ESTO'S INSTANT HAT - Part II

A lecture given on
1 March 1972

We have a dichotomy working here. Now, it will ebb and flow. The Product Officer will continue to make inroads on the very hard won establishing ground that has been won. "And I don't care what you have to do with those CF folders, I want right away eighty-five names out of them!" Of course he gets the eighty-five names this week and then nobody's developed any eighty-five names for next week, because CF didn't get established. Everybody in it was writing letters and they never got a chance to file in all the requests for training and processing. You know how bad establish, you know how bad establishment can get?

A radio ad in the Los Angeles area in l950 was pulling in a hundred and twenty five new people a night. They came in, they were given cards, they were given a very bright lecture, they were very interested, they were given these cards to fill out as to whether or not they wanted training and processing, and what was their home address and phone number. The cards were handed out to them. The organization left them on the chairs, they fell off the chairs and on the floor, and eventually an old showman, the janitor, sort of got the idea maybe he shouldn't be burning up all this trash and started turning them into me directly. So the line which was established was the janitor swept the application cards up off the floor, sorted them out from the chewing gum and handed them to me. That was the operating line of PE, l950.

The organization was making a fortune, until it all just went bong bang crash thud bong on just too much dev-T, out-ethics, dishonesty, various things. Somebody decided he'd like to cut himself a whole piece of the organization, things of this character. But the organization could be put back together again to run at that high rate of speed anytime, any minute. We have found out it doesn't matter what the papers say, it doesn't matter what Time Magazine says, it doesn't matter what the psychiatrists say, the word of mouth in the streets, it doesn't matter one bit at all. It doesn't matter how many football matches, it doesn't matter how many this, how many that and so forth. An effective, efficient organization which is viably running and so forth, makes a mint. It makes money exactly in proportion to the amount of production done by each individual post in it without dev-T. And that is how an organization is put together.

Now, let me give you a tremendous flaw that has been going on. They hat somebody, that's a flaw, they hat somebody. There's a period there, see? There's the remainder of the sentence, hat somebody and get him to produce what he should be producing on the post. And that is the full sentence embraced in the word hatting. And that doesn't make the Establishment Officer a Product Officer at all. Now, let me show you how this goes.

There was an OOD item which will probably be in the thing, but I'll just read it off to you rapid fire. A new guy comes on post, see; this isn't all, I'm going to continue beyond this, see; new guy comes on post. The Establishment Officer would say something like this, "There you are on the org board, there's your desk, here are your supplies, here's your hat pack, the guy you relieve can answer your questions, here he is, go ask, and so forth, read your hat pack, I'll be back in a couple of hours to check you out.

"Now, what's your post? Who's your senior? Now, what do you produce on this post? Take hold of these cans. What are your misunderstoods? What word is it?" Method four. This isn't necessarily how you guys go about it, but this is just a review of ways I have hatted people and gotten them. "What machines do you have here? Where's your instruction manual for operating that machine? Study it for an hour, identify all the parts, I'll be back in an hour to star rate you on it. I'm sorry you're confused. Sit right in front of me, sit right here and confront your area for two hours. Good. We'll run reach and withdraw on your boatswain's locker, or typewriter or desk or whatever it is."

By the way, do you know how to run reach and withdraw on a steward? You have him walk into the dining room and walk out, and walk in and walk out, and walk in and walk out. And that's running reach and withdraw. Berthing steward, walk into the cabin, walk out. But you know you won't do that unless you've done a two hour confront first? The gradient of the TRs. These are work TRs, and they work. All the TRs can be done.

You would just be amazed, around here someplace is the account of Bill Robertson hatting somebody by reach and withdraw on one of the wildest dev-T artists we had had for some time. And he had him walking into the dining room and walking out for quite a while. And the guy would go in and he would give him all sorts of cognitions and he would come out and so forth. And it is a howl, because the fellow actually was one of the worst that we had anywhere, he just caromed from this and that. All due respect to it, after this sort of thing he did produce on his post, he did function on his post and is doing quite well as a Sea Org member now.

Now of course, there would be your repetitive actions and your, of, or there'd be your acknowledgements of three and so forth when you're repiitive; you'll find a lot of guys who are on, on their posts who have gone downhill because they don't acknowledge and they've never been acknowledged. They don't report, they don't say they've done it, things like this. Their TRs go out, you see, on their post. TRs have a lot to do with this. Alright.

"Now, let's go on with this hatting. Read Problems of Work, I'll be back in four hours to see if you've finished. Alright, go to admin cramming and attest if you make it. Buy Volume 0 from the book store and read it. Oh, you haven't got any pay? Well, we'll arrange for some credit for you or something. Now, come over here and we'll show you the comm system. Here's what the comm system is, this is how it runs." And it says it goes on for weeks. Now, the funny part of it is that would be a Hatting Officer operating, you would, could be more detailed. You as an Establishment Officer could actually drop back and see if he actually was doing his confront, see if he actually was reading his Problems of Work, see if that, this thing was going on.

Now, these are degrees of hatting. On the job training was the modern solution to the fact that university students who had majored Medieval Arabic or something, were producing and doing nothing and couldn't do their jobs in England. English engineers were getting bad, they were sitting in the little cloisters of their offices wondering "what wall?" So they introduced the idea of on the job training, and they sent them to school for six months and then they sent them over into an architect's office for six months or a shop for six months or an engineering firm for six months, and they alternated training and practical. And it wasn't just practical.

Now, we're going to step that up enormously. We're going to instant hat him and have him produce the product of the post, and then we'll hat him a little more and have him produce the product of the post, and then we will hat him a little more and produce the product of the post, and hat him a little more and produce the product of the post. We're going to do on the job hatting, so that you could fully expect to bring in a brand new typist, into dissem, letter registration, and have her immediately getting out some letters. And tomorrow, they're going to be better letters because you're going to spend some time in the middle of that hatting her. And then you're going to have her produce some more letters, and you're going to have her produce post. Post production, post production.

Now, I had somebody the other day get the FMA and track the FMA around to get him to do an investigation. Now, in that wise you could see what the FMA was up against and what he became confused against. Now, he unfortunately ran down his criminal to being one of the people he couldn't touch and the other person was a bit high up. I don't know if you heard the aftermath, but he couldn't quite complete his investigation and he didn't complete it in a half an hour, but he got it narrowed down to two, neither one of whom he could tag. But he was probably for the first time doing something that resembled an investigation.

Now, that of course could speed up, that would get better, that would get better and better. And that could be steeped up to a point where the guy all of a sudden would be a top investigator the like of which you never heard of. "Oh, I know who that is." You know, it's almost that, you know? "The modus operandi of the crime is so-and-so and so-and-so, the head of it must be so-and-so, up to it again. Let's go out and check this, there's about three more. Pang pang pang did whop whop whup, that's that investigation, bing."

Now, people will tell you, and I have C/Ses right now telling me, "But you see, I know where to look for the technology, so I don't really have to know it, do I?" Aah so, aah so. A C/S of all people has to know of the existence of the technology so he can tell the auditor to look it up. He has to know the existence of the technology so he can plan and put it together with the case. I see C/Ses stumbling around on things that I find it very difficult to credit that they would stumble around on. Our C/Ses are not all that bad, but they make mistakes, they make mistakes. Now, why do they make mistakes? They just haven't been over their materials often enough.

It's a very funny thing, I became an absolute genius on one subject through my formal education. And that was basically because, for some reason or other, it was always in question that I had done it, because I never seemed to get a formal credit for it. I would either leave a class early before it was all over or the examinations or something I never really failed an examination on, I just didn't ever get a formal completion. I've studied basic physics, the same textbook, five times. That's an awful lot of times to study basic physics with all of its laws and so on. I have studied it within an inch of its life five times.

One day, maybe you've heard this story, but one day I was walking through the senior's lab at George Washington University, where I "never went," and I found a senior sweating blood. He happened to be a pal of mine, I was a freshman at the time, but he was a pal of mine. And I said, "What's the matter?" and he was trying to design a railroad locomotive and he didn't know how big to make the fire box. I said, "But that's easy. It's the number of BTU, British thermal units, that you can recover from coal efficiently at cold water percentage of about nine or eight percent. And that converted into power!" And he says, "British? British thermal unit. Oh yeah, I've heard something about those." "Yeah," I told him, "Well, you go look it up, and you'll see that!" "Gee, thanks." Here was four years of education, fancy education, hanging up on high school physics.

Do you know that C/Ses hang up because they don't know what an engram does? They don't know what it's capable of. They'll send a guy to medical right after he's had a Dianetic session because he's suddenly broken out with a rash. Never occurs to them, "Hey, I must have restimulated, must have restimulated something," because that's caused by an engram. I have to take C/Ses back to their basic textbooks, basic textbooks. I never bothered to teach them the upper story of this. And you'll find out with every post that isn't doing its job well has its basic tech fundamentals out, to the point where they don't even know they exist.

You'll find you're just sweating, absolutely sweating trying to get a letter registrar to write a letter that doesn't ARC break the screaming hell out of somebody. And you get him to check off on the policies and you get her to go to cramming, and then you'll find out she never heard of the ARC triangle. You think I'm kidding? I just found it, not in a letter registrar but in a person who was writing letters. Never heard of it, didn't know anything about it, couldn't handle the staff members around him or anything else. He had never heard of the ARC triangle. And you say, "That's impossible." It's very possible in the absence of an Establishing Officer. Administration these days is just like auditing. There is the policy letter that resolves the case. There is a thing called Standard Admin. There is a way to file a CF. It has to do with cabinets, and it has to do with folders, and it has to do with a prefile set of baskets.

And who's out there right now at AOLA putting in those exact standard actions but Herbie. And he's actually operating really as an Establishing Officer crossed over into a Product Officer, because he's making it produce. But he went out there and he found three children

were part of their staff. And he found one guy he couldn't hat at all, so he picked him up by the scruff of the neck. He couldn't get the Ethics Officer to do anything so he handed him over to the AG who disposed of him very promptly.

Now, this is the kind of thing that people at command level, driven around the bend trying to produce, never get a chance to look at. They could keep saying to Sally Glutz, "Please write a letter with some ARC in it, please." I guess we've got to go into quality of letters instead of quantity. Now, it's against policy but we'll have to go into quality of letters because we just, I just keep hearing all the time from these people saying, "I never want to hear from you again," and so forth. And he really hasn't got time, and frankly he hasn't, to sit down with that person and find out where the hell this gradient is missing. On this one letter writer he would have found the incredible, unbelievable thing of somebody who had been around for ages and had never heard of an ARC triangle. Didn't even know that if you wrote pleasantly you would get a pleasant reply. That was how far that was out.

Now, what does it take? What does it take, then, to put somebody on a post and hat him? Well, it actually takes putting him there and saying he is there, and showing him where he is on the org board and what his position and relationship is, and what terminals he goes immediately to just wham, see, "And that's it and there's supplies and so forth, produce something." And that begins to reveal all at once. Now you find his misunderstoods. Now listen, you can muster him, you can march him, you can teach him to chant in unison in front of an org board, but when you put him on that post you won't find out if he knows anything about the post or not unless you ask him to produce something. And then all confusion starts to rise to the surface like the body after three days. Yes.

"Well, alright, let's see a sample, let's see you do a sample now of the product of your post." That statement will probably get fantastically blank stares, and that's why you've got dev-T, because the guy will do something. Now, people never do nothing on a post. And that's exactly the first point at which dev-T generates. Now, it's up to you to figure out what is the product of that post and see some of it. You want him to do it. And now you know what policy to start feeding him and how fast, now you know what supplies that he's got to have and how he'll run into these, now you'll begin to know what this division eats up in terms of materiel. The lines start exposing themselves the moment you say, "Produce the product of that post."

Now, this would seem to be in collision with the Product Officer's duties. Now the Product Officer, he wants all the products of that post and he wants them all now. He wants them so they can be numerically counted and if he doesn't get them, he gets bloody minded. And bloody mindedness immediately pursues into ethics and heavy ethics and witch hunts, and all the witch hunts we ever had probably had amongst them only one or two or three that were valid, had a real valid target. The rest of them were simply dev-T merchants, through unhattedness were too damn stupid to know that their actions were totally suppressive. They wouldn't even know. The guy might even be producing some of the product of his post, but his producing it and shooting it off and handling other things that aren't his post to such a degree that he's got it all snarled up in a ball, and nobody notices.

And you keep wondering, "Why can't we hold this division down? What the hell is going on? It's always exploding." Go in there this morning, there's nobody working and so on, there's two guys saying they're going to quit, and they're going to leave, and they've been! What the hell happened? It was all cool yesterday afternoon at sixteen hundred. What happened? Ah, just too god damned much dev-T, really what happened.

Now, for instance, we ran into a state of heavy ethics just at the instant when we were starting to establish. Now, it tended to knock out the enthusiasm for getting established and it was one remedy, but it was the wrong why. It wasn't that the people are lazy, it wasn't that the people are other-intentioned, it wasn't that the people are this, it's just that they were stupid on their post product beyond belief, and were half the time producing products which were not the product of that post and that nobody wanted.

The worst producers of dev-T in an organization, now hold your hat, are auditors. They are trained as auditors. Now, because they know Scientology auditing technology, they think they know Scientology. And you're dealing with somebody who knows he knows, and you try to get in admin tech on him and it has nothing to do with his post. Now, because he is such a good auditor, you graduate him up to an executive position in total ignorance of policy. You're just absolute demanding an organization go total dev-T, because an administration is itself a technology quite separate from auditing technology and is just as standard, and has just the same horrible consequences to an organization or a division when done wrong that auditing misdone on a pc has on a pc.

So, what is the, what's the score? When you're establishing something, why, you've got to make it all mesh so that it produces because that is its purpose. You'll find out you'll never have any morale, production is the basis of morale, unless the guy produces. So, your final test as to whether or not the person has been hatted is whether or not he produces a quality product of his post, not whether or not he can do an examination. But the funny part of it is that if he produced a quality product of his post, he would be able to do an examination, what do you know? So, we introduce the idea of on the job training, we won't get into conflict with the Product Officer. That makes a bridge across.

Now, wrong whys is the bugbear of the Establishing Officer, and it's also the bugbear of the Product Officer. That is the failure point of all management units, they operate on wrong whys, they do off the cuff management not based on sound evaluation, and introduce programs into the area which are unreal but which develop and involve everybody in the organization. So, you've got a two page program that is busily being done that has nothing to do with the other end of the thing because it's based on a wrong why. But you don't dare establish anything in that organization because that program has total emergency and has got to be done now, and nobody has any time to be hatted. If that is a wrong program that is based on a wrong why, it'll practically destroy the organization. That means an Establishing Officer has to be a better why finder and evaluator than a Product Officer, who has to be the best in the world.

Now, the qualifications of an Establishing Officer would then consist of being able to perform and take responsibility for the functions of each one of the departments of HCO. He doesn't actually deliver the dispatches, that is about the only thing he doesn't do that is an HCO job. He does not just duplicate HCO's work, however, but he is a hip pocket HCO. And if you want to know in the final analysis what his authority is, it's the hip pocket HCO. And just like an HCO, if he himself is inexpert, he will descend into heavy ethics as his final solution. And instead of solving everything with Department 1, recruiting and hatting, he will try, start trying to solve them with Department 3, heavy ethics.

Because when you can't get any area to produce, people in it get bloody minded. But bloody mindedness comes from an inability to find the right why. All bloody mindedness ceases throughout an organization when the right why is discovered, which is quite remarkable. It's a sort of a case gain the place makes. They got the right why, they blew the right engram.

In 1950 I was looking for group auditing because I was well aware of the fact that groups could get an engram, mutual. And group auditing has been experimented with and worked with from time to time, even on a continental level, in an effort to do something about this. And what do you know, we finally have found what it is. It's a wrong why that causes a group engram. And to de-engramize a group, all you have to do is do a complete, competent evaluation and find the right why and handle it correctly, and the group will dis-emote. This is quite remarkable. In other words, data analysis is third dynamic de-aberration and is as remarkable a technology as running engrams on the individual case. Interesting. The right why, the right why. So therefore, the aberrations of the planet are simply built on the wrong whys of yesteryear.

I'll give you the most flagrant example of this in modern times that has any relationship to our field or activity. Psychiatry operates on a wrong why, and it gets itself into miserable trouble, and has miserable programs which are terribly unpopular. It thinks there's a thing called mental disease and that that disease is a physiological thing. And Kreplin's chart, the largest chart, I have a copy of it here, gives all the diseases. It's only on a little section of the last page that they say that something might be caused by purely environmental stresses. The rest of it is all physiological, insanity is physiological, schizophrenia is physiological, paranoia is physiological. It's because the guy hasn't eaten the right brand of beans or something of the sort, and they dabble around with this. Freud's breakthrough was that it might have something to do with mental, but psychiatry at large has never really admitted to itself that this is the case. So they have this thing called mental health. What the hell is this thing? Szaz, Dr. Thomas Szaz, exposes this in a very scholarly way in a terrifically well annotated, and cross-indexed and so on, set of books. He's a marvel, he's a psychiatrist, he does not believe in institutional psychiatry. And this is actually what it is.

And so therefore, they let the medical doctor into the mental field. And how did he get there? He got there about four and a half hundred years ago by saying that witches were actually possessed or not, whether it was physical or produced by demoniac possession or spells. And the medical doctor, from that period to this, has been the hidden factor back of psychiatry. Four and a half hundred years ago they called in the MD to find out whether or not the guy was physically ill or whether or not he was obsessed by demons. And if the medical doctor said he is physically ill, they treated him; and if he said he wasn't really physically ill, they tortured the guy on the rack and burned him at the stake. And that's been going on for four and a half hundred years and hasn't stopped yet, and that's basic psychiatric law.

"The Manufacture of Madness", a whole book devoted by Szaz to this subject, and at first you believe this is just a gag, but no, the references are total. They were operating on a wrong why. There is no such thing as physical mental disease, and yet in every university the Psychology Department teaches people that they think with their brains. I was busy running this out the other day as a long series of locks, and you never saw anything so funny in your life. You keep blaming the prefrontal lobes and it makes them kind of hurt. All they are is just some meat. People have been told this so often that they become suspicious of this area of the body. Now, it is true in paresis, which is syphilis in its advanced stages, why, people get some weird states; they do, they get very weird states; but then perhaps it would just be the hiddeness of a disease and the cut off of any future procreation that would produce a mental response such as you get with that. There is no evidence of any kind whatsoever that there is anything called a mental disease. So therefore, the whole of psychiatry is based on a wrong why, and the whole of civilization for four and a half hundred years has been tossed into dungeons, and tortured and burned at the stake, and electric shocked and pre-frontal lobotomied and put in ice packs and everything else. Wrong why.

Now, we come along and we find the right why, we find the right why, we find the remedies of this sort of thing. The fact that somebody might actually get cured and that they might be wrong is really what drove psychiatry down the spout, it wasn't really our publicity. They were so fixated on the fact that if we got loose with this idea, and they knew very well that we produced results and they didn't, they knew that well. The only thing for which one can't quite forgive them, they knew Scientology worked, they knew, they knew Dianetics worked, so that made their whole theory wrong and it drove them around the bend. We had another theory, it worked. They were operating with this other theory, it didn't work. So, they ceased to be able to broadcast with sincerity from their top echelon because somebody could catch them out, somebody had missed the withhold. They knew psychiatry didn't work. Somebody missed the withhold. That's what's taken them down the drain.

You get some long program, "And so, the HCO Secretary will immediately ta-wa-da and da-de-da and do programs one, two, three, five, eight, nine and twelve; and the Distribution Secretary will do so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so. It's all based on the idea that the public now wants something stimulating." No survey, no survey of any kind, no proof of any kind. Yet here is a long time-involving program that pulls off the hat of

practically everybody in two or three divisions in order to all-hands this thing into being, the end of which is going to wind up in the complete soup. Aah. So perhaps there should be a side check on the Product Officer's evaluations by the Establishment Officer, side check.

Now, there can be such a thing as the guy knows he's so right, that it fits so well with all of his data, that it will resolve. But the funny part of it is, if it doesn't bring in GIs, it's outside the reality of the people he's working with. What do you know? The program and evaluation which was done which brought into being the Establishment Officer and so on, was unanimously agreed with by staffs all over the place that HCO had failed to establish. Bang, that was unanimous. Alright. That's part of the observation, and the rest of it is when I released this other program, I absolutely received a snow storm of DRs of cheers, cheers, cheers, yes, yes, yes, true, true, true. In other words, it was just like blowing an area of aberration. This was a great mystery we were living with.

Now, people very often get into the idea that the great mystery must be a who. And there was one organization that was completely blown up. A fellow went from the Los Angeles area, pretended he was a Sea Org missionaire, told the whole staff that they had a suppressive amongst their executive strata, got them to looking for who it was. This organization, then as a group of staff, got together to send somebody, one of their members, out to the PAC area with special reports that were to be couriered straight to me on what they had found. The guy who was carrying the things, however, was not quite as stupid as some of the others, and when he walked out the aircraft terminal, the airplane terminal gate, the airport gate, he turned around and walked in another gate and he got on the phone and he called the Guardian's Office and he blew the whistle on the whole deal. But it didn't save the org. The org crashed, it's executives blew, the staff kind of blew all directions, and we're still trying to put it back together again. And that organization is New York. And the man who pretended it was R. Zorro, and that happened about three years ago, and you know, that engram is still sitting around in the New York area.

Now, a fellow going into that area as an Establishment Officer could do worse than, in his spare time, do a why, an evaluation, and publish it to the staff and mail it to all the old executives. Just a standard evaluation, whether it had very much program on it or not. This was the why.

Now probably, I don't have the whole why. How, because the why would have to be, how was the staff that weak? How was the staff that weak that it didn't do anything on standard channels? Why did it suddenly grab other channels sideways? I don't know the answer of it to this day. I know the events, but I don't know the why. How could they be unstabilized into believing that three high-producing executives were actually, one of them was suppressive? How could they believe this? I don't know. But the data is kicking around New York and an evaluation could be done. Right now New York is still having a bad time. It has never really been able to get those blown executives back in. They're ARC broken clear back to the beginning of track. It would really require something to destimulate that particular environment, but it could be done. But it would be done simply by finding the right why, and if that why was found and it was it, and so forth, it'd blow charge all over the place. Funny part of it is, it doesn't have to be a PR why. It just has to be the truth.

You'll find more staff members who will develop more PR to explain why they aren't producing, and develop more PR in lieu of production per square inch, than you ever heard of. So, the Establishment Officer has to be an expert in PR. I recommend to you the first tape of the FEBC course, which is totally valid. That piece of technology is part of the Establishment Officer's action, not part of a public action. It's not part of the Org Officer's action, it's the Establishment Officer's action. He has to be able to handle this sort of thing, H E and R, human emotion and reaction faster than scat, without taking sides with the staff against the executive strata. Now, he himself is part of that executive strata. His authority stems from the chain of command. If he goes too worker oriented, he'll destroy the workers. If he goes too thoroughly martinet, he will destroy their confidence in him.

So, there's a happy ground in between where he's got to be the friend of the staff member without agreeing with the staff member that he is being done in, because the staff member probably isn't. His ignorance of recourse to justice and things of that character, the way he's getting kicked around and so forth, all have channels for recourse. And he must have been standing in the wrong place at the wrong time to get shot at in the first place. So, you have to teach them how to stand in the right place at the right time. Don't ever take the side of a staff member who is natter natter natter. Auditor's Rights, all of the peculiar human reactions contained in Auditor's Rights, are also part of an Establishing Officer's kit. And I would recommend to you CS Series #1, Auditor's Rights, as the basic reaction of human beings as far as auditing is concerned.

Now, if you can get somebody patched up who is in a sad effect by having his ARC breaks of long duration pulled, and if you can get somebody patched up by pulling his withholds, if you can get somebody who is dramatizing a service facsimile handled! It doesn't matter the guy's OT 3 but his, nobody's ever, that service fac list was wrong and it wasn't tripled, so he just generates dev-T to make everybody wrong. In other words, he's not doing his post, he's dramatizing his bank. There's a big difference. That isn't in Auditor's Rights, the action of a service fac, so the HCOBs about service fac are definitely part of an Establishing Officer's kit. And all of the Data Series and expertness in it, and all of the Org Series of course, and all of the HCO series are all tools and weapons which the Establishing Officer can use.

Now, there's probably an Establishing Officer's code, which hasn't been written, because he's something new, because he's something new. Now, I've tried to get you, give you something of the width and breadth of the post and the importance of that post. If an Establishing Officer does his job well the organization will not rolly-coaster, but will continue to expand. He will have more and more facilities with which to deal.

At the time of expansion, the one thing he will forget to do is put on an assistant Establishing Officer, because when a division goes up to thirty, forty, fifty, and he doesn't have an assistant Establishing Officer, he will no longer be able to establish it, because he has the model behind him of HCO in an org of thirty, forty, fifty, was unable to establish it. So therefore, he must remember that what brought the Establishment Officer into view was the fact that there were not enough people establishing and therefore when he finds himself having too many people to establish, he had better get an assistant Establishing Officer and hive off the two sections of this and split up the duties in such a way that it can be done still. And when the organization has a division which has about two thousand members in it, I would say that somewhere in the vicinity of how many? If it's something, I don't know what the figure is, it's probably one to ten or something like that, there would have to be two hundred Establishing Officers. Wild, isn't it?

Now, somebody is going to give you, sooner or later, the economics of having an Establishing Officer on post. "You see, our tech/admin ratio is two to one, and we really can't afford enough Establishing Officers." The answer to that is that the size of an organization has nothing to do really with the effectiveness of its individual staff member, but tends, it doesn't have anything to, no improvement factor on the effectiveness of its individual staff member, but has a corrosive effect. An organization does not get more productive the more numerous it gets, it gets less productive the more numerous it gets. They can't afford not to have an Establishing Officer, they just can't afford not to have one. It is the most heroic, wasteful action that anybody ever heard of to have a thirty man organization without some Establishing Officers.

Let me give you some kind of an idea just so that you will have the genus of it. An organization of three staff members should have an Establishing Officer. It's one auditor and one CO and one Establishing Officer. That would have a possibility of functioning, because it would very shortly become an organization of five or six people, if it had an Establishing Officer. It'll stay an organization of two or three if it doesn't.

That this isn't understood is represented in some stuff I got here the other night. "I don't want to be an Establishing Officer I/C for my organization because the ED has wanted to have an Organizing Officer for some time." You see, he doesn't realize we're changed over and phased over into a refinement of the Product/Org Officer system. It isn't the Product/Org Officer system is gone, it's been refined so that it works. So he wanted to be an Org Officer. I can tell him that he could have and be and Org Officer and he would not raise the income of that organization one five shilling piece. He just wouldn't. But as an Establishing Officer, he'd probably quadruple it. You see, that's the difference. So, it's not a well understood action, so you're going to have to do some sales talks.

Right now here locally, I've had somebody say, "I don't need an Establishing Officer in my division, I hat my own staff." The only thing he's missed is, is they aren't hatted, and what production comes out of there, I do it. Otherwise, all is well. So, the truth of the case is, that one can't afford not to have one. So, the evolution would be one Establishment Officer would have to be there even if you had a staff of three, one of them would have to be an Establishing Officer. You say, "Well, of course he wouldn't be a full time hatted ESTO." Oh yes he would be, oh yes. He would probably be the only person there that was single hatted. The CO might be the registrar and the D of P and everything else, but not the Establishing Officer. Single hat. So, there is no such thing as a double-hatted Establishment Officer, even beginning that low on the org board. There is no such thing.

Now, let's take an organization of about ten or twelve, or something like this. Now at that stage of the game, you would have an Establishing Officer I/C and an Establishing Officer for divisions seven, one and two, and another Establishing Officer for divisions three, four, five and six. And you'd have three Establishing Officers. Why? Because it will very shortly then, if it has Establishing Officers, it'll shortly become viable. It can't help itself now, it's had it. All of these hopes of decay are gone. It'll soon become an organization of twenty-five or thirty. Well, what do you happen then? That's too many people for three establishing terminals, so at that moment you start going for broke. You've got to put in a TEO/QEO, specialized, so that brings it up. Now your organization gets up to around fifty, something like that, well you just better cover it across the boards now.

Now, what about a CLO? Well actually, a CLO is in a position right at the present time, Officer for the Operations Bureaus, four of them, all by himself. And that would require an Establishment Officer I/C, so the minimum number of Establishment Officers for a CLO would be an I/C, one for the early divisions, one for the late divisions and one for the middle would be four Establishing Officers. See? See how it goes up? Now, what happens when they really start getting busy? Well, you figure out where they're busiest and put your assistant Establishing Officer in there, your Establishment officer.

Now, I've used Establishing and Establishment Officer interchangeably. It's a descriptive term. The actual term is Establishment Officer. His duties are establishing. You'll find out that a lot of people don't understand what this post is and that sort of thing, so any Establishment Officer going on post has to do a certain amount of personal identification. If he's in charge of divisions seven, one and two, well he had better tell each one of those divisions that he's in charge of these three divisions. Otherwise, each one of them will think he's off post three quarters of the day, and what an easy job. In other words, he has to identify himself.

Now, we have yet to put together the uniform of an Establishment Officer and the insignia of an Establishment Officer. We will be doing that. We will be building a corps. There will be an Establishment Officer senior, top Establishment Officer in the Management Bureau, for Sea Org and Scientology orgs. In the PAC area for instance there will be two Establishment Officers on Flag, putting in the network. Their opposite numbered terminals will of course be the Establishment Officers in charge of each of the orgs. So this will go in as a network.

Now, what happens on something like Flag? Now here you have a numerous, although the

fact. It combines a bureau and a division, and it combines two entirely different sets of policies in the one section. So the Establishment Officer, you don't have an Establishment Officer for the bureau, because in most of these bureaux like bureau two for instance, I think has one person in it. It's just got the Aide, you see? He has the job of realizing that he has two different organizational types in the same division, with two different, entirely different, products. One, the bureau is external. A bureau always has external product, its products are external. It may have some internal functions, but at that moment they're divisional. So, external, the external lookout, the external management function and so on is the bureau function.

It actually operates in a difficult way because it operates not only on all the basic policy, but it also operates on FOs and CBOs, the Central Bureau Orders. So it has entirely new, different packs; it's an entirely different bit of expertise. Furthermore, there's quite a lot of expertise into just the matter of being an Aide. And we find out that people have an awful lot of trouble when they come on if they don't just know the song of being an Aide. It's rough for them, they don't know what to expect of it and so forth, and some of the things expected is quite outrageous. But that on Flag has an Establishment Officer who is covering both the bureau and the division.

Now, the divisional function is normally internal functioning. Out into the public we don't consider it external because it isn't, it's just that division operates that way. A bureau is something that operates another org, it doesn't operate the org that's there except it also does. And you will find out that uniformly an Aide will operate the other org over there and will not operate the org immediately under him. So there will be a tendency, there will be a tendency for the Establishment Officer to forget about the bureau. The person is a senior, the person has different problems than the division, it all looks internal. And on Flag, guess what? It is the external function that's important. The external function brings in, for god sakes, eighty-three percent of the income of Flag and the internal function only brings in seventeen percent. And yet the internal function is enormously manned up and the external function is terrifically undermanned. Isn't that interesting?

So what is the effectiveness of that external function? It will be as effective as the person is hatted and doesn't indulge in dev-T and as long as he is served well by the internal group. So therefore, you have a divisional secretary who has a senior as an Aide, who doesn't pay any attention to him. That's awful. And you'll find out those lines are raggity baggity. So that the division operates, however, as Product Officers. Your Product Officers' Conference is your divisional secretaries; the Aides and the pure bureau functions are all devoted to another body called the Aides' Council, which is engaged in management of external orgs. Now, how it is worked out has just recently changed and has not been implemented any further than a set of notes by LRH Personal Comm, but those notes exist. And its chairman right this minute is practically doing her nut because she hasn't got this other system in yet.

And so the Aides' Council does not engage in the running of the ship, but can monitor the living daylights out of it if it isn't served. Now, let me show you how important this works. Each big boom of Scientology orgs was when Flag was very heavily on the lines managing. And when the internal organization noise became so great as to distract the attention of Aides and management back into the ship internally, a crash occurred on the external lines. And that is the subject of a very searching evaluation. You want to know why these booms and depressions occurred. There is the bigger why of unhattedness and dev-T, but the local why is extremely just this, the ship unhatted develops sufficient dev-T that it distracted one from the external lines and crashed the stats. Dev-T and unhattedness was the reason.

So therefore, the internal functions of the ship are very, very important, but they are important from the degree of hattedness and no dev-T to a degree that no org would dream of. The dev-T discipline on this ship has got to be so extreme that an org, a very efficient org on the subject of dev-T would look totally dev-Ted on Flag. We cannot afford one tiny scrap of it, not one little tiny scrap, because that's what broke the international stats. And that's why you were on the job and summoned so immediately and so urgently, and why this

system was going in so rapidly. Found the why, you find within, oh within seventy-two hours and so forth, we got the whole system within grasp and being established.

Now, you are being asked to go on the job without yourself being totally established as an Establishment Officer. I call to your attention a Sea Org FO where a Sea Org member is expected to be doing anything. We expect a Sea Org member to be able to do anything. And so you are an Establishment Officer. That's it. That's all there is to that. Now, you can make up the deficiencies of your technology as fast as possible by putting in your normal study time plus an additional study time. Now, if any of you ever go out to an org as an establishment inside, you will find that this same condition occurs. This will repeat. You cannot afford to spend the next two months training and training carefully in a classroom a bunch of Establishment Officers. You won't be able to afford it. So Establishment Officers will probably always be trained this way and that's on the job training though, isn't it, because you will rapidly find out what you don't know and have to go look up in one hell of a hurry. I wouldn't be a bit ashamed of you if you suddenly disappeared from sight around the back of a bulkhead or something like that, and were hurriedly shuffling through a bunch of policy letters to find out what the hell it was.

If you look at the number of things you have to know, you have to know all the policies and functions and operations of a division, plus all the functions, policies and operations that have ever been written about HCO, plus all the functions and policies that have ever been written concerning technical application to the control of human emotion and reaction. And that gives you the scope of what you should know in order to do your job successfully.

This talk today was to instant hat you, to show you to a marked degree the scope, the reason why, the background of your post, the need for it, and the reason that you cannot possibly afford to fail. So, you are an Establishment Officer. Thank you very much.

(Thank you, Sir.)

OK.