put together or do what he's supposed to do, you've got your finger on his Why for no production.

With the inspection and handlings given in this policy we can now handle any degree of disorderliness and disorganization.

And order will reign.

Nonproductive areas become capable of producing.

Already-producing areas increase their production.

And production will roll.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:gal.gm Copyright 10 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

448

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 28 FEBRUARY 1980

Remimeo

Org Series 41

Finance Series 25

Executive Series 21

PRODUCTION AND ONE'S STANDARD OF LIVING

References:

BPL 19 Mar 71* Finance Series 7

BEAN THEORY-FINANCE AS A
COMMODITY

HCO PL 9 Mar 72 1 Finance Series I I

INCOME FLOWS AND POOLS-PRINCIPLES
OF MONEY MANAGEMENT

HCO PL 27 Nov 71 Exec Series 3, MONEY

HCO PL 3 Dec 71 Exec Series 4, EXCHANGE

FEBC Tapes

(NOTE.- I realize that management units, orgs and staffs are daily pounded with false economic data. The real facts of life collide with much false data. Such crippling data comes from many sources-school, advertisers, government, bankers, propagandists, even parents who insisted Johnny be a doctor so he could "live well" or set a horrible example themselves. Many have had a hand in messing up people's wits on the subject. It is a factor in inhibiting the individual prosperity of executives, staff members and orgs. Where an area is not prospering, this PL should be starrated on its people and the false data they have on this subject stripped so that they then can prosper as they should.)

"Standard of Living" can be defined as the relative quality of a person's or group's possessions, quarters, food, equipment, tools and conditions of their area of work and existence. It is the state of the person's living, including working, environment. Where its potential continuance exists it is related to survival. It is a basic natural economic law that personal production of VFPs and one's standard of living are intimately related.

This applies to the individual as well as the team.

Where violations occur, inequities exist.

At a personal level one must produce in excess of his standard of living just to retain and maintain it.

Actually, the "excess" means that because of overload, taxes, services, plant, utilities, raw materials, machine and other costs additional to his own work sphere, a person cannot expect to get the full value of his VFPs all to himself. That is not economically feasible. The "excess" varies from post to post and job to job but is never less than 5X minimum. In industry it is considered to be at least IOX to maintain company standards and solvency. The "excess" can be very high indeed in some industries. But in any case any idea that it should be one for one is fatal. People who know little of economics or management sometimes propose a worker should get the full value of his VFPs-but all work and all VFPs require support services and to neglect these would quickly bring on poverty. Even when working for oneself alone, these "excess" factors exist and seldom drop below 5X as one still requires support services. Corrected gross income divided by staff has to be at least 5X the cost of the standard of living of the individual staff member for that standard to be barely

maintained. This does not mean staff pay should be 1/5 of that figure. It means that all the things (pay included) that go into maintaining their welfare and work environment would have to be covered by 1/5 of that figure. A fairly efficient and prosperous org with a hatted, industrious, gung ho staff can very easily maintain quite acceptable standards at 1/10 that figure. The actual cash value of every piece of work done by a person can actually be calculated. It is intricate and tricky to do and much subject to over and under estimation but it can be done. It is not vital to do this but one might just be curious about it. If so, do it for yourself. Thus VFPs can be priced against what they bring in as part of the overall scene even when they seem indirect. All the above figures are very rough and subject to variation but this gives you some idea of what is meant by "excess" in that law.

Where a number of people in a group or on a team do not produce VFPs in excess of their standard of living they depress the standard of living of the group or team.

Where some in a group do not only not produce VFPs but produce overt products, they actively depress the standard of living of everyone in that group or on that team.

Many economists and theorists seek to avoid that law. They do it to gratify politicians or aggrandize some false philosophy whose true purpose is suppression under other colors. But the law remains and its violation breeds an epidemic of economic ills. Amongst such ills are inflation, super bureaucracy, chaos with the marketplace and a decay of the civilization.

When a whole society demands a high standard of living and yet doesn't concentrate on the personal production of VFPs, it is finished.

Products are the basis of a standard of living. They don't appear from midair. They come from work truly done. Not from hope or false data.

It is a druggie's dream that machines, computers, under the dictatorship **Will** do it all. Machines can raise a standard of living by assisting in production. But they can't do Man's living for him. Intelligently designed and used, they permit, within limits, increases in population. But machines are just tools. They have to be thought up, designed, built, run and serviced and their raw materials and fuel have to be found and delivered and their products promoted, delivered, used and often in their turn serviced. The machine age was actually recognized as failed when world leaders first began to urge population reduction on the planet to "improve the individual standard of living." If machines were going to solve it all why is the civilization now in such a steep decline? It took producing men *working in and with a machine age to make* the society go. Not **idle mobs on welfare expecting a high standard of living while a few** guys work their guts out. Pie in the sky is **nice but did anyone ever get to eat** it? This misinterpretation of the machine age was a heavy violation of the above economic law. But the real harm of the machine age was creating a false belief that one did not have to produce much to survive. This lowered people's estimate of how much they would themselves have to produce to survive, much less have a high standard of living. Factually one normally has to work fast and expertly and in high volume to bring about any acceptable standard of living for himself and his group. This is a point the machine age obscures. But it remains vividly and demonstrably true.

An executive who works hard yet wonders about his own low standard of living should look over his people to find those who are not producing VFPs or who produce even overt products while yet demanding a living. *They* are absorbing the potential raised standard of living of the group.

Where a group has a very low standard of living, it need only review the above law and its potential violations to understand why.

One cannot, in fact must not, increase the standard of living of a group in ways that violate the above law. It will eventually bring calamity on that group.

In a society led astray by crackpot economics, violations of the above law create a vast number of wrong examples. The rich (most of whom work like mad) are seen as idle or even criminals. The best way of life is made to appear to be idleness. One seems to be owed a living without any effort on his own part. The producing worker should be fined by higher taxation. These are not seen to be simply false data spread about to

450

wreck the place but are held as "truths." And in their wake comes a funeral for that group or society.

There is even an economic theory spread about today called "equalitarianism." It declares everyone should get the same pay and have the same standard of living. It does not mention that anyone should do any work. It holds that the better worker should not be better rewarded. It would crash any society.

Then there is the "monetarist" who believes you can manipulate a whole society with money alone. And no thought of any production. His answer to production? (You won't believe this.) Decrease demand! In other words, reduce everyone's standard of living!

Basic economics eventually catches up with all these weird false pretenses. It may take time but, as in the law of gravity, the apple eventually falls no matter how many crackpots advance theories to say it can't fall, will go up, or vanish. Real basic economic laws are like that. They catch up. So don't wonder about inflation and depression and decayed civilizations. Basic economics caught up with the crackpots.

An executive has to pay attention to the basic law about a standard of living. If he doesn't pay close attention to it, the standard of living of himself and of his group will cave in.

He can be "a good fellow" and seek popularity by attempting to raise the standard above what is earned. He and his group will crash.

He can be foolish and seek to raise his own rewards above what he personally is earning in terms of VFPs. But both he and his group will fail.

He can ignore the real producers of the group and not see that their standard of living is comparable to their individual production. And he and the group will fail.

He can ignore the nonproducers and the overt product makers and by so ignoring them, tear his own and the group's standard of living to bits.

He can listen to a bunch of PR from a staff member about how valuable that staff member is and surrender to it without ever really counting up the real VFPs that staff member is not producing (or even preventing). (It happens.) Only real VFPs count.

He can **work himself half to death without demanding production** from others and have his own standard of living crash.

There are swarms of false data flying about today on this subject. It is taught in schools, the very best schools; it is heard on the radio and seen on TV and in the papers. The civilization, as it caves in, is blinded by literally thousands of false ideas about what and how a standard of living

occurs. These, where they conflict with the basic law, actively prevent one from prospering as they blind him to the truth of his scene.

In an org or management unit in Scientology, the real VFP is valuable fine people who produce valuable final products who then make up a valuable fine public. Every piece of work and duty in a management unit or an org contributes to that.

The standard of living of an executive, a management unit, an org or a staff member is determined by that one basic economic law: The personal production of VFPs for the group and one's standard of living are intimately related.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS

of the

BDCS:LRH:ab.gal.gm CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

Copyright © 1980

by L. Ron Hubbard

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**[Note: BPL 19 Mar 1971 mentioned under "References" on page 449 has been revised and reissued as HCO PL 19 Mar 1971R, same title.]*

451

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 3 SEPTEMBER 1980

Issue I

Remimeo

(The contents of this policy have been taken from an LRH OODs item of 15 May 71 and are now being issued in policy form to bring forth the wealth of data formerly issued in the Flag "Orders of the Day.")

Admin Know-How Series 38

Data Series 50

Esto Series 42

Org Series 42

OUT OF SEQUENCE

Out of sequence is the most common outpost according to a survey of despatches and projects a couple months ago.

The thing which gets most commonly out of sequence is the pattern of the Key Ingredients as covered in HCO PL 14 Sept 69.

The correct sequence for a piece of work would be to plan, obtain materials, and then work.

If this is made into work-plan-materials, everyone works hard but no product will result.

As production is what morale depends upon. a smash of morale would occur if the Key Ingredients were thrown out of sequence.

Omitted data runs a close second to out of sequence as the most common outpost.

When the sequence of a work project is thrown out and then data like technology of how to do it is omitted, a group could work itself half to death and have down morale as well from no product.

The right way to go about it is to have the tech of a job, plan it, get the materials, and then do it. This we call *organizing*.

When this sequence is not followed, we have what we call cope. Too much cope will eventually break morale. One copes while he organizes. If he copes too long without organizing he will get a dwindling or no product. If he organizes only he will get no product.

Coping while organizing will bit by bit get the line and action straighter and straighter and with less work you get more product.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY BDCS:LRH:SA:bk.nf
Copyright c 1971, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[*Note:* The original mirneo copies of this policy letter incorrectly labeled it as "Admin Know-How 36" which has been corrected above.]

452

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 27 SEPTEMBER 1980

Remimeo

(Originally LRH OODs item

of 8 March 1971)

Org Series 43

Esto Series 44

ORG OFFICER

Org Officers think they approach HASes to organize. They don't.

HCO has not formed because Org Officers keep making demands on it instead of doing their job. The organization it takes to get out a specific product is instant stuff. HCO is a long-term build of the establishment. Entering instant organization into HCO of course defeats its purposes and prevents it from the long-haul actions necessary to form a whole org.

If an Org Officer considered himself the Product Officer's expeditor he would begin to get the idea.

We have a Product Officer/Org Officer mission going in to expedite FEBCs. The Product Officer will get the product-a competent graduated FEBC on an airplane going home-being made and fired. The Org Officer will push the materiel and lines into shape to back up the Product Officer. Now, what's *that* have to do with HCO? Nothing.

The Org Officer makes sure there is a pack or tape or recorder or gets them (not by despatch) and the Product Officer checks out, verifies, grooms, solves FEBC problems, pushes cases.

The Course Super goes on supervising, Course Admin goes on admining. What they're doing right with the student gets pushed and done more of. And what organization there is gets more of from the Org Officer.

For instance,

SITUATION: Course numbers building up. You see this in orgs.

HANDLING: Put on a Prod-Org mission to get numbers completed and fired.

The Prod-Org team finds 3 who could be made ready to fire at first glance and gives the order GO-GO-GO, to Action.

The personal cope was fire three NOW. The medium-range was get a mission on it.

That is uptight production.

A Prod-Org team works in *hours* and *days*. Save an hour, save a day. Do it in hours, do it in days.

By doing it they learn line and materiel outnesses and their reform CSWs of lines and actions are written up when they're completed and that's their first contact with the HAS and HCO.

453

Now with these reforms the general org action will be easier and faster and a product backlog peak won't occur so fast again.

A Prod-Org team that writes despatches and harasses HCO just doesn't know THAT THE PROD-ORG SYSTEM IS TO HANDLE BACKLOGS AND OMISSIONS IN PRODUCTS. *Having handled* they can advise or order or get approval for line changes and new recruitment, etc. These, the HAS can get in for the long haul.

Prod-Orgs WORK, they don't just order.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and edited for issue by Sherry Anderson Compilations Missionaire

Accepted and approved by the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:SA:dr.gm Copyright © 1971, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

454

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 21 SEPTEMBER 1980

Issue 11

Remimeo

(Originally LRH OODs item
of 29 Oct 1970)

Personnel Series 31

Org Series 44

AN ORG BOARD

REF: HCO PL 28 Oct 70 ORGANIZING AND HATS

An org board is a list of hats with seniorities. The hats are in flow sequence.

A hat is a duty. It outlines the actions necessary to accomplish a production and receive what's needed, change and route it.

In theory the I/C holds all functions. When he doesn't fully outline them they can't be hatted. If they're not hatted he wears them as an unknown fog. Simple as that.

What defines a hat is a product.

If you count up the expected products you get the minimum number of hats. The steps to get the product is the hat. Products are also composed of lesser products, so hats can be enlarged. It's what you designate as a product that makes a hat. It's the importance of that product to others on the line that makes the hat's importance.

The completeness and size of the product make the seniority of the hat.

The overall product of a division determines the hat of the divisional officer. The lesser products that when combined make the overall product determine the rest of the division hats.

Until you can define in one go the overall product of a division you aren't likely to be able to post any real part of its org board. For the product of hats of that div add up to the div product.

When you see an unposted or unreal org board, the head of the div is not producing a product with that div, no matter how busy it all looks or how exhausting.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

Approved and accepted by the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:SA:dr.gm Copyright © 1970, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

455

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 17 SEPTEMBER 1980

Remimeo

(Originally LRH OODs item

of 11 March 1971)

Org Series 45

ORG BOARD AND PRODUCTION

HCO PL 9 March 1971, Issue 11, POSTING AN ORG BOARD, will solve a lot of confusion about org boards,

Read it and then look at what you may currently have and lights may blink like a pinball machine.

An org board does have something to do with getting the work done.

Quality as well as volume depend upon workable organization.

The opposite ends of the action are organization at one end and production at the other.

Things get easier and better all around.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:SA:bk.gm Copyright © 1971, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[Note: The original mimeo copies of this policy letter were incorrectly numbered as Org Series 63.1

456

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 11 SEPTEMBER 1980

Remimeo Issue 11

(Originally LRH OODs item

of 10 Nov 1971)

Org Series 46

Exec Series 23

ORGANIZATION AND SURVIVAL

Well organized activities survive. The survival of individuals in those organizations depends on the highly organized condition of the activity.

A small group, extremely well organized, has excellent chances of survival.

Even a large group, badly organized, hasn't a prayer.

The essence of organization is org boarding, posting with reality and, in keeping with the duties being performed, training and hating.

To this has to be added the actual performance of the duties so that the activity is productive.

The outward signs of a badly organized group are slovenliness and fumbles.

Another ingredient that goes hand in hand with organization and survival is toughness. The ability to stand up to and confront and handle whatever comes the way of the organization depends utterly on the ability of the individuals of the organization to stand up to, confront and handle what comes the individual's way. The composite whole of this ability makes a tough organization.

An individual who is not properly posted, isn't performing the duties of the post, is not trained or hated, is soft. He has no position to hold, therefore he goes down at the first fan of a feather.

Confidence in one's teammates is another factor in organization survival. Confidence in one's self is something that has to be earned. It is respect. This is a compound of demonstrated competence, being on post and being dependable.

After an individual has failed, confidence in him on the part of his teammates sinks. He has lost face and is not respected. This, then, shows itself up in numerous ways. It is up to that individual to earn back confidence so that his teammates will again trust him. The way to do this is to get properly org boarded, trained, hated and to confront and handle, with competence, whatever that post is supposed to control.

The ultimate in no confidence by a group in a team member is no post at all, Reports from those who have no post or from those who are between posts stress the horrors of having no post.

Our survival depends fully on becoming entirely and completely organized. This will happen to the degree that every separate unit, department and division in an org is properly org boarded, properly performing the duties of the post, is trained and fully hated.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS

of the

BDCS:LRH:SA:d~.gm CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

Copyright c 1971, 1980

by L. Ron Hubbard

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

457

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 12 SEPTEMBER 1980

Issue I

Remirneo

(Originally LRH Flag Ship OODs

item of 7 March 1971.)

Org Series 47

Executive Series 24

Admin Know-How Series 39

HANDLING OVERLOADED POSTS

Reference:

HCO PL 28 Jul 71 ADMIN KNOW-HOW 26

Product and Org Officers can take over a grossly overloaded key post and (a) increase its production and (b) reduce the work hours. They should take over posts for 48 hours and give the incumbent a rest and see what gives.

The rules that seem to apply are

- a. It is a key post of the area in question and
- b. It is the most overloaded and/or most nonproductive post in that area.

It's one thing to issue orders. It's another to do work.

One doesn't stand behind the guy. One takes him off the post and actually does the work of the post.

While doing it one will see why it can't be done or isn't being done and one can then get a good bright idea of how it can be done and get it in and write it up.

One often finds he has to ask "What hat am I wearing?" when one finds he is on overload.

Well, one solution is to just go over and really wear that hat and see why it can't be worn, get an idea of how it can be worn, do the action to see if it's right, write it up for issue and put the person back on it.

A junior often can't mesh up the lines so they work because he hasn't the know-how and hasn't the authority. His proper action would be to figure his post out and write it up for issue and get it in his hat. When he doesn't do this it jams or overloads his own and other lines.

Where this situation exists and isn't changing, a Product Officer, Org Officer or HAS or the divisional Product or Org Officers have an out. They can take over such a post, do all its work for 48 hours with no help from the incumbent, get an idea of how to debug it, see if that works, write it up and turn the post back over.

L. RON HUBBARD Founder Compiled and issued by Sherry Anderson Compilations
Missionaire for the BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:SA:dr.gm Copyright* 1971, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

458

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 22 SEPTEMBER 1980

Rernimeo

(Originally LRH OODs item

of 23 August 1972)

Esto Series 43

Org Series 48

ACTIVITY

We are in the midst of a great deal of activity.

This means a certain amount of disestablishment occurs.

Such times are the times when Dept I has to go FLAT-OUT.

It has to actually produce.

It has to get new people in, org boards revised, hats collected, people on new posts HATTED!

It has to somehow hold the form of the org and keep it producing.

This is no time for Dept I people to sit at a desk doing their in-baskets all day or studying.

This is the time when the org form situation is continually reviewed and beefed up and hatted.

A hat is NOT an explanation. It is a checksheet and pack and it gets DONE right now.

This is the time when you make up for fewer numbers with better utilization. And you make up for increased traffic with greater efficiency on each individual post.

Esto trainees who don't know or can't do these things won't be worth anything in their own orgs.

The question is, can they do it or can't they?

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

Accepted and approved by the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:SA:dr.gm Copyright © 1972, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

459

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 24 SEPTEMBER 1980

Issue I

Remimeo

Hat Officei

(Originally LRH OODs item

of II August 1972)

Org Series 49

HAT OFFICER

When a Hat Officer has somebody to hat, he hats that person fully. It may take days. You don't keep changing Hat Officers on the same person day after day.

Hat Officers, like auditors have th& pcs, should have a list of clients they are hatting.

It isn't getting points that count. It's getting a fully hatted person.

A frequent change of Hat Officers, like a frequent change of auditors, winds up with no completions.

Every Hat Officer post should have its list of clients. The Hat Officer changes only when transferred. The post keeps the same clients.

It takes a firmly hatted staff to handle the scene we've got on the planet today.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

Approved and accepted by the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:SA:dr.gm Copyright © 1972, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

460

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 6 OCTOBER 1980

Issue I

Remimeo

(Originally LRH OODs item
of 13 July 1971)

Org Series 50

THE USUAL

When in doubt do the usual, the routine, the standard.

If your hat says recruit, recruit. Don't do tool purchasing.

**WHEN A POST DOES NOT DO ITS USUAL ACTIONS THESE BACKLOG AND
APPEAR AS TRAFFIC AND DEMANDS.**

The post goes into desperation and tries to cope and, failing to do what it was supposed to do in the first place, just goes more desperate.

A post will run wrong so long as it does not do the usual. And it will go wronger and wronger.

Like auditing a pc. Every shortcut, every unusual solution, just makes the pc worse. You can't go on with unusual solutions forever. The pc will collapse.

So it is with a post.

Do what the post is supposed to do in the first place. Cope part of the time, yes. But somehow get in the usual action.

If you don't you will feel desperate, 9,000 feet up and in a hurricane.

EVERY personnel line has gotten in this state.

Failing to recruit and do the usual has backlogged HASes over the world to a point of total desperation. Yet I see no Personnel Procurement Officers single-hatted on post in orgs. I see no new campaign for recruits. I see no hammer to get standard forms signed.

Thus by not doing the basic usual actions, each HAS is going mad trying to answer people who are demanding personnel. Then the HAS musical chairs the place, destroys the org form.

WHY? Because the usual action of PPOs on post and records and lines and personnel promo were not done.

Not doing the usual resulted in desperate solutions.

This is the way any post goes when it backlogs. It backlogs for lack of the usual. Then it goes into total desperation.

The way to get out of the mess is each day do a couple hours of the usual regardless of traffic and demands.

And surprise! One will dig out of it and get on top of it.

One has to know three facts.

1. The usual solution already exists. One has to find out or work out what it is.
2. Unusual actions will backlog one and if continued will drown one.
3. One can dig himself out if he spends some time each day getting the usual lined up and in.

One's full hat usually contains the usual. A starter is to get the full hat and know it.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

Approved and accepted by the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:SA:bk.gm Copyright © 1971, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

462

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 6 OCTOBER 1980

Rernimeo Issue 11

Hats Officer

HAS (Originally LRH OODs item

of 6 June 1971)

Org Series 51

Personnel Series 34

A MAJOR DUTY OF THE HATS OFFICER

REF: HCO PL 7 JANUARY 1966 LEAVING POST

If you leave a post without turning over your hat and grooving in your relief, you are at risk. You can be called back for the next two years if that post goes wrong.

You must HAVE a hat in a folder and its write-ups (all of them) and you must turn it over.

The Hats Officer is supposed to see this is done. It is really his major duty. He must see that it is done and he must be able to attest that the relief on the post HAS and CAN DO and IS DOING the hat.

Hats, checksheets and packs are also furnished by the Hatting Section under Hats Compilations. These are issued as prepared. However there is ALWAYS a hat.

Anyone on post without a hat cannot be expected to be paid.

If a Hats Officer only compiles hats he unmocks the org.

The Hats Officer must be there in a flash at every post change and see that the hat, and duties of the post are turned over and the relief grooved in. Records, Assets and Materiel Dept 9 sees that the materials are turned over and are correctly inventoried or the Dir of RAM or the Treas Sec can be hit for any lost items,

This is an old, old drill.

There are standard ways to do things.

Any post not so turned over MUST be turned over correctly with hat and materiel or the org will shatter.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

Approved and accepted by the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:SA:ns.gm Copyright c 1971, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

463

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 9 OCTOBER 1980

Issue II

Rernimeo

(Originally LRH OODs item

of 25 April 1970)

Org Series 52

MORE ON LINES AND HATS

REF: HCO PL 16 Mar 71 LINES AND HATS

The soggy feeling one gets from lines sometimes comes directly from the line passing through a point which isn't wearing its hat.

Hats can be not worn through ignorance or through neglect. Many times hats are accepted not to help a group but "to have an opportunity to ." Like an MD who studies medicine to "make money" or "to obtain better opportunities with women." So one has two reasons to wear a hat-(a) to do a job, (b) to have an

opportunity to do something else.

When a hat is not worn for any reason at all, one gets a breakdown at that point. We call this a "camouflaged hole." Somebody has a title but doesn't do the duties or actions that go with it.

That is the soggy feeling's cause, the unworn hat. A group that cannot or does not snap and pop and get on top of it has some members in it who aren't wearing their hats.

The most common reason why hats aren't worn is because they are not known.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

Approved and accepted by the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the **CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY**

BDCS:LRH:SA:dr.gm Copyright c 1970, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

464

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 8 OCTOBER 1980

Issue 11

Rernimeo

(Originally LRH OODs item

of 6 April 1971)

Org Series 53

ORG BOARD KNOWLEDGE

It is very funny to see what a green crew member does with an org bd.

He eventually gets to know *one* terminal, the Captain. Anything that he wants he asks the Captain.

However, it can be worse than this. An org crew sometimes doesn't even know the Captain! They are a sort of drifting mob.

Knowledge of the org board permits a crew to push in the lines.

Whether the lines and terminals are in or not depends upon the crew or staff, not on one senior.

If the whole crew uses Knowledge Reports, sees the right terminals and knows enough about lines and hats to force performance of duty and service, then the org will form and smooth out and prosper.

A Knowledge Report to the MAA or E/O when someone has refused to do his hat, senior or junior, will accumulate enough data to permit the reposting of areas so they work.

In the final analysis service quality, cleanliness, production and prosperity depends upon a staff or crew.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

Accepted and approved by the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:SA:dr.gm Copyright © 1971, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

465

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 8 OCTOBER 1980

Issue III

Remimeo

(Originally LRH OODs item

of 17 September 1970)

Org Series 54

HATS

We're right at the beginning of handling the *real* WHYs in departures from the ideal scenes.

We are establishing recruitment and we are beginning *real* hats that include checksheets and packs.

Real hats made up of a factual checksheet and pack of FOs, PLs, HCOBs, manuals and books and required to be trained on are THE missing items in orgs over the world.

Ethics was designed to keep in tech and policy. We expand it to keep policy *in use*.

As it has been used it was a personal target action not a tool to spot out-tech and out-policy.

So ethics is going to have to shift target from the individual to the drop out of know-how.

When you see how far out things are on this point of view over the world in orgs it takes a bit of confronting.

Both auditing tech and all our admin policy has been very nearly lost for three years!!!

Pretty awful.

But the plus side is look how we'll soar when we get it in!

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

Approved and accepted by the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the **CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY**

BDCS:LRH:SA:dr.gm Copyright c, 1970, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

466

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 12 OCTOBER 1980

Remimeo

(Originally an LRH OODs item

of 21 September 1970)

Org Series 55

COPE

I've had an insight into what "cope" really is. It is the process of finding and correcting outpoints without ever discovering a WHY and without organizing any return to the ideal scene.

A coper goes "outpoint found-correct it; outpoint found-correct it; outpoint found-correct it." This perpetual cycle never finds or corrects WHY these outpoints. So it just gets worse and worse and worse.

If you start spotting outpoints and correcting them you are not dealing with the Why but with the symptoms only. So an executive gets on a cycle of outpoint spotted, corrected, spotted, corrected, spotted, corrected. With no WHY located it will just wind up in a collapsed mess of cope.

If all one ever did was handle despatches one would really get into a mountain of overwork while stats stayed down,

The WHY we face now is absence of recruiting, lack of full hats with checksheets and packs.

The Why of that was failure to make the materials riled accessibly and collatable. So it's a snake eats its tail. No hats then brought a condition of no data available in files. A true dwindling spiral.

And no hats traces to the introduction of ethics into HCOs and that it is easier to assign a condition than to compile or check out a hat. Hats went out when ethics came strongly in. Without ethics in HCO, HCO can only make stats recover by org form and hats.

Ethics has a role-after all else fails.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

Approved and accepted by the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:SA:ns.gm Copyright c 1970, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

467

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 26 OCTOBER 1980

Remirneo Issue III

(Originally LRH OODs item

of 7 Nov 1970)

Org Series 56

"NOISE" AND ORGANIZATION

REF: HCO PL 14 Dec 70 GROUP SANITY

HCO PL 8 May 70 DISTRACTION AND NOISE

Each division is to have a completed org board.

In order to do this well it is best to study the Org Series.

"Noise" is the amount of disturbance and off-line actions and chatter and general dev-t in an area.

In some divisional areas "noise" by far exceeds actual traffic.

An org board amongst other things reduces "noise" when it is well done and known.

Improvement of production occurs when there is a good org board that is also well known.

When you assess the effort expended on a post against the actual production of a post you get an idea of the amount of "noise" present. One can be expending lots of time and effort and yet attain no production. Proper organization increases production and reduces effort by eliminating "noise."

My insistence on getting org boards done, in and known comes from my own post observation. For some time I have been seeing lots of "noise" and very low production.

When this visibly began to eat into my own production (about April '70) I began to push in organizational steps. I restudied the subject (as you see in the PLs of the Data Series, Personnel Series and Org Series) and consulted existing realities. I was amazed to find how little technology Man actually had on the subject and how wide a gap there was between theory and reality.

Studying orgs themselves, including the ship, Flag Org, bureaux and orgs as per LRH ED 123 INT (the ten social aberrations, later issued as HCO PL 14 Dec 70, GROUP SANITY) the worst items were "hiring, training, apprenticeship and utilization" including production.

The first four would of course account for (if out) lack of production.

So far as an org is concerned, these are the functions of HCO.

Once these points are in you will see things begin to move better, noise drop out and production increase while effort reduces.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

Approved and accepted by the

BDCS:LRH:SA:dr.gm **BOARDS OF DIRECTORS**

Copyright o 1970, 1980

by L. Ron Hubbard Of the

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

468

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 30 OCTOBER 1980

Issue I

Remimeo

(Originally LRH OODs item

of 10 March 1971)

Org Series 57

ESTABLISHMENT AND THE HAS

REF: HCO PL 21 July 71 1 HAS STANDARD ACTIONS

The terminal for staff members and execs to contact when they want personnel is the HCO Area Sec (HAS).

They do NOT route this through or to the Org Officer.

The HAS should work to put an establishment there.

The Org Officer helps the Product Officer to get products by organizing the immediate area being concentrated on so it is smoothly producing.

You don't write Personnel to get personnel. You write the HAS.

The HAS channels to HCO on such matters.

When the concept of what is an establishment is grasped, all else is easy.

Space, materiel, machines, personnel, hats, lines, control of the org form, are all *establishment*. (Org Series 10, Product 1.)

The HAS uses Inspection and Reports (Dept 3 HCO) (stats) to measure the volume, quality and viability of the establishment so more or less can be put there. The HAS corrects the establishment using her other depts-Personnel, org bd, comm lines and lines and Ethics.

Until everyone knows what is an HAS and what is an Org Officer they won't be able to direct requests or comms and the system will jam up.

The HAS establishes, forms, puts there, corrects, posts, hats, org boards, stats, corrects the org. All on a long-term basis.

The Org Officer organizes production areas for the Product Officer so they produce.

The Product Officer gets the products of the establishment produced or corrects the products.

Org Series No. 10 gives you the four types of products-1, 3, 2, 4. *One* is the establishment itself. *Three* is correcting the establishment. Two is what the establishment *produces*. *Four* is correcting the faulty product of the establishment.

You can organize forever and get no production of valuable final products.

You can produce valuable final products with no organization on a total cope. But volume, quality and viability will be awful and the overload will soon overwhelm.

469

So there are two sides to the coin-organize, produce.

There is long-term, steady, stable, expanding organizing. That's the HAS.

There is instant, immediate, right-now organizing. That's the Org Officer working with the Product Officer.

There is hammer-pound, right-now production of products. That's the Product Officer backed up by the Org Officer close to hand and a bit out in front.

There are also "Consumption" Officers who get the products wanted outside and consumed. These are the Dissemination Secretary (Div 11) (old public) and the Distribution Secretary (Div VI) (new public).

So you have a line-up: Organize an establishment, organize the production area, produce, get the product wanted and consumed.

It's all that simple.

On this depends the uniforms, the pay, the facilities, the food, the transport, personal success, expansion, general success and eventual accomplishment of large targets.

When these points aren't understood, then all the shortages and upsets and confusions you object to occur.

Wherever morale is low, somebody around that point doesn't understand this or agree with prosperity.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

Accepted by the

BOARD OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA

BDCSC:LRH:SA:bk.gm Copyright c 1971, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

470

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 2 NOVEMBER 1980

Rernimeo

(Originally LRH OODs item

of 25 July 1971)

Org Series 58

HATTING THE RIGHT WAY

The sequence is instant hat, mini hat, fully hat.

Staff Status 0, Staff Status I and Staff Status 11 are minimum for a recruit. (For the Sea Org it is Products 0, 1 and 2.)

As the recruit line works in, all these must be done while the person is in the expeditor pool of his org. (Product 0 for Sea Org is the exception.)

Then expeditors are instant hatted for short jobs and mini hatted for longer temporary jobs.

When posted, or apprenticed and posted, they are then fully hatted on lower posts and apprenticed and fully hatted for more senior posts.

This should get programmed out for each staff member.

It takes a while to hat anyone fully. But it just has to be worked at. A couple hours a day eventually arrives.

The reason most people who don't study regularly aren't studying is that they have 3 or 8 or a dozen incomplete courses behind them. They begin to define a course as "something you don't complete!"

This can get in the road of courses very badly.

The right way out is complete each pgm left incomplete or at least run out the bypassed charge of past incompletes.

Word Clearing is the real big boost. Somebody the other day didn't know what TR (for Training Drill) meant in an HCOB and the whole thing was blank until he spotted it!

Clearing the purpose of a post is essential to hatting.

Well anyway, grab the slogan

TO BE HAPPY GET HATTED AND PRODUCE THE ACTIONS OF YOUR POST.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

Approved and accepted by the

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

of the CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA

BDCSC:LRH:SA:dr.gm Copyright Q 1971, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

471

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead. Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 18 SEPTEMBER 1980

Issue II

Remimeo

(Originally LRH OODs item

of 28 March 1971)

Org Series 59

STATE OF ORGS

There are innumerable little out-org situations that need remedying. They make life rough, consume time and edge up tempers.

By standing for about 45 minutes in one place observing I found five bits that in themselves would each add up to a time-consuming confusion.

No transport unit, no purchasing unit, no line patrol or refinement were visible.

This makes people seem to work very hard but results in no production.

Therefore it takes HAS officer-type observation as the org's lines are out.

To adjust a line one (a) sorts out the particle types, (b) sorts out the change points, (c) puts the correctly hatted terminals on it, (d) removes needless terminals, (e) reduces the number of times something is handled, (f) shortens the distance, and (g) increases the speed of flow.

If you do any *one* of these the line will get better. If you do them all the speed is fantastic and the load lightens all around and products occur.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:SA:bk.gm Copyright © 1971, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[Note: The original mimeo copies of this policy letter were incorrectly numbered as Org Series 41.]

472

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 3 NOVEMBER 1980

Issue III

Remimeo

(Originally LRH OODs item

of 31 Oct 71)

Org Series 60

Personnel Series 39

FULL HATTING

A person is responsible for his own hatting. Dept I is also responsible.

As lack of full hatting is the WHY of declining organization it is very important that persons be fully hatted.

The gradient is instant hatting, mini hatting and full hatting.

A person found on a post who is not fully hatted is liable to ethics action.

Awareness of the scene does not seem to exist in the absence of hatting. Thus unhatted persons look sort of blind.

For instance, an unhatted Dissem Div is completely unaware of no money, no students, no pcs.

It's sort of strange. Mystery about the post seems to result in no perception of its environment. Mystery on post equals mystery of environment. You see this as a sort of frightened no confidence.

I think hatting even changes eyesight. We ought to test it out.

We already know that unhatted people get hurt more than hatted people. We know overts stem from misunderstandings. And we know running overts changes eyesight.

It then probably follows that unhatted people couldn't see a tiger if it was biting them!

So, how to be mystified by it all and afraid-remain unhatted.

Get hatted and *see*.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

for the

BOARD OF DIRECTORS of the **CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA**

BDCSC:LRH:SA:dr.gm Copyright c 1971, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[Note: The original mimeo copies of this policy letter were incorrectly numbered as Personnel Series 38.1

473

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 3 NOVEMBER 1980

Issue IV

Remimeo

(Originally LRH OODs items of

26 February 1971 and 24 August 1970.)

Org Series 61

Esto Series 51

DRILLS

Drills have several purposes. To groove in a team action is a principal one. To test a system fully. To groove in lines.

Whenever postings are changed, the new post holders have to be grooved in on their posts (hatted and on-post trained) and then the team itself must be drilled.

The two steps are always needed.

There's a maxim about all training that applies. It is this: **TRAINING MUST INCLUDE ALL THE ACTIONS AND APPROXIMATIONS OF THE ACTUAL.**

This includes of course the whole cycle of an actual sequence of actions. It's the sequence that counts.

The drilling of sequences of actions is a stable series of data that prevents chaos from overwhelming one.

This applies to org lines as well. Dummy runs and dummy bullbait runs serve as the drill.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled and issued by

Sherry Anderson

Compilations Missionaire

Approved and accepted by the

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

of the CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA

BDCSC:LRH:SA:dr.gm Copyright © 1970, 1971, 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

474

HUBBARD COMMUNICATI

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinst

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 14 J

Rernimeo

Starrate on

all Execs Target Series I

OT ORGS

What it takes to make an org go right is the intelligent assessment of what really needs to be done, setting these as targets and then getting them actually fully *DONE*.

We have all the data necessary to make orgs boom.

Therefore we find that when they don't, these faults must be present:

1. Completely unreal analysis of what needs to be done to make things really go.
2. Cross orders-juniors setting other targets a-cross vital targets.
3. Noncompliance with vital target accomplishment.
4. False reports on actions or false data concerning targets.
5. Failure to doggedly follow through on one action and get it done fully and completely.
6. Distractions leading to any of the above.

MAJOR TARGET

The desirable overall purpose being undertaken. This is highly generalized, such as "to become an auditor."

VITAL TARGET

By definition a VITAL target is something that must be done to operate at all.

Man's worst difficulty is his inability to tell the important from the unimportant. "Every target is the same as every other target" is part of $A = A = A$.

It takes good sense to be able to survey an area and find out

1. What **MUST** be done.
2. What **SHOULDN'T** be done.
3. What is only desirable to be done.
4. What is trivial.

As Man all too easily specializes in stops he tends to stress what **SHOULDN'T** be done. While this enters into it, remember that it's a **STOP**.

STOPS ALL OCCUR BECAUSE OF FAILED PURPOSES.

BEHIND EVERY STOP THERE IS A FAILED PURPOSE.

A stuck picture or a motionless org are similar. Each has behind it a failed purpose.

475

THERE IS A LAW ABOUT THIS-ALL YOU HAVE TO DO TO RESTORE LIFE AND ACTION IS TO REKINDLE THE FAILED PURPOSE. THE STOPS WILL AT ONCE BLOW.

That law (it comes out of OT VIII materials) is so powerful it would practically revive the dead!

It applies to orgs.

It applies to cities or nations.

When you diverge from a constructive purpose to "stop attacks," the purpose has been abandoned. You get a *stop*. The real way to stop attacks is to widen one's zone of responsibility. And pour the coal on the purpose. Thus all attacks one makes should be in THE DIRECTION OF ENLARGING ONE'S SCOPE AND AUGMENTING BASIC PURPOSE.

Thus, in the case of Scientology orgs one should attack with the end in view of taking over the whole field of mental healing. If our purpose was this then it had to be this on all dynamics. We only got into trouble by failing to take responsibility for the whole field!

We'll win back by reasserting that responsibility and making it good.

Targets, to that degree, are purposes.

Purposes must be executed. They are something to DO.

OT

Let us look at the definition of OT-cause over thought, life, form, matter, energy, space and time.

As one falls away from that one becomes a SPECTATOR, then one becomes an effect. Then one is *gone*

One causes things by *action*. Not by thinking dim thoughts.

One can be doing an IN-basket as simply a spectator.

In the society today *spectatorism* is very common. Magazine writers, reporters, write weird pieces that look at how odd things are. The writer doesn't understand them at all. He just watches them.

Spectatorism is not so low as total effect.

The total effect-no cause-person has mainly a case. He doesn't even look.

Thus there is a gradient scale of OT. It's not an absolute. One is as OT as he can CAUSE things.

One of the things to cause is target attainment. When somebody can push through a target to completion he's to that degree OT.

People who don't push targets are either just spectators or they are total effect.

ORG STATE

An org is somewhere on the OT Scale. Any org is. Of any kind.

An org can figure out the vital targets and push them through to completion or it can't.

It's a gradient scale.

An org succeeds or fails to the degree its individual executives and staff members can measure up to the OT formula: Cause.

476

Scientology orgs must become cause over their environments.

They do this by each executive and each staff member *accomplishing* targets, small and large.

Thus:

(a) if the targets of what **MUST** be done to operate at all are set and

(b) are carried out with no noncompliance and

(c) if no false reports are entered into it,

Then

That org is way high on the OT Scale

AND IT WILL CONQUER ITS ENTIRE ENVIRONMENT COMPLETE.

That's really all there is to it.

One way to fail at it is do (a) with things that are so general that they invite no doingness.

Some guys are so bad off they set targets like "move the mountain" and give one and all a big failure. Since there's no way to do it and probably no reason to either, that's an SP target. So what **MUST** be done means just that. What is vital and necessary. Not what is simply a good idea.

Here's some **MUST** targets as examples:

A. Get tech delivered 100% in the org itself.

B. Get the public aware of its being delivered and wanting it.

C. Get the admin machinery in to get the public in and out.

Or another series:

D. **GET** 10,000 trained auditors into the org field.

E. Get the public aware of the project and wanting training.

F. Set up terrific 100% snap-pop courses to handle the flow.

Or another:

G. Get a £100,000 reserve cushion.

H. Get all accounts staff and executives checked out on finance policy.

1. Shove the throttle down on promotion.

J. Deliver fantastic service.

K. Get enough tech people in training to handle the flows.

L. Find bigger poshier quarters to handle the flow *when* it rises.

M. Get all staff onto the OEC to diminish flow line flubs.

You get the idea.

An exec who is just a spectator to his in-basket flow is doing nothing but cultivating dev-t.

You can assess the situation.

477

You can drive targets home to full completion.

Every executive and every staff member is somewhere on the OT Scale. And he can rise higher just by setting up the targets and plowing them through to done, done, done.

Yes, it requires ideas. But ideas come from interested looking and sizing it all up before you set the target in the first place.

You can even raise an org by gradients so as not to overwhelm it. Set and *make* small targets. Then bigger and bigger ones.

Well, you get the idea.

It's the ORG's road to OT.

L. RON HUBBARD Founder LRH:bw.ei.rd.gm Copyright © 1969 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[*Note:* This policy letter has been corrected as per HCO P/L 23 January 1969, OT ORGS CORRECTION.]

[*Note:* The Target Series designations and numbers have been added to the target policy letters by the editor.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 23 JANUARY 1969

Remimeo

Target Series 1-1

OT ORGS CORRECTION

(Correction to HCO Pol Ltr 14 Jan 69)

(The first paragraph below and the next heading "Vital Target" were left out of issue.)

MAJOR TARGET

The desirable overall purpose being undertaken. This is highly generalized such as "to become an auditor."

VITAL TARGET

By definition a VITAL target is something that must be done to operate at all.

(The HCO Pol Ltr 14 Jan 69 continues).

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 16 JANUARY 1969

Remimeo

(Reissued from Flag Order No. 1734,
same date and title)

Target Series 2

TARGETS, TYPES OF

There are several VALUES of targets. Not all targets are the same value or importance.

There are, in any org, "understood" or continuing targets which came from FOs or Pol Ltrs and Mission Orders.

PRIMARY TARGETS

There is a group of "understood" targets which, if overlooked, bring about inaction.

The first of these is

SOMEBODY THERE Then

WORTHWHILE PURPOSE Then

SOMEBODY TAKING RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE AREA OR ACTION

Then

FORM OF ORGANIZATION PLANNED WELL Then

FORM OF ORGANIZATION HELD OR REESTABLISHED Then

ORGANIZATION OPERATING

If we have the above "understood" targets we can go on BUT IF THESE DROP OUT OR ARE NOT SUBSTITUTED FOR then no matter what targets are set thereafter they will go rickety or fail entirely.

In the above there may be a continual necessity to reassert one or more of the "understood" targets WHILE trying to get further targets going.

VITAL TARGETS

Under this heading comes WHAT WE MUST DO TO OPERATE AT ALL.

This requires an inspection of both the area one is operating into and the factors or materiel or organization with which we are operating.

One then finds those points (sometimes WHILE operating) which stop or threaten future successes. And sets the overcoming of the vital ones as targets.

CONDITIONAL TARGETS

It is interesting that one can go into an art type "perfection" with targets and groom up primary targets *far* beyond the need to accomplish purposes.

You've seen chaps work all their lives to "get rich" or some such thing in order to "tour the world" and never make it. Some other fellow sets tour the world and goes directly at it and *does* it. So there is a type of target known as a *conditional* target: If I could just . . . then we could . . . and so accomplish. . . . This is all right of course until it gets unreal.

There is a whole class of conditional targets that have no IF in them. These are legitimate targets. They have lots of WILL in them, "We will . . . and then. . . ."

Sometimes sudden "breaks" show up and one must quickly take advantage of them. This is only "good luck." One uses it and replans quickly when it *happens*. One is on shaky ground to count on "good luck" as a solution.

A valid conditional target would be

"We will go there and see if the area is useful."

All conditional targets are basically actions of gathering data first and if it is okay, then go into action on a vital target and operating target basis.

This could add up like this:

CT I - Survey Lower Slobovia to see if it would be a suitable place for an org.

This survey done, if it is positive, one then goes into primary targets and operating targets.

The primary targets would be

Lower Slobovia One: Appoint local Organization Officer here for Lower Slobovia.

Lower Slobovia Two: Form up Lower Slobovian Org. (Personnel)

Lower Slobovia Three: Train up org. (Staff Training Officer)

Lower Slobovia Four: Translate texts. (Translation Section)

Lower Slobovia Five: Finance formation. (Finance Section)

Lower Slobovia Six: Transport LS Org. (Transport Section)

Lower Slobovia Seven: Prepare LS bldg in LS BEFORE ORG ARRIVES.

(LS Org Officer)

Thus we would establish Lower Slobovia. AND IT WOULD ALL GO OFF WELL TO THE DEGREE THE PRIMARY TARGETS WERE MADE, DONE, COMPLETED.

Primary targets setting on Lower Slobovia would fail if some primary target were omitted in the first place (never set) or if the conditional target findings on LS were a false report.

Thus we are very hot on "false report" and very hot on "noncompliance."

480

OPERATING TARGETS

An operating target would set the *direction* of advance and qualify it. It normally includes a scheduled TIME by which it has to be complete so as to fit into other targets.

Sometimes the time is set as "BEFORE." And there may be no time for the event that it must be done "before." Thus it goes into a rush basis "just in case."

To get all the shoe salesmen in Boston enrolled on a PE Course would be an operating target. This would *then* go into the framework of a *primary* target as to the remaining targets set.

Operating targets often look like "basic purpose." They can come before or after primary targets. But an operating target has its *own* series of primary targets. To enroll all the shoe salesmen you need somebody in charge of it, a PE Supervisor, literature, a handbook for salesmen, etc., etc., which are all set as primary targets.

Sometimes an elaborate operating and primary target series falls apart because there was no conditional target set, i.e. to find out if Boston had any salesmen and *which* types were responsive. You might find the operating target had been set with no inspection.

So, again, we can move backward and find that an operating target needs a conditional target ahead of it-to wit, an inspection.

PRODUCTION TARGETS

Setting quotas, usually against time, are *production* targets.

These often fail because they are unreal or issued for other reasons than production (i.e. propaganda).

As *statistics* most easily reflect production, an org or activity can be so **PRODUCTION TARGET** conscious that it fails to set conditional, operating or primary targets. When this happens, then production is liable to collapse for lack of planning stated in other types of targets.

Production as the only target type can become so engulfing that conditional targets even when set are utterly neglected. Then operating and primary targets get very unreal and stats go DOWN.

YOU HAVE TO INSPECT AND SURVEY AND GATHER DATA AND SET OPERATING AND PRIMARY TARGETS BEFORE YOU CAN SET PRODUCTION TARGETS.

A normal reason for down statistics on production is the vanishment of primary targets. These go out and nobody notices that this affects production badly. Production depends on other prior targets being kept *in*.

PROGRAMS

Programs are made up of all types of targets coordinated and executed. ON TIME.

Programs extend in time and go overdue to the extent the various types of targets are not set or not pushed home or drop out.

Programs fail only because the various types of targets are not executed or are not kept in.

481

SUMMARY

You can get done almost anything you want to do if types of targets are understood, set with reality, held in or completed.

People whose own purposes have failed often cannot either set or complete targets. The remedy is to rehabilitate their own purposes which then blows off the stops.

People who stop targets actively have failed so badly that they can only think in terms of stops.

This whole subject of targets and purposes is probably a large one. These are just rough notes and the naming of the different types which is itself a considerable advance.

It is of help in grasping what is going on and gets one somewhere.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:sdp.ei.rd.gm Copyright c 1969 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

482

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 18 JANUARY 1969

Issue 11

Remimeo (Reissued from Flag Order No. 1736,
same date and title)

Target Series 3

PLANNING AND TARGETS

(There are at this writing 3 HCO Pol Ltrs of near date on this subject of targets. The area has never before been examined or written up as a philosophic subject.)

Plans are NOT targets.

All manner of plans can be drawn and can be okayed. But this does not authorize their execution. They are just plans. When and how they will be done and by whom has not been established, scheduled or authorized.

This is why planning sometimes gets a bad name.

You could plan to make a million dollars but if when, how and who were not set as targets of different types, it just wouldn't happen. A brilliant plan is drawn as to how to convert Boston Harbor into a fuel tanker area. It could be on drawings with everything perfectly placed. One could even have models of it. Ten years go by and it has not been started much less completed. You have seen such plans. World's fairs are full of them.

One could also have a plan which was targeted-who, when, how-and if the targets were poor or unreal, it would never be completed.

One can also have a plan which had no **CONDITIONAL TARGET** ahead of it and so no one really wanted it and it served no purpose really. It is unlikely it would ever be finished. Such a thing existed in Corfu. It was a half-completed Greek theater which had just been left that way. No one had asked the inhabitants if they wanted it or if it was needed. So even though *very* well planned and even partially targeted and half-completed, there it is-half-finished. And has remained that way.

A plan, by which is meant the drawing or scale modeling of some area, project or thing, is of course a vital necessity in any construction and construction fails without it. It can even be okayed *as a plan*.

But if it was not the result of findings of a conditional target (a survey of what's needed or feasible) it will be useless or won't fit in. And if no funds are allocated to it and no one is ordered to do it and if no scheduling of doing it exists, then, on each separate count it won't ever be done.

One can define *planning* as the overall target system wherein all targets of all types are set. That would be *complete planning*.

COMPLETE PLANNING

To get a complete plan okayed one would have to show it as:

- (a) A result of a conditional target (survey of what's wanted and needed).
- (b) The details of the thing itself, meaning a picture of it or its scope plus the ease or difficulty in doing it and with what persons or materials.

483

- (c) Classification of it as vital or simply useful.
- (d) The primary targets of it showing the organization needed to do it.
- (e) The operating targets showing its scheduling (even if scheduled not with dates but days or weeks) and dove-tailing with other actions.
- (f) Its cost and whether or not it will pay for itself or can be afforded or how much money it will make.

Complete planning would have to include the targets and the plan of the thing.

Thus, by redefining words and assigning labels to target types we can get a better grip on this.

A plan would be the design of the thing itself.

Complete planning would be all the targets plus the design.

Thus we see why some things don't come off at all and why they often don't get completed even when planned. The plan is not put forward in its *target* framework and so is unreal or doesn't get done.

Also it's a great way to lose or waste money.

Sometimes a conditional target fails to ask what obstacles or opposition would be encountered or what skills are available and so can go off the rails in that fashion.

The whole subject of plans, targets and target types is new in the realm of analyzed thought.

It is a subject to "get the feel of" and "learn to think concerning" rather than a fully "canned" subject.

But if these points are grasped, then one sees the scope of the subject and can become quite brilliant and achieve things hitherto out of reach or never thought of before.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:Idm.ei.rd.gm Copyright Q 1969 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

484

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 24 JANUARY 1969

Remimeo

Target Series 4

TARGET TYPES

(Note: This is a developing subject, new in philosophy. It is part of the philosophy Scientology.)

You should learn the names and types of targets for quick use and classification of what you are trying to do.

MAJOR TARGET - The broad general ambition, possibly covering a long only approximated period of time. Such as "to attain greater security" or "to get the org up to 50 staff members."

PRIMARY TARGET - The organizational, personnel, communication type targets.

These have to be kept in. These are the terminals and route and havingness and org board type targets. Example: "To put someone in charge of organizing it and have him set remaining primary targets." Or "To reestablish the original comm system which has dropped out."

CONDITIONAL TARGETS - Those which set up EITHER/OR to find out data or if a project can be done or where or to whom.

OPERATING TARGETS - Those which lay out directions and actions or a schedule of events or timetable.

PRODUCTION TARGETS - Those which set quantities like statistics.

PROGRAM - The complete or outline of a complete target series containing all types.

While there may be other types of targets, these (more fully described in HCO P/L 14 Jan 69, 16 Jan 69, 18 Jan 69 and correction HCO P/L 23 Jan 69 and this one, HCO P/L 24 Jan 69) should be studied and every target set should be classed as one or more of the above.

"Complete planning" and "programs" are synonymous at this time and **PROGRAMS** is the preferred word.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:Idm.ei.gm Copyright c, 1969 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

485

HUBBARD COMMUNICATI

Saint Hill Manor, East Grins

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 24 J

Issue 11

Remimeo

Gung Ho

FSMs

Pub Divs ***Target Series 5***

PURPOSE AND TARGETS

(This is No. 5 in the Target Series)

Out of data of OT VIII has come some material that cannot be relegated to that level. It is minor to that level but major to our operations.

The reason we are fought where we are fought is contained in its major part in purposes.

Purposes often fail and wind up in *stop*.

Stopped purposes can then be dramatized.

In Scientology we use (quite correctly) FREEDOM. While not the most basic purpose TO BE FREE is a common purpose to all thetans.

This tends to key in (restimulate), in some persons, the stop of being free. They themselves wanted to be free. They were stopped, they dramatize the STOP of being free and try then to stop us. We restimulated (keyed in) their own purpose to be free or free others and where we are opposed the person or persons dramatize the stop or disagreement.

Also where we not only restimulate the stop but oppose and deny him *as well*, we get an enemy.

We are then stopping stoppers. While this is necessary to save the day, it is *preventable* if begun early enough,

The psychiatrist is not the only "freedom stopper" we will ever meet. Many people who have been in healing and mental treatment in the times before we came along had only failures. So anything offered to them (including their own) will be looked on as a failure at best or at worst a fraud.

That it really *can* be done in Scientology is not only outside their reality but regenerated the failed purpose they have had to be free and free others and they dramatize STOP.

While this is not the total reason (interrelations also restimulate ethnic values meaning customs) it is a big reason for dedicated opposition to us.

We restimulate their failed freedom efforts and they dramatize what stopped *them*. So they irrationally seek to stop Scientology.

This would also be true for products of a commercial nature. It is good advertising technology.

Freedom is one of the buttons that gets us forward. It is also the button that restimulates the opposition into efforts to stop us.

In dissemination then to such people, theoretically one need only get them remembering when *they* wanted to be free or free others to blow their stops. But as they may have many crimes now built up on top of it some may just spin.

But in all discussions with persons opposing Scn, one should try the approach of getting them to remember their efforts to be free or to free others and let them talk. As you listen you will realize they were without Scientology to help them and they didn't have a chance.

Led in from that point you may get a very receptive person.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:Idm.ei.rd.gm Copyright © 1969 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

487