

EVALUATION AND HANDLING OF PERSONNEL - Part I

A lecture give on
2 March 1972

Alright. This is the second of March, 1972 and it's the second talk on ESTOs, Establishment Officers.

As you know, the technology is not totally covered anywhere at this time. That will be amended and policy letters will be written. You should note that the Product/Org Officer system which is the immediate predecessor, there's a word that you'll have to look up or be blank the rest of the lecture, the thing that went just before the Establishment Officer system. The Product Officer/Org Officer system was not put into policy letter because it was a tape system, it was taped, it was run, it had success and it is a very successful system. But it had a fatal weakness, and the fatal weakness was that establishment could not occur. And there were two reasons for this, is the flurry and urgency of production make it very difficult for establishment to occur, and the establishment personnel of the org were insufficiently numerous to stand up to the demands of production. And therefore, the org was relatively unhatted while production was being demanded of it, and the demands of production then produced fantastic quantities of dev-T, which then drowned the org which had not been established.

Now, I can give you instances and examples of how dev-T drowns an org, but the dev-T pack which you have, and policy and so on rather covers that ably. We have known about it for a long time, and somebody will come along and say, "But we've known about dev-T all these years, what is so new about this?" What is new about this it was, there is and actually does occur in one of the sentences of dev-T policy, a faint reference to unhattedness. It didn't step up the importance of this fact. The cause of dev-T is unhattedness, and dev-T drowns an org. So we had the technology of dev-T, but it's like a person turns yellow when he has jaundice. And you say, "Well, he's yellow and therefore let's get some cosmetics or something and cover up this yellowness," when the actual truth of the matter is that jaundice is caused by a liver illness, and the liver becomes infected, and the person should be given horse needle shots of antibiotics and double handfuls of pills and put into strict isolation. And all the cosmetics in the world would not cure the jaundice.

So you could keep battering away at dev-T and should, but you must recognize that it is the yellow skin, just a symptom, it is not the disease. So therefore, you have the weapons of detecting unhattedness by spotting dev-T. So a continuous dev-T survey, going on on an org, will deliver into your hands the persons, you think at first glance, that are causing dev-T. No. It delivers into your hands the people who are unhatted, and unhatted to a degree that they are consuming the labors of two additional staff members just to take care of their nonsense, while their own post functions are not done. So, dev-T tells you at once that you have an added staff load and that you have additionally a camouflaged hole. A camouflaged hole is one that looks like there is something there but it is actually a hole, and of course that itself would generate dev-T. But because the person is so noisy, you will at once say, "Well, but look, we have a Qual Sec or something, he's always on my lines, always on my lines. Just yesterday he was saying that he couldn't get anybody to walk into the org while handing out the bills to the customers." He's very obvious as a being and he may be carrying the title of Qual Sec, but if he is not holding the actual post duties of a Qual Sec, he will generate just by that missingness, enormous dev-T, because the people all around him will have to wear the hat of Qual Sec, and cope with the nonsense that is coming from that pretended post.

So dev-T is a primary diagnostic tool for the illness of an org. It's got jaundice. A division gets jaundice. What's causing it? Now, it isn't a who. You shouldn't really think in terms of who. As we say, "Who is suppressive here? Who shall we fire? Who shall we shoot? Who needs to be flung out onto the garbage can?" That is not the way to think for an Establishment Officer. It's "Who needs hatting?" Crunch down over the head, clear to the ankles. Now, that's an interesting thing, isn't it? That you are actually working with a

diagnostic illness, the symptom of which is, a diagnosable illness, the symptom of which is dev-T. It just means that somebody isn't doing his job and he's not only not doing his job, he's involving the time, effort and material of several other personnel. And you can have eight thousand six hundred and fifty-five staff members getting out the production of one small boy, who would probably be kicked in the head if they caught him at it.

It is very easy to think of this in terms of maliciousness, because the destructiveness is so great. And you as an Establishment Officer will continually receive, continually, continually receive demands, from the production and program side of the org, to shoot. They don't have any why, it just seems absolutely desperate. The Germans, by the way, in operating in World War II intelligence circles, could not believe that anybody could be as ineffective and as inefficient as Italian intelligence. And so they conceived that they were full of spies, and boy did they take that organization over with a crash. There was nothing wrong with Italian intelligence, it just wasn't hatted. But it looked to the Germans like they ought to all be sent to the nearest concentration camp and crematorium, shoot them, kill them. And in the desperation of operations with the funding going down the spout, the human emotion and reaction which can generate is very great. And its first expression and so forth is, "Them guys is doin' us in. Where are some lions to throw them to?" So if you wound up automatically going overboard, sacking, firing, doing in, comm-eving, shooting every person who was indicated to you must be shot, you would soon have no organization and the people in it would be so terrified that they would lose the war like Italy did.

You can generate a level of insecurity in an organization this way which is unbelievable. Posts aren't safe, nothing is safe, eventually you hear a rumor coming up the line, "I don't think it would be safe to be an executive. The last six on that post have been removed." Actually, I've had this come up in sessions, read it in work sheets. "But I really don't want to be an executive, you see, because they always get shot." That kind of a thing can generate in an organization where the yellow skin has gotten very, very, very yellow, because people trying to get things done do not have necessarily time to go down and find why this division will not send out the bills. And you'll find out that they think bill is the name of a friend they had once. The depths to which humans can sink in terms of non-comprehension are very, very low. That is no reason to lose your faith in the whole human race because the funny thing is, is they can be pulled up, too.

We had a very funny one happen last night, a very, very funny one happen. Three stewards had slipped in the last twenty-four, forty-eight hours. One of them had fallen heavily, another one of them had broken all the dishes on the tray, another one had run into a door. And so I, it took actually two investigations, and I sent a messenger down to investigate this and she came back. Well, the reason why she came back is she assumed she knew the answer, found that it wasn't so, so returned to me to tell me that they were just being careless, you see? I actually was interested how she thought and why she came to this conclusion, and I found out that she already knew why before she went and looked, and then when she found it wasn't why, she didn't look for a new why. In other words, she knew before she went and having found it wasn't true, why she just discarded the investigation, she didn't find a new why. Do you follow?

The other one was a little sharper, mostly because I kept banging her back into the investigation, and it sounds, doesn't sound possible, but somebody, the floor of the galley was soaking wet and the stewards were getting their feet wet and then were walking out in rubber soled or leather heels, a little bit of grease that'll get on such water, they were walking out with slippery shoes. And they were sliding and skidding and running into things like mad, and what had actually happened was, is three days before now, during two of those days people were getting hurt, the dish washer had cut her finger. And she now wore huge gauntlets; gauntlets, a glove with a long arm; which had a point which dropped way below the arm. In other words, back they came, and was washing the dishes with the water streaming back along the sleeve of this glove, and it was running onto the floor in streams, in utter streams.

And the messenger said to her, "Where's all this water coming from?" And she says, "I think the Jackson boiler is leaking," and looked around with the water running off her sleeve onto the floor. There's still a funny bit. The messenger came back and told me there was water on the floor of the galley and I said, "How did it get there?" and she told me how and I said, "Well, did you point this out to her?" And she looked sort of vague and said, "Well, no." So I said, "You go back and tell her to roll up the sleeves of those gloves and where it is coming from." And she did so and the dish washer thanked her very much. It was a great relief to the dish washer to find out how that floor was getting wet.

Now, that is an oddball investigation which an Establishment Officer would think is outside of his premises, because it isn't on a program sent down by the Commanding Officer. It isn't on a formal program, it is something, simply something you would have to do sixteen hours a day as an Establishing Officer. Continuous, continuous discoveries of why, because it's the why you can't hat, it's the why that's going wrong, and it has to do with an individual. And what do you know, there's always a why.

Now at command level, these discoveries or workouts which then go into a why and which go into a formal program of do this, do that, do the other thing, are normally worked out to the last inch and they have targets and certain things have to be done on these targets. You have an example of that, one has just come out, and it gives the Establishment Officer something to do in each one of these cases. And I found out the only person who could do it would be the Establishment Officer. There wasn't anybody else in that tight a communication, there wasn't something you could do otherwise. There is usually a why.

It is not that people won't get out the bulk mailing, there is usually some huge bug. Now, that would be a command level investigation, evaluation and program. Bulk mailing stat low, wof wof wof, investigation, he goes around and he finds this, he asks this, he asks some Establishment Officers and so forth, and he finds a why. He finds the general, big, broad why. They weren't given any postage. Postage has not been FPed for in the last, and the reason for that is, is not that there is no money, but that it isn't on FP number one done by Joe Smogesboeg for Keokuk and applied to this org without further questioning or it'll be some damn weird, cross line which just breaks the back of things. Now that's a production, that's a production target and investigation. You wouldn't have too much to do with that until it came down to remedying the unhattedness which would cause it, and at that moment you do have something to do with it. So there's always a target or two kicking around that has to do with the unhattedness of it.

I found one. There was a direct why of unhattedness just last night. I found out that a folder to be able to tell the difference between one type of income and another type of income in the Sea Org was causing a treasury division never to work at collecting money, because the money it had and was collecting didn't belong to it. They immediately assumed that that belonged to it and then neglected a huge amount of collections because they, well, they didn't need it and they were all right. It's like saying the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company says that they, says that Uneeda Biscuits is solvent, so we needn't bother. You can't figure one that dim and you wouldn't believe it, but demand after demand after demand after demand after please, my god, after practically a screaming fit of, "Give me the income for 1971 of org A," wouldn't, wouldn't. Had it right there sitting on the desk. The income of org A was considered to be the income of org B. And so, what was all the flap about? "There's plenty of money. Org B is making fabulous quantities of money."

You say nothing can be that dumb. Well, it can get dumber than that. "There is plenty of money in Switzerland. Why should we make money?" I know it just overwhelms you. You say, "Well, geez, how can anybody think that?" And that didn't unravel until I suddenly realized and then proved it, that not one single scrap of finance policy was known to the people on those lines, not one tiny scrap, not a single paragraph. Income must be greater than outgo, not known.

Now, there's a much more subtle one that was not known; much more subtle. The management organization must be supported by the service organization attached to it. And that's in policy and it isn't kidding, because if that management organization is so lousy that it can't make that service organization right next to it solvent, it doesn't have any business trying to fill its pockets up full of remote, far away organization incomes. Right? So that policy is what it means. It was the unknowness of both of these two policies that pointed up the fact that there's a total unknowness of any Scientology finance policy being used in that zone of management. Why is it unknown? Somebody must have said at some time or another, "We're not on proportionate pay in this org, so therefore policy doesn't apply." And I know that earlier it was stated, "This is an SO organization, so Scientology org organization policy doesn't apply." I know that.

Now, you don't have to find that why on individuals any further than that, because there's a thing called a disagreements check. And disagreements check can be done in department thirteen, and department thirteen should know how to do a disagreements check without backlogging it for the next six months. So you will find one of these wild twists wherever it is going wrong. They're very difficult to believe and so in the realm of the incredible, it is easy to substitute for them, "Shoot him. He's a traitor, he's treasonable. Nobody in his right mind could think that." Well, that may be true and maybe he isn't in his right mind.

Now, there is a scale of management actions which begins with case and then goes into other, it's in policy, there's no reason to quote it. The first thing you've sounded out is the person's case in the matter and that's when you're checking out personnel, mostly for employment or recruitment. Now, you start filling up an org with people whose cases are below the center line of an OCA, and you're going to be in trouble. Now, it is elementary, the reading of these graphs. Now, you've turned over the second page of an OCA, you will find out that testing has done a beautiful analysis of the case that reads like a horoscope. And that's fine and the public love them. That isn't how I use them. You use an OCA simply and totally this way: Down on the left below the center line, wild screamingly out of valence; down on the right, evil purpose, wildly nuts. And that is all you need to know except this one fact, that a person who is very theety wheety has tremendous number of significances and has a very high OCA. They're kind of fey. It's all very significant. Super significances.

"Oh, I was wondering if you'd come around and see me today because yesterday I sort of had an idea that I saw you looking in my direction and this told me somehow, when I got up this morning I was almost certain!" It's all sort of not quite with it or on it. Such a person with super-significance and a high OCA will fall on the OCA under processing to an extremely low left side and then a very low right side, and then will come back up into normal range and be sane.

I've now told you in these few sentences all you need to know about an OCA, and if anybody gives you any more significances than this, you don't need them. That's all you ever use. Now, that can be interrupted by a D of P evaluating an OCA, telling people what to write on the OCA, falsifying an OCA, or an OCA graph being done by somebody who has been a test I/C and knows all the right answers. That is usually caught up by an aptitude test and an aptitude test, when it grades below sixty-five, is a person who will break things and will have accidents. You don't want too much to do with him.

So the OCA can be cross-checked with the aptitude test. Believe me, I've told you everything you need to know about an OCA or an Oxford, the Oxford Capacity Analysis or the American Personality Analysis. That's all you need to know. Now, the American Personality Analysis does not have the nice center line, it's just the middle of the graph, it's the plus and minus. The OCA has a much better looking and easier to read graph. You look at the two graphs and you'll find out they're both the same except one's got shaded areas properly and the other one hasn't.

This tells you a great deal about personnel, right? Now, those tests which require opinion to evaluate, are tests that you want nothing to do with. Like the Boreback, the Minnesota multi-

phasic. You might as well just go out in the pasture with a shovel, you'd get the same answers, if you pardon my crudity. But the psychologist has gone over into the significances of his own evaluations because he is so significant and his right, left side graph would go down if he were processed, and then the left side, right side would go down if he were processed, and then they would come back up. You see that that throws your significance test, do you get it?

If anybody ever gave you a Rorschach and you simply said; Rorschach's the inkblot test, and the way they make them is they drop some ink on one side of a sheet of paper and then they fold the paper over and then open it up again, and now they've got inkblots on both sides and that makes an inkblot. And then you're supposed to look at the inkblot and see what you see in it, that sort of thing. If anybody ever gave you one of these things, don't ever bother to answer much and say, "I don't see anything in it." It absolutely ruins the test. Or say, "It's ink on a piece of paper." Actually, it was a child's game.

Now, most of these tests and so forth were born out of the area of phrenology, which is reading the bumps on people's skulls to tell their character, and that's where psychology came from in the first place, and why they eventually went deeper and thought it was the brain. You think I'm kidding now, I'm giving the actual fact.

IQ, precisely timed, is another factor. You don't want anything to do with a person whose IQ is below seventy. I'm now talking about personnel. You want to regard with some suspicion somebody whose IQ is only ninety, and processing will raise an IQ at the rate of about one point an hour of processing. These are really the three types of tests.

Now, there are some other tests, there are some other tests that are given, such as how often can you, how long does it take for you to arrange the blocks on and get the round pins into the round holes and square pins into the square holes. This type of spatial relationship test, and so on. And they had one, and those are very quick tests and they're usually were used by Ds of P to determine how many hours of processing somebody needed or something like that. A little, little test that only took five or ten minutes, it only took a short period of time. I say it only took five or ten minutes to evaluate, it might take much longer than that to do. But these tests were thrown out very early in Scientology because Mary Sue could do them all in one minute and thirty seconds and they're supposed to take twenty minutes or a half an hour. So they didn't think the test had any validity, because it had no grade range for one minute and thirty seconds.

Now you are dealing, you are dealing in personnel then, against certain stable things, and these stable things are those tests, and I've now given you the types of tests. There are some other things which you can evaluate personnel against, which is past record. But that is subject to false reports. But they're, it has validity. Statistics are usually fairly valuable, and the higher in the org the statistic is, the more validity it has. The individual statistic of how many envelopes he stamped today, or something like that, have a tendency to be falsified or not be as accurate. But the higher you go, the wider a span of org the statistic represented, the more value, validity it has.

Well, let's start at the obvious. The Commanding Officer of an organization whose gross income and paid completions were very high, you know, that sort of thing, that's, the validity of it is great. But somebody who licked stamps, the validity of that certificate isn't, you see, that's open to question. But no statistic at all and he never kept a statistic on the post, is also terribly significant. So therefore, the evaluation of personnel can be done with fair rapidity. It includes the test battery, it includes his ethics record, it includes his personnel record and it includes any record of statistics the person might have.

Now, that is very, very good to know; that you can actually have some index of evaluation. You will err more in the direction of failing to believe it than you will err in any other direction. The person had a very, very thick ethics folder and he was very, very wrong, and you say, "Well, he's a good boy now and so therefore we will!" and oh god, you've had it

Now another thing is, is the strange hopefulness that people will get, in lower level organizations particularly, of putting somebody on a post just to have a body there, and hopeful that then auditing will handle the person.

Now, it is true that auditing will handle a person, but you as an Establishment Officer have to know the degraded being technology. There are two or three policy letters with, HCOBs with regard to this which make this very, very plain and should be part of any Establishment Officer's packs, because he'll fall into this hole. Orgs since time immemorial have fallen into this same hole. Yes, yes, it's perfectly true that a hundred hours of processing and all of his expanded lower grades and that sort of thing and so on, will make this person far more able than he is. That's perfectly true. You've hired a pc.

Now, a staff member is somebody who handles pcs. Pcs do not easily handle the public and you've just mixed your personnel pools. You've tried to take your staff from the pc pool. Now, the second you put him on staff he will absorb or tend to absorb all of the auditing that should be available for staff, and the F/N VGI percentage of your staff will fall if you have too many of these people, because you will be processing them and you will not be processing the staff at large. So therefore, the staff at large will be going for weeks, months, even a year without a session, while obsessively people in the department of processing will go on continuously processing Joe Schmoe because he's in such terrible shape. So you're rewarding a down stat and the principle of rewarding a down stat is the principle which drives civilizations right on out the bottom. He really ought to be out there with a job, shoveling coal or something, and buying his processing.

Now, you can get very soft in the head on this. "Poor old Joe Schmoe is a good fellow, let's send him to Flag where his case really can be handled." It's very true that Flag could handle his case, but it's also true in many instances that Flag is not about to. Now, that's very important to an Establishment Officer because you'll find these people scattered through your divisions. So how do you estimate this sort of thing? Well, by the factors I have given you and by the thickness of his pc folder while on staff, plus his current meter check. Now, an Establishment Officer should know all about meter checks and meter checks are not sec checks. You just put the guy on the meter, what does he read, that's it. Where's his TA, does he F/N, does he have a dirty needle? It's just a meter check, you just hand him the cans. Furthermore interviewing and so forth with a pc on a meter is a very, very interesting activity because you will immediately find the charged up areas.

Now, I always do a D of P interview metered. A personnel interview I would also do metered, if it really came down to the fact that the person was on staff and I was trying to find out what was bugging him. Not somebody you're hiring off the street. I would have him on a meter and I would have an idea, I would make a bunch of guesses, let me tell you how I would do this. I'd make a bunch of guesses. Is it his home life, is it his wife, is it his boss, is it an overload, is it because he can't study? I'd just do a little bit of an assessment list, see, I'd think of all the things that might be bugging this guy. And with your experience which you would pick up very rapidly; if you haven't got it already you would pick it up with great speed, because it is survival for an Establishment Officer to accumulate more experience in one small unit of time than anybody else does in a lifetime. Experience with handling something.

So you do his little list and you sit him down, you say, "Well Charlie, I want to ask you about some things now. How about your blok-a-blogs and how about your wok-a-blogs and how about the wik-a-wogs and your home life, and how's your wife treating you these days, and so on and etcetera and so on," and my god, you find out it's his boss. He was bugged on the subject of his immediate senior. His wife was getting a divorce from him, his creditors who were charging into him from all sides, these things don't bother him at all. So you could a terrible mistake by assuming that you knew all about this person. "Well, Charlie is getting a divorce you know, I mean of course he's upset." And that doesn't bother him a bit. You see what I mean?

So an interview of you standing around frowning at the guy and talking to him and trying to get out of him somehow or another what is this, I mean how come he keeps being absolutely unable to put file folders back in the files, and how is he so disturbed that he never seems to be able to do this, all he does is take them out and put them on the floor. You're trying to hat this guy to make some files, you see, how he doesn't file the invoices into the base file, you know? And you argue with him and you talk to him and you tell him a half a dozen times and you keep finding this is not done, and it's bog, there you are. See? And you can just waste fantastic quantities of time and yourself generate a lot of dev-T by throwing the guy into cramming, by sending the guy for a disagreements check, for doing this, doing that, doing a lot of other things, because you're trying to do something before you know a why. And so, before you take any broad, sweeping actions on a case, you better know why.

Now, there are certain lists that help you out a great deal. When you send somebody to study who can't study, why, there's a study correction list. We're rich in this material now. You go down the study correction list and you will find why he can't study. It is a very long formidable list and it's an auditing action, and an Establishment Officer would not be doing it for the excellent reason that it's an auditing session. And it would have to be done by an auditor and it'd have to be done at that point of the pc's program that it could be done. You can suddenly order these things into the middle of a program and practically wreck the case. C/Ses will raise hell with you at that moment and they will say, "You get off my lines and so on, and stop ordering these people over to correction because they're all here and we don't want them." And the reason for it is they then have to pick up the pieces, and they get tired of picking up these pieces and then they take it out on the people who ordered the people to have these actions.

Now, you've right now got salted through the organization about a hundred and fifty people who have had a rather down tone set of questions asked them. They got reads on these things. He talks about you're about to shoot the organization, you know I mean, they're all sort of down tone, they're really trying to leave or something, and this kind of thing you see, they're very down tone. And they've got lots of reads on them that weren't cleaned up. I took four of them, got a twelve auditor to clean them up on four pcs, and they felt marvelous right afterwards. See? So these checklists and so on which then don't get anything handled, can be sometimes very gruesome. So don't make them down tone or accusative. You can ask the guy anything you want to ask him and he will feel very good as long as you don't invalidate him too heavily in the questions.

You get off, you see you can get easily off into the sec check zone. When I'm talking about this little list of, "Is it your wife and is it this and that," I'm not talking about sec checks, I'm not talking about, "Are you really stealing money?" I might say, "Have you got overts?" but I wouldn't try to tell him what they were. You get what I mean? See, you just want to find out the zone where he's having trouble with. You're not auditing him. One of the first things you do when you do that say, "I'm not auditing you." Yeah, you let him talk about them a little bit and you'll probably get an F/N. I wouldn't turn it into a big auditing session, but I would find out such a thing, the guy just can't bear to study.

We had some fellow who went into a total confusion, he was on the FEBC. He arrived here, he was in a total confusion, he was in terrible shape. Every time he tried to read an HCOB, he had tried to read one one time in a former org he was in while he was on drugs or something, and people tried to clean this up and that didn't clean up, and he just went sort of dweee every time he started to read an HCOB or a policy letter. Now that's interesting. He has to take an OEC doesn't he? So we pinned up a bulletin upside down on the wall and had him confront it for two hours and he came through it. There's a mention of this kind of thing in study tech.

Now, there's these bugs, these whys. Now, this person is supposed to be occupying a post, he's supposed to be producing something for the organization. That is your point of view. The auditor's point of view, he's trying to do something for the case. You're trying to do, when you do this kind of action and look at tests and that sort of thing, you're only interested

in the effectiveness or efficiency of this personnel and how his morale affects it. Now, you'd say that is a very, very cruel, a very capitalistic, a very super totalitarian communistic way of looking at personnel. But it isn't. If this guy doesn't produce, his morale will remain on the bottom. Production is the basis of morale and an individual who isn't completing cycles and getting something done and so on, will never have good morale. I don't care how many ice cream sodas he can have a day, I don't care how many liberties he gets a week, I don't care what you do for him. If he isn't contributing something to his immediate environment, he's a gone dog.

Now, a person who is very evil-purposed, a psychosis by the way is simply, we know what psychosis is these days, there is a bulletin on it, but it is simply an evil purpose. It means a definite obsessive desire to destroy. Now, anybody has a few evil purposes when they suddenly think of, of having to do this or that that they don't want to do. They say, "Boy, I'd like to get even with that guy," or something. That's not what we're really talking about. This is the monitoring evil purpose which monitors all of this guy's activities. And that is a psycho, that is a real psycho.

Now, there are people who are PTS and who act fairly psycho, and there are people who are, quote, "aberrated." They've simply got out-points in their thinking. The psychiatrist never differentiated amongst these people. That's because he thought people had a disease called mental illness. And I refer you to Manufacture of Madness, this is an exposure of that fact. It is not true, there is no such thing as a mental illness, there is no bacteria which produces psychosis.

So it falls into three groups. The guy is a really, an evil purpose boy, he's out to destroy the lot. His whole life is monitored by this, he's getting even with his!, and he does it in the most remarkable way. Criminals and that sort of thing are motivated this way. These are guys, and they're very hard to detect because they carefully cover it all up while pulling the rug out from under anything. Now, these fellows are rare. It is very easy to say; well they're not all that rare; but it's very easy to say that anybody who is acting a little odd or is not doing well on post is psychotic. He may be PTS. One of these cats, somewhere in his life or in his family, may be running into him with a truck.

So he's a potential trouble source because he's got an SP somewhere in his environment, and he will act pretty mad. A psycho may do some strange things or may not. His behavior does not monitor his, it does not show you his psychosis. The PTS guy, he's fairly obvious. He's way up today and he's way down tomorrow and he gets a beautiful session and then he gets terribly ill, I mean, and that's the history of his life. If you look into his folder, you will look at a folder summary and you will see that every two or three sessions is a repair. He, he can't stay on a program, that is to say he can't stay on the advance program, it wouldn't be such a thing as you finish up this guy's Dianetics and you give him his straight wire and so on. Now, that can be a C/S's fault that he was never brought up the grade chart. But the truth of the matter is, if he's PTS why, he goes a little distance up the grade chart and roly coasters and has to be patched up, and then goes a little distance up the grade chart and then he has to be patched up, and then some fool lets him way up the grade chart and he gets there and then that all has to be patched up, and then he goes a little bit further and then he has to be patched up, and it just, it looks like Coney Island. See? Hence, roly coaster. He was OK last week but he's not so good this week. The guy can roly coaster on post, don't you see.

Well, the detection of that is perfectly visible to you whether you're trained as an auditor or not, right in the pc's folder summary inside that folder. You look it over, the guy that's running fairly straightforwardly even though lengthily, even though he gets innumerable rundowns and so forth, why, it's going on F/N VGI, F/N VGI, F/N VGI, F/N. And if the other one will run F/N, did so-and-so on Dianetics, run such-and-so, so-and-so, BIs or BER, bad examiner report. And then F/N, then F/N, then high TA, high TA repaired, so forth, BER, BER, F/N. Now, somewhere in that guy's vicinity, he was connected with a suppressive and that's all there is to that. He has some familial connections or something like that. There's something going on in this fellow's life which is most remarkable.

Now, just because somebody is connected to a suppressive doesn't necessarily mean they cave in. Sometimes the suppressive does. But where you have staff members who continuously rolly coaster, you're dealing with a PTS. And PTS policy and so on is dead on, dead accurate, and we can solve it these days. The PTS rundown, it can be done by a Class IV, and it's not difficult to do and it is a new accomplishment and that can be solved. Now cases or staff members fall into two categories with regard to this first category, the management scale, which is what I'm talking about. They fall into two categories. They fall into the category, if they're bad off they fall into two categories. Do you follow?

They fall into one, you're about to take him on staff. Don't. And the other is, you've got him on staff, now what? Those are the two categories. You solve the first one, don't take him on staff. The second one, now what are we going to do with him? Now we're into that sort of thing where you've inherited the mistake of a recruiting officer or a department one of yesteryear. Now, what are we going to do with this guy? We just going to shoot all these birds? No. But there is a thing called a fitness board, and a person can be sent before a fitness board, but in all justice a person shouldn't just be sent before a fitness board and shipped off. No, no, no, because that brings about terrific insecurity, and it is just a damn bad thing to do. It takes a court or a comm-ev to put somebody in front of a fitness board, just like that.