

HANDLING PERSONNEL - Part II

A lecture given on
3 March 1972

Alright. Now, when you get a real fixated hatred going in some direction, from command toward some line, when you get a real fixated hatred going it is usually quite blind. It again comes under the category of what I was first talking about. J. Edgar Hoover's hatred of communism was similar to Gellen, the German intelligence chief that the CIA put in charge of all German intelligence. They're fixated, absolutely fixated, and it made them both just dishonest bums. J. Edgar Hoover's book, *Masters of Deceit*, is one of the most deceitful books you ever wanted to read, because he really doesn't tell the story of communism. He's just blind to all of its side panels. The guy's supposed to be an expert on it since 1919, or something of that sort. Pooh. He just fixated, just a fixated hatred.

Yes, communism is lousy, it's lousy, it's been lousy since the time it ruined Sparta. Plato's Republic, the only, only effect I ever heard of of Plato's Republic, which is what communism was based on, was the destruction of the affluent state of Syracuse, and that was the only state that was ever run by or tested on, on the subject of Plato's Republic, and it went wwwwungg, and that was the end of Syracuse. And I think ten or fifteen years later they had to import thirty-five thousand people to have some inhabitants there on that little desert spot. It was remarkable.

So these fixations obscure enough facts to render them very ineffective. That is to say, he gets so mad, or it is so mad dog, on the subject of this one fixed thing, that they never see the facts that are immediately adjacent to them. So you say, "Well, you can always get people going in one direction if you have a cause." Yes, but don't associate a cause with a fixated hatred. Communism won't ever take the whole planet because it hates capitalism, knows nothing about it and has excluded out of its system certain principles of economics which are vital to its survival because they're part of capitalism, they think. Those cats don't even define capitalism. They're cheats. Capitalism is living off the interest of loaned money, basic definition. It doesn't go with war mongers or something.

So what is all this about? Your intention, what is the intention in which the staff is operating. Is it operating in such a way that the intention will be misread and is being misinterpreted to them? Have they got a J. Edgar Hoover around who is teaching them this, that or the other thing, and that they ought to be all against something or other or something or something, making them totally blind to other factors in their environment? Or, what is this, what is command intention? Now, the interpretation of command intention and so forth is a PR job. And it says in definition, that is one of the functions of PR, "The interpretation of management policy, do it's stuff, and plays as a prime function of public relations." And then because they don't do it then the shop steward says, "All those guys is interested in is money, see?" It can be re-interpreted because it isn't entirely true, because it's PR. What is it? What is command intention?

Now, you will find that when somebody in an executive strata gets an axe out for somebody, you will run into one of your most oddball problems, or when somebody thinks somebody in the management strata is mad at them and has singled them out, oh, you've got a hell of a problem on your hands. Command intention has been colored for them to a point that it can make them ill. "Command intention is so-and-so, that you ought to be happy that you do your jobs, that you produce, that we make money, you can get bonuses," that we do this, that, the other thing and so forth, but they know by personal experience that the director of something or other has their number under his blotter. They know this not, not by reading it in the atmosphere, they have seen it, and the guy will sort of cave in.

Now, I have to be very, very careful of this, and if I have to be careful of this, and you're working as an Establishment Officer in these organizations, you'll have to be careful of this. I

have to be careful not to get mad at a staff member and not to hold a grudge and not to keep people on a blacklist or something like this. But I have to be particularly careful not to get mad at people, and I often do. But it is one of these things that blows right on by. I mean, I don't object to saving people's lives, I don't object to handling things so they all run right, but I do object to somebody coming in and proudly dumping a dead rotten gopher in the middle of my desk saying, "See what I did?" And at that point I reserve the right to myself. This happens every once in a while. Somebody goes out and he just makes a mess, he makes a dog's breakfast and then messes that up, see, and he comes back up or I will send for him, and I blow his head off.

Every once in a while it does a lot of good. But you have to watch it, you have to watch it, because it can make somebody quite ill and you'll knock them, knocked down to a point where they don't come up again. You can practically kill them from a, an altitude. They become convinced, they key in somehow or another, they all go beowww, and then they don't know where they are and their stable data gets all blown, and maybe it wasn't too well aligned to begin with. Do you follow? And so there is a little rule that goes along with this. You handle the group for the group's benefit and then you handle the individual for his benefit. It's the one and the two which really is the three and the one. You act for the benefit of the group and then you try to salvage the individual, because sometimes when you act for the benefit of the group, somebody gets hurt. And although there are casualties along the line, I think the record stands pretty good.

But never, we're not now talking about anger, let something happen to the guy until some action had been taken; that is if it was in my hands, this happens at lower executive stratas over which you don't have total control, otherwise you'd be a totalitarianism; but do something to handle the group and then do all you can to catch the individual. And that's the one tool. The individual is the second action but is nevertheless an action. That's why you say things like Steward's Project Force, Deck Project Force, orders to that instead of just booting him off into nowhere. One of the, that I had to put the brakes, for instance, suddenly on offloads because I found that offloads were being off loaded without proper justice procedures, and that can unstabilize not only the group but can certainly upset an individual, because these various things, things can happen.

Justice is always expensive, it's either expensive in terms of bruised feelings or it's expensive in terms of cash. Holding on to somebody who was there under false pretenses and that sort of thing, long after you should have and so forth, is probably one of the faults that could be pointed out that I have. Trusting somebody, leaving him on post far longer than I should have, that sort of thing. I would rather err in that direction than otherwise. Sometimes you see something happen suddenly, but there is usually your considerable explanation behind it, but there is also the individual's reputation at stake. You don't necessarily throw a big withhold, or build up a big withhold on it, but there isn't any particular reason to, just because you had to do something for the group's sake, to then ruin somebody's reputation at the same time when he probably was not doing anything that he considered malicious. It's after the guy's been given a chance and you've handled him and you straighten it out and you straighten it out and you straighten in out and, well, to hell with it. We've got other things to do.

But those are the two steps which an Establishment Officer must put into his operating action. It's the group and then the individual. You don't just go dumping people in garbage cans because you had to get them off the post because they thought money was something you lined garbage cans with. Do you follow? Now, that doesn't mean that everybody who has ever been hit or who's ever been transferred or something had something terribly wrong with them. There's also another thing that happens.

You'll find somebody on some kind of a post or another, he really didn't want to be there, that sort of thing, he isn't doing too bad, he isn't doing too good, something like that. Or somebody whose position as what he's occupying is making him ill and he's just worried and upset all the time about the thing and it's getting in the machinery and so on. Or somebody who would do far better on some more important post even though it doesn't have a better

name. The post may not have as high a status but it is more vital. Like a post out in a CLO and a post on Flag. If I got too pushed on a post on Flag or something, too pushed on Flag, although I would think about it for quite a while, I might very well pull somebody out of a CLO, no matter how important they thought he was. Do you follow?

And reversely, and this has happened too often and has given you a problem immediately right now here on Flag, a cycle has gone on whereby we have continuously exported our best people, and the personnel officers keep looking over Flag rosters to find out who can be in command of or who can be the something or other in and so forth, and then they send him. And then they look over the Flag roster and then they pick out this name because he can do it and they send him. And then the next thing you know, you look around and you find out you have a group that has been picked over and picked over and picked over for capabilities, but at the same time there hasn't been as much work put in on recruitment and training aboard, so you didn't fill in the slots. It wasn't that everybody that's left are bums, it's that the better part of the people left are only partially trained or only partially readied for anything or only partially have experience that matches these posts, and it gives you a tougher job. Do you see?

But personnel always has a little heartbreak in it here or there, but you try to lessen in all you can just as a matter of policy. It doesn't mean you will always be successful and it doesn't mean you will always keep your temper, that's asking far too much of anybody. After you've worked for forty-eight hours non-stop trying to handle a flap somebody generated, I think you could be very well forgiven if you said, "You blankety-blank-blank-blank!" I think you could be forgiven. But the third dynamic, first dynamic, is always, you will find that is the winning sequence. If you think first dynamic, first dynamic, first dynamic, first dynamic, you too are stuck on a first dynamic. And if you think only third, third, third, third, you're stuck only on the third.

Now, it is possibly true that some managements are usually concerned only with the buck, the ninth dynamic, and they do everything for the buck and only for the buck and that sort of thing, and that may or may not be true, and it may be just a bunch of propaganda, because certainly the top executives I've known and so forth weren't interested just in the buck. They're always talking about, "And I can see it now, we're going to lay out all these swimming pools, and we're going to do this and we're going to do that and we're going to fix up this and that and the other thing." They're usually fairly constructive personalities, but the union starts telling them, "They're only interested in the buck, see," and all kinds of counter-action is taking place because counter-intention is being put in the air.

Now, if enough of that counter-intention is put in the air, a management becomes educated into disinterest in the individual and disinterest in morale and disinterest in welfare. It is the back flow. They've been so hard hit with inefficiency, they are working so hard in the direction of solvency, they are working so hard to get the show on the road, they can't really get their hands on it, they're sweating it through somehow or another. They don't have the right whys, they get in a somewhat murderous frame of mind. If there's a little bit of dissidence, that is to say sauciness and upset and nyah, nyah, nyah one another through the group, they get the wind of that, they become immediately certain that, "These bums ought to be shot down in cold blood." And you get a reverse action against staff that can be very harmful. And I call to your attention that I said getting mad at somebody and getting upset with somebody can bring on sickness. The guy's hit, he's hit too hard, his previous concepts of intention are shattered. He loses what stable intention he thought he had in the environment and it flips him. You see what the mechanism is?

It isn't that the raw naked anger is capable of burning out his eyeballs, only that can be, too. You see what I'm talking about? So you can get a staff/management interrelationship which grossly affects the efficiency and the capability of the Establishment Officer, and it will be, you will find, one of your larger factors. Intention. You might call it the environmental intention if you wanted to be very fancy about it. And that intention, the intention in the surroundings, in the place of work environment, that intention can get so cuddled up and so

ridged up that it blows it, and it makes the Establishment Officer's work absolutely drudgery, because he no longer has cooperation.

Now, the Establishment Officer has to have the cooperation of the upper echelon and the executives, and he has to have the cooperation of staff, so he's sort of caught there on the firing range somewhere between the, the targets and the rifle line, because he's the one that will get the full kickback of intention. If the intention shattered as far as the staff is concerned, the intention shattered as far as management's concerned, it will mess up a ridge into a ridge situation. Management can be awfully mad at a staff for quite a while without the staff finding out, and then the staff starts to wake up to this sort of thing and then they cave in. That is something you handle, but you're in a position to handle it both ways, and remember that it does take both ways.

The best way to handle it for management is to find the right why. The management will know that's the why and it'll blow charge and they won't want to kill anybody then. And the best way to handle it for staff as an individual and so on, is to find out what it is that they're particularly upset about, who they think is sore at them, what they think the score is and try to clear up the air for them. And it's quite interesting that this is quite a subject. It is harder to do from the staff level than it is the management level. All you've got to do for the staff on the management side is just find the right why and convince them that that was it, and they cheer up. But on the staff side of the line, this guy feels more at effect than otherwise. I don't have any bag of tricks that I can give you at that particular line except to find with the individual what he believes, and so forth, and then mitigate it.

And I might go so far as, were I in your position, to write a note to the Distribution Secretary to please tell Joe that you're not mad at him, and that you're not going to transfer him. You'll find also members on staff will begin to worry about phantoms. You don't normally have it worked up to this pitch of interpersonal relationship. My interpersonal relationship with a staff member is probably much higher than is general in such lines. But I remember one back, this was a very interesting thing that opened my eyes to this sort of thing when I first found it.

A Chief Petty Officer walked up to me one time and he says, "What is wrong with A?" and he mentioned a name, "What have you got against A? What's, what's the matter?" I said, "Why, nothing." "Well," he says, "You better tell him so." He says, "He's down there in the mess hall and he is crying and he's hysterical and he's in terrible condition." I says, "What on Earth happened?" "You didn't say good morning to him this morning." That was all it took, the guy was practically around the bend. Now, this is not just me, that's just an example of the phantom, the phantom ideas that a person can have. He looked funny, you know, he didn't put "love" on the dispatch, he only said OK. You'll find they'll look for these signs and symbols and there will be something there, because he's now got an unsafe environment, so that his management intention or his executive intention, or the intention of his friend or the intention of the person he is depending on, has been upset for him and so he feels unsafe, unstable because he's not in much of a position to defend himself. He hasn't any high post or doesn't think too much of his capabilities, he has maybe overts, and maybe he's been goofing off, and maybe this sort of an action misses a withhold or something of this character.

So it's something you have to watch for. It's actually the interpersonal relationship between two parts of the third dynamic, that is the executive echelon and the staff echelon. Now if you don't watch this, they will separate. And in the Los Angeles organization as I speak, the reports which I have on the Los Angeles organization, is the executives they have out there are out of communication with the staff to a degree you would not believe. The executives never hatted their own staff, never really worked with them from what evidence I have had and what reports I have, and they're just out of communication. It wouldn't matter what order they issued, they don't exist. So various conditions can exist. Apparently there is no command intention there at all. The staff can't find out what they want and the staff are not trained or hatted, so how would they know? How would they know what was wanted? So it keeps the person in continuous non-existence or below non-existence on his post. You see what happens?

So there is a communication line that you have to safeguard as an Establishment Officer, and you'll have some rough problems along this line, and right now as you start to work here you probably have quite a few that are cumulative. Now, you could make a terrible mistake if you believed everything you heard along this line. You would make the most ghastly error. You go around and run on some of the reports you will be given, and you'll just be running down wrong whys left and right and you will do more damage than you could possibly mend up in the next week. You jump in on a secretary and say, "Why are you sacking Buffwuff, or why are you ordering a committee of evidence on Permbang, and yap yap yap and you shouldn't do that." Is your face red when you find out he doesn't know the person's name. "Oh, is he part of the division? I didn't know that. Comm-ev what, what?"

Now, people at staff level will feed each other the most confounded packages of lies you've ever heard in your life and naturally, because they've got some people around whose names they can use that they can drive somebody's anchor points in, you'll have a few people around who will try to drive people's anchor points in by coloring this intention. "Oh, I'm awfully sorry, I just saw a dispatch, I'm not sure what it was, I was up in the office there and your name was on it and it was an offload list and you're being involved and so on, I just thought I'd better tell you because I am your friend." Now, rumors of that character breed in the absence of communication.

Now, more than one CO in the Sea Org has been actually demoted for a failure to communicate to his crew, or to pass information to the crew, because he had to be because he didn't exist, not for the crew, he just didn't exist. We had to take him off before the whole thing fell apart. It didn't have a CO, he didn't communicate, he never passed on information. Now, in the presence of that sort of thing, a crew or a staff will not go without information, so they manufacture it. And that is actually the source of rumors. Your best defense on that sort of thing is briefings so that people know what is going on, and if you made it part of your muster actions to tell them what was going on today or if your OODs was more specific as to what was carrying on, they'd close it up. It gets very gung-ho. You cut down on the rumor line.

So therefore, briefings and information about what's going on and that sort of thing, which aren't a bunch of blaaa PR, but the truth of the matter, are sometimes cut back on a subject called security. "You can't say this because of security." Now, that's one of the things wrong with our OOD. They mail the thing all over the world, wrong public, and as a result there are certain things you can't put in it and that's a pity and it's one of the things you will have to mend sooner or later because it's a legitimate part of the Establishment Officer. You've got to keep your staffs briefed. You do it at musters, you don't just stand there and say, "Joe, Pete, Bill, Oscar." That's why you have to keep yourself informed. So therefore, your Executive Establishment Officer has to keep himself informed so that Estos can be informed, and it isn't gossipy stuff that you're interested in, it's operational. And if you don't know something about the operational picture, you've had it.

Now, you have to know something about what plans we are operating on. Immediate. You can also have long range plans but the immediate plan. Right now, for instance, there is a plan on foot and a program that is out to remain in this port past the sailing date, but does the crew know it yet? And yet there's been a considerable amount of correspondence on it. And the program on the subject was OK'd yesterday. That would take everybody by surprise, wouldn't it? So in such an atmosphere, you can breed a considerable amount of rumor. So a staff has to be informed in order to give them a continuing idea of intention, what is the intention around here, and they can read intention out of the plans as well as coordinate their own work. Now, one of the things that's interesting is is you sometimes will find executives who have the most marvelous plans, but they never tell the people who are going to have to do them, so they never get done. It isn't that the people are unwilling to do them, it's just they never tell the people about these plans.

Another thing, another trick that muddies up intention like mad is to release program A and then when everybody gets working on that and they're about half way through that, do program B and when everybody's working about half way through B, release C and don't let anybody complete a cycle of action. And incomplete cycles of action will pile up, pile up, pile up and the whole place'll go to pieces because no work is productive. You sometimes find a boatswain every time he finds this guy chipping bulkhead A, sets him to chipping bulkhead B, when he's halfway through chipping bulkhead B then he has him call up rope someplace else, and when you find that sort of thing you know your staff will sooner or later go around the bend because it's not permitted to complete a cycle of action, and they will ARC break.

Somewhat worse than that, it muddies up intention. What is the intention of their seniors? Well, the intention of their seniors quite obviously in such an instance is to do them in, not let them get anything done, to harass them, to worry them, god knows what. But they will have some very odd ideas of what the intention is although it's never been expressed.

These are the various things that you will run into. I've been giving you a rundown of them, this thing of intention back and forth is a critical one, it's what causes all these labor/management problems. England has been inoperational for a month or two this winter just because they can't handle labor/management relations between the government and the coal unions. And that's got many factors, but it started up the day that they thought they had to have a union to substitute for some leadership that wasn't there, because their leaders were the aristocracy, and of course the aristocracy didn't speak to pigs. So they got into some kind of a group of some kind or another, they had to have some kind of communication or reassurance because they felt rather shattered, and you get unionism. There's nothing really bad about unionism but when unionism turns around and fixes it up so nobody can produce, I think that it's an interesting phenomenon because they do not have the right to smash things that don't have anything to do with them, which they then proceeded to do in England recently.

So the upshot of it all is! The Tall Pebble Martyrs, by the way, is also an interesting book, and you think that's non-sequitur, but that was the first union formed in England and it was not right to smash those guys and it was not right to take those birds and transport them to the colonies, grab them by the arm and walk them off to trial and torture them and sentence them up, because all they did is they got together as a little sort of an agricultural collective, six of them, and they're called the Tall Pebble Martyrs, it's somewhere towards the earlier part of the nineteenth century. And there's been a book on it released recently and boy, did the aristocracy and commercial strata fix them, except they fixed them too good, they made them martyrs.

So that is the wrong way to go about it and it's also the wrong way to go about it to leave it in a state where there is a complete chasm grows up between labor and management. In the first place there is no labor in management, who the hell's talking, the guys who are in management are laborers, too, and they probably work twice as hard. Anyhow, the final analysis of the thing is if you don't want to get a games condition going, you will handle that factor. Alright.

Now, there's one more, a thing that you should know in this category. You can talk all you want how bad it is, you can talk all you want to about how you have to mend the guy up, you can talk all you want to about the smartness you have to have to overcome certain ills. There is a subject called a positive postulate. Now, this has so much technology back of it, behind it and so forth, that it belongs to levels that I wouldn't like to discuss with you at this particular time, because it would take too long and it's not in this, you're not at that grade anyway. I'm not making anything, it's not germane. This is the tiniest entering edge of a very wide technology, but it is very well worth knowing, and to this degree it is very useful to you. The rest of it really isn't of all that use to you. The positive postulate.

Now, you can take away negatives, negatives, negatives, negative things, you can de-negativize. In other words, this girl is all fixated on the second dynamic and this guy is, goes around all the time listening to the voice of god. And you can take that voice of god away and you can take this girl and straighten her out so that she can have something on the second dynamic, instead of talk about it all the time, you can do this kind of thing. Don't you see? That's negative. You can erase engrams, you can do all these things, that's taking away. You get actually negative gain by the removal of the harmful thing, you can get a positive advance. It's called negative gain.

Once in a while you will have erased some old lady's engrams and totally cured her arthritis and have her come in and say, "Yes, but how about my hearing." She just got up out of the wheelchair that she's spent the last twenty years in. Negative gain, see, it's gone so she isn't aware of it. It's called negative gain. You can take it away and take it away and take it away and take it away, and there's lots to take away, and it is successful, and sure enough there's many cases you have to take a great deal away before any positive gain in this and that. But from the viewpoint of positive postulates, there is no negative aspect. You just skip the whole category of negativism.

And when all else fails you have that, and also you have that when nothing has failed. You could come under the heading of the granting of beingness, this has something to do with the granting of beingness. It has a lot of things to do with a lot of things. You know, granting of beingness, the ability to grant beingness, the willingness to have somebody else be something. That would be perhaps what it would take to make this effective, but that even assumes that somebody might be unwilling to grant beingness. If you can conceive of a postulate that doesn't also conceive any negative, then you know what I'm talking about when I talk about a positive postulate. It's not only that there is no negative given attention to, but it does not assume that any negative is possible. It doesn't pay any attention to negatives. It isn't in the positive/negative to the degree that there's a dichotomy. It just is itself. And your determination or intention that somebody be a good, effective staff member is of course a positive postulate, and it will be ineffective to the degree that you doubt it.

"Well, I don't know what I'm going to do, boy, this is a pretty sad case and I don't know what I'm going to do about him at all, oh boy. You know where I found him, I found him back of the well deck and so on, he was supposed to be at work and oh, my god." Well alright, you say that sort of thing. But if you carry that on too long, it isn't any magical thing, you won't make it. Be as critical as you like, nobody's asking you to restrain criticism, but remember there is this thing which is just a clear cut positive postulate and you yourself can create an operating environment totally independent of any management environment, totally independent of any fixidity or stuckedness, totally independent of any frailty, and even of a considerable lack of ability. It isn't something you have to think, but you could actually create an operating environment that is simply positive. In your actions and in your motions, you don't express doubt.

This by the way goes off into many fields. There is one fellow who had the most remarkable ability to treat tuberculosis that anybody had ever heard of, and he was down there on the outskirts of Pasadena and he ran a hospital down there for many years. And he used to be harried and harassed by the medical profession to end all harassments, because he didn't bother with X-rays and things like that. By laying his hands on a fellow's chest, he could tell whether or not he had TB, and the American Medical Association had him up for charges for curing somebody or making somebody well and hurting their business, and so they brought something on the order of about a hundred and fifty TB, non-TB mixed onto a stage and just had him walk past this man, impossible clinical conditions you see, and just had him lay his hands on their chests and say whether they did or didn't. And he called every one of them.

Nevertheless, he remained unpopular, but only with the medicos. People got well with, to treatment. Oh, he'd feed them things and he'd shoot air in their lungs and collapse their lungs and do things like this, he'd go through all the motions, but people got well because he expected them to. They simply got well for him because he expected them to. Now, that is an

interesting actual, real life example of what I'm talking about of just one little ramification of this thing I'm talking about on positive postulates. It's, his expectancies were positive. "There you are, yes, you came to see, yeah, you're well, that's it." A most remarkable state of affairs. It upset all of the treatments and serieses and so forth of how you treat tuberculosis in all directions. But the funny part of it is, it didn't work for everybody because I don't think anybody understood the fact that somebody would do something simply because somebody expected him to.

Well, regardless of that, that's just one shade of this. If you expect this guy to win, you expect him to succeed, you expect him to be able to do the job, you expect that what you do will be effective in making him do the job, and you go right along the line, you won't even be caught in the dichotomy of it because you're not working with the negative side of it. Just neglect it, ignore it. "Well, I won't be able to do it now, I've never been educated, and I just never got up above about thirty-five words in typing and so on, and that was when I was at my peak, and I don't know whether I can do this," and so on and so on so on." Oh boy, you, it'll be challenged. It'll be challenged, but don't take it as a challenge, just expect that they will be able to, and it will reflect in your speech and your attitude, and it itself will give you an aura of confidence which in itself is formidable, horrible, because more than one person will simply throw you a bunch of curves to watch you cave in, because they don't like being chittied up like this. They've got something or other, something or other, something or other, see, something.

Interpersonal relations enter into it. The guy's absolutely sure that you were fooling around with his girlfriend or something. Interpersonal relationships. Or you're about to steal something or other, you have other motives in view, or something like this. And they say, "Nya, nya, nya," or they have withholds, they didn't do the filing and oh, they're there under false pretenses or something, here's lots of reasons, see?

So there's innumerable opportunities for the person to sort of snide at you and flash back at you and to prove you are wrong, service fac in full bloom, prove you are wrong by showing that they can't do it. To hell with it is the attitude, it's just to hell with it. Well, we can get the guy audited. When you run reach and withdraw on that typewriter and so forth, that has effectiveness, do the effective thing. Also expect that it works. Also expect that this guy will then be able to do it. And what do you know, it gives it a booster. And if you add a negative quantity to it, it might not work at all. So there is a piece of magic the Establishment Officer can engage in, and it's called the positive postulate. Now, that doesn't go just to holding it in your head and your attitude and the way you hold your hands, you can say so, you can say so. Very funny, you can tell this person he is a typist, and if your TRs are good enough, he will be one. Now you're into the real stuff. And that's why you should only speak to people in post titles. Never say Joe, always say his post title. It's part of the positive postulate line. You are talking to a beingness known as a file clerk, you are talking to a beingness known as a mimeo typist. Now, rather than get it artificial and rather than make it sound odd, why, you can shorten the title, you can do this, do that, but don't talk to Mary. Talk to the machine operator, and of course you can call him operator, but don't call him Joe. Don't think you're getting in with ARC by the personal touch and the Dale Carnegie, because you won't make it. What you will get is Joe, you will not get a mimeo operator, and you'll breed dev-T, boy. Positive postulate.

Now possibly in some organization which had never been processed, this might not work. But in a Scientology operation, you are Scientologists, you've been processed. Let me tell you something funny about people who have been processed. Well, the machine, I'm very sorry that the machine was not operational when it got to England and I've been meaning to have the thing rebuilt. It's called a beep meter. And wherever a person has a painful spot on his body, if you put the electrode on it the machine goes beeeep. But right along side of it, it doesn't beep. It's a beep meter, was developed for chiropractors and so on by ol' Volney Matheison from a model furnished him by a chiropractor. And I have one of those models, which is out of repair, in England. But it's very funny. If you have somebody hold this meter against his cheek; ten, fifteen, twenty feet away, a Scientologist can make it connect. He can

make it connect and he can make it go beep, but he hasn't got any wires and he's nowhere near the machine and there he is and the guy holds the electrode. And one of the tricks is, it makes a sort of a little black ridge and you just turn the ridge white, but you just make it beep, twenty feet away.

I've had newspaper reporters in and other people and they go uuuh and eh-h-h and nothing happens, nothing happens at all. And you take somebody, he's merely had maybe ARC Straightwire, something like that, and he looks at it and it goes beep. And then the first thing he says, "I don't think I'm doing that." Beep, beep, beep-beep. "Hey, hey I!," he begins to realize what he is and he's an electric eel. In other words, in other words a Scientologist can have a considerable effect. Nothing theetie-weetie about it, it's factual. I really, really have to get that beep meter fixed up so that I can have Establishment Officers fool with it. At first you don't believe it, that you can have an effect on something like that at a distance, across thin air.

But you can have, if your TRs are good and if your Tone 40 on an ashtray is good, you can practically blast somebody into being exactly what he is supposed to be, know, so that he doesn't even question it. Now of course, Tone 40 isn't yelling. It is simply the degree of intention you can put into some of it. It's the amount of intention. Now, you radiate that intention if you are expecting, if your expectancy is good. If your expectancy is bad, your expectancy is critical, if you get a lot of overts on somebody, something like that and so forth, he has some recognition of this, he senses this. But he might not sense it consciously, but he just knows that it doesn't quite communicate. Now your expectancy, you don't necessarily have to be a super saccharine ARC, theetie, you know, sweet and all this sort of thing. You don't have to be loud or haughty or anything of the sort, it's just your, the normal action, but your expectancy and what you say and so on can have a fantastic effect. Because it is incredible, you might not want to believe it.

There's somebody right now who is just being processed, I was reading their worksheet, not amongst you here, somebody who thinks I'm very angry with her, and it's rather pathetic and so forth that this is so reversed. It isn't even there at all, do you see, it isn't true, but she thinks it's true and that's enough to make it true as far as she is concerned. What she neglects to notice is that she committed an overt in the line which is pulling it in. So people can get funny ideas about what you're doing, but that is the negative side of it.

You, by running a positive line on it can overcome that whole thing. So when all else seems to be against it, you can still get through, you can still get through. You get through the least effectively when you yourself are sufficiently doubtful of the outcome to have to drop your tone, because there's nobody quite as an antagonistic person, he's very doubtful, unless it's an angry person. And the only person more doubtful than an angry person is a person who is afraid. They're full of doubt, they doubt the whole environment. "What is going to happen to me now?" And you actually can cut through all those emotional tones just by your own beingness.

If Christ ever drove any herd of swine over a cliff, and I'm surprised at him having overts on a herd of swine, if he ever did, if he ever existed, which is, has some doubt with it. So many people were crucified in Roman times and for other reasons on the track, is they very easily think they must have been Christ. If you run it out they find out that they were crucified two hundred years afterwards and a hundred years before, and so on, and it looked pretty good. And a lot of people have been crucified on the track for having espoused reasons which were not quite those of the established authority. So, he might or might not have existed, but if he did, but if he did, that would be the technique he was using, that'd be the mysterious technique. One wouldn't quite believe it. Perhaps at some time or another somebody's going along the line on crutches and instead of saying, "You poor fellow, how I sympathize with you," if you suddenly said, "Walk," and he did, you'd probably drop your false teeth. But it can happen.

And to the degree that there's a little doubt mixed up in it, and to the degree that you realize that it is easy, that is the total trick. If you could cut down the amount of effort you were expending sufficiently, you could mock-up a planet. It's the smallness of the effort implied and the largeness of the postulate, not the largeness of the effort and the smallness of the postulate, or the loudness of the postulate, or making the postulate with your neck cords all swollen up. Now we are really talking into the, into the airy-fairy land when we're talking about this sort of thing. It has lots of ramifications, it would just be healing on sight, that sort of thing.

Now, whether it would do that fellow any good to all of a sudden have his body all of a sudden, or whether or not it would throw him into a mental shock and suddenly find out that he was walking and that something had hit him, or something had happened to him at that particular time, that's beside the point. It could happen. Now, this is not necessarily contrary to the person being causative, although you have made him a considerable effect, haven't you, but you have not made him a bad effect. So therefore is to that degree acceptable to him, so he can operate with that cause. Remember that it is you really who told the fellow to flap his hands and then ask him who was doing it. And then he eventually said, "I am," and he was when he said I am, but what started him?

It works just that way with the positive postulate if it's very successful. It's a matter of, "You are a staff member," not "What a lousy staff member you are." Well now, that has it's own thought, but you can just eradicate the second thought entirely and boost the R "you are a staff member" up, and you all of a sudden will build some very startling results which will occasionally amaze even you, because you still care to believe that your better tricks are incredible. So you can do those tricks without believing they are incredible at all, if you just do the tricks and not worry about them being incredible.

Now, once in a while you say woo, and nothing happened. So, nothing happened. So, nothing happened. Alright, great. That shouldn't stop you from saying woo. Now, a person who is failing, failing, failing, failing, failing, usually sets himself up to fail. He tries the impossible. "Let's see if I can postulate. Well here I am looking at the Empire State Building. Fall over. Didn't fall. Can't postulate. Proved it." So what you set yourself up to do is to succeed in this like, but there isn't any worry about it. You see, if you were worrying about whether you were going to succeed or going to fail, there would already be doubt in the postulate and it wouldn't work anyway, so just don't bother to worry about it one way or the other, don't worry about success or failure. But it's a terrific, terrifically strong weapon. It's big, it's much bigger than you think.

You are in the business of handling people, you have to get their cooperation, the only thing which justifies the fact that you should get their cooperation and so forth is they really would be better for it. Nobody's trying to do them in, their morale depends exclusively on whether or not they respect themselves in their own eyes, and that depends exclusively on whether or not they can produce. And the cycles of action which they engage in and complete and finish without a bad conscience, determines their morale and their usefulness. There is nothing quite as pathetic in this universe as a useless man. Not all the soda fountains or luxuries or swimming pools or anything else will ever handle morale to the degree of just good, honest production. And don't think that discipline will injure morale, as long as it does not contain injustice it builds it.

While you are working then, you have certain tools for handling the individual, work for the group then handle the individual, you build up the group by handling the individual, and the primary index that tells you whether or not you have succeeded as an Establishment Officer is the increase in quality and quantity of production and the absence of dev-T. It goes without saying that if you achieve this, it will only be because you have very cheerful, happy, high-toned staff members because they will only be cheerful and happy if they have achieved an increase in quality of production and quantity, and if they have reduced their own dev-T. So it is one of these things that pursues itself around in a circle.

And maybe other people may think that the best way to live is to go down in the Wallabee Isles and lie in the sun, chewing upon lotus leaves, but I've known a few people in the Wallabee Isles who have chewed upon lotus leaves, and they are the most decadent, caved in bums I have ever seen in my life. So maybe what they aspire to do is not necessarily what they would really like to do. Their retreat to the Gullaby Isles, or the Wallabee Isles, is simply some thought that they really wouldn't be able to make it in any kind of a competitive group, because they don't think they could produce.

Now, I'm not telling you all of these things just from the point of view of having tricks. They aren't tricks, they're basic fundamentals because we are in actual fact very sincere about it. We are depending on you to a degree you wouldn't believe. We're depending on you very, very heavily for the excellent reason that if we ever get the show on the road, planet around, it will only be because we have succeeded with organizational tech and have managed to get it in and get it functioning, and get cooperative staff work. That's why you exist, that's why I'm talking to you.

Thank you.