

REVISION OF THE PRODUCT/ORG SYSTEM - Part I

A lecture given on
5 March 1972

OK. This is the fifth of March AD22 and Establishment Officer lecture number five. I'm lecturing to you on the basis of a very upstage, highly advanced, graduate level. Undoubtedly, some hearing these lectures will get disestablished by saying, "My god, I didn't realize there was that much to it," or, "What are all those heavy big words, like is?"

The day an Establishment Officer comes on post fully trained will probably never arrive because I am still learning about establishment after twenty-two years in Dianetics and Scientology organizations, and I haven't quite counted up how many years on the track. There have been some very fancy org boards, there have been some very fancy organizations, there have been several systems, several billion systems, several infinities of systems of organization. And the Scientology organization, as you can read in a policy letter, was taken from one of the better planetary, interplanetary organizations, which as far as I know is still running. And its basis was mind, body, product.

Now, the question will be asked at once, "How does the Establishment Officer system fit into the Product/Org Officer system? Well, it fits in very, very easily. If you change Org Officer to Program Officer and if you change HAS to Establishment Officer throughout the series, and possibly some minor change in lines, why, you will have a conversion of the system. It is a conversion mainly then of title, but the concentration of function has not, in actual fact, varied. When I first started out with the Product/Org Officer system, I piloted it myself, I found immediately having gotten out the product, that I had in my hands a program; the one-two. Trying to get out that product resulted in a program, thinking about getting out a product in the future resulted in a program, and these programs both required a formal investigation, by me. Not "Appoint a board of investigation to discover!" no, no, no, no. And not by asking a lot of people, but with the eye. In other words look, don't listen, and find the why, and that would turn into a program.

Well, that program required a certain amount of execution. The programs were not always feasible and a program takes longer to get out than a product. The speed of establishment necessary to accomplish a program always exceeds the hope of the Product Officer. The Product Officer looks it over and he's, he's now, he's set a target of some kind or another and he wants some this or that, he wants this new course started and so on, and he looks it over and sees what he's got to get, and therefore he will turn out some sort of a program. He's got a new course that of course has to have a supervisor and has to have packs, and it has to have promotion and it has to have maybe a tour, and it has to have this and it has to have that, and it has to have an opening date, that sort of thing. You see? Ratta-tat-tat. And it's got to have somebody sign them up who won't say, "Oh, you're here to sign up for the new course? Yeah, well, what do you know? I guess I'll have to ask somebody," and so on, "It's alright."

Do you believe that a registrar could exist who forgot to take the people's money? It just happened in Auckland, that's why Auckland was going broke. So you see, if he says it has to be registrared, the Product Officer, why that would mean that the registration of the course was not just simply to get a blank, that person would have to be genned in. And little gen-ins like talk to the person, "Here is a flier for the course, it tells what it is, here's the information about the course and here is the cost of the course." We just started a course and nobody had set its cost yet, for instance. "And here is what you do and here is the hat relating to interviews and you take the money." Show you how daffy this can get, you said, "The registrar can invoice the money received," see, intention; because we found out in London after they were signed up if they weren't invoiced, huge piles of sign-ups accumulated at the cashier, some of them as much as a year old. The person had left the registration office, but had never arrived at the cashier's office for some reason or another, and the cashier either

wasn't there, wasn't on post or there was no cashier, and so all of their business was falling between these two posts.

So, we remembered in the earliest days that the registrar always did write up her invoice with her cash and so on, and then turn this over into the cashier. The policy letter was unfortunately headed "Registrar Invoices" so do you know what happened? I just got a horrible suspicion when I looked at this. This was one of these things where you do an investigation by flare. That is to say, the obvious answer to make this situation would be this goofiness, and you hit these every once in a while. Now, be careful because you can also, don't get drunk with your godliness on this, because you can also be wrong, but in this and many other cases, these are very right. And I said, "My god, they have dumped all registration, all invoicing and all money handling and balancing, on registrars. I'll just bet you this is the case." And we instantly put it out on the telex lines and looked over and so forth, aaaah, it's true. They had taken the cashier off post because "the registrar invoiced now." The registrar was invoicing books, mail, the registrar was writing all invoices that were written by the whole org and was taking in the money, was balancing it up. So, complete nuttinesses can occur that you don't believe. So when the Product Officer says, "And register the course," where does the Establishment Officer fit? Now, that means you've got to have a hatted registrar.

Now, there was this sad fellow one time who was found hanging himself and he was a former Establishment Officer who was reasonable. That would be the most deadly flaw that an Establishment Officer could have, "be reasonable." Next to it would be a deadly flaw of "take somebody's explanation." I have heard all the explanations I ever care to hear, and do you know, I look forward to the day when a correct one is given me. You know, I have never had a correct explanation from a staff member why this thing wasn't working? It's almost uniform, they almost always have the wrong reason, and that's why it doesn't correct. Now let's go over into auditing tech and we know that if the person doesn't have the right problem, it won't resolve. So they're usually trying to solve the wrong problem. Well, that applies to every staff member there is. If he has a problem on his post, it is not the problem he has on his post, or it would not be a problem. Do you follow? It has to be a false problem for the thing to persist. So the right why is another way of saying "the correct problem" or "the correct reason."

So as we look down the line we find the Product/Org Officer/HAS line-up was frail just to this degree. But it doesn't take long to write up and even to do an investigation; although if you do a wrong investigation it can take six or eight months of re-doing the investigation and re-doing it and re-doing it and re-doing it until you really do get the right why, and that can happen to the best; but it doesn't take long, proportionately speaking. Now, it is easier to demand the product than it is to get the program bits executed that will give you the product. Now, it is easier to demand the program bits of the program than it is to establish in the MEST universe. Many thetans disagree with this, that is to say they disagree with this idea, and you'll find this quite prevalent, it extends all over the place in other words. The guy says, "Well, why can't I just sort of make a postulate and there it is?" Well, that is the way that made the MEST universe and that is perfectly true, but working in the MEST universe there is amount of time involved, there's preparation, there is construction. But a thetan will hang up on this. So he says, "Well, bop, and therefore that'll materialize," see? "Eight thousand dollar GI, bop," it just ought to materialize. And almost no one ever estimates the amount of programming and organization it requires to get an eight thousand dollar GI. So look at these, look at these, the quick postulate of the product followed by the slower, but nevertheless fairly rapid one-two-three-four of getting the program in for that particular thing.

His idea of demanding the product is he wants it far sooner than it can be accomplished, and the demand of the program checker is he is demanding it far sooner than it could be gotten, and he is demanding it through other actions in progress, routine post duties and dev-T. And a wrong program will itself generate dev-T, so getting the program actually accomplished is sufficiently arduous and sufficiently difficult from the viewpoint of establishment, that you very often get not done and half done. There's a PI on this. "Not done. Half done and

Backlogs.” The not-dones and the half-dones will result in a backlog, and the backlog kicks their brains in because it serves as dev-T to all fresh traffic. So the system, the Product/Org Officer system, had these frailties. But it was very, very easy to demand the product, to do the investigation and to write up a program.

Now, it required a considerable longer period of time to check out that exact program and run around and see everybody and get all that, those point in. That’d be the Org Officer now would be the deputy, he’s the Program Officer, and trying to get those points in and complied with will usually wind up in the lap of, usually the Org Officer wound it up in the lap of the HAS. And the HAS just had Org Officer around his neck and he looked like one of these statues where this ancient mythological family had, was attacked by snakes and there were just snakes all over the place, and boom, boom, boom, and they sort of went bonkers. So, it wasn’t posted in proportion to the amount of work necessary. Just that. It made overloads. In other words, the Product Officer could very easily overload the Org Officer. “And get this fixed and get that fixed, you got that now? Oh, that’s fine.” And the Org Officer says, “OK,” and he runs at a dead, flat out run. Well, the fact that the Product Officer is running made the Org Officer sprint like a racehorse. Now these guys, the Org Officer doing that, had to get establishment out of an HAS who was already swamped, backlogged, routine duties, so on, gone dog. You see what was, what was essentially wrong, all that was wrong is that the system was imbalanced.

Now, the Product Officer could very easily have his hat ripped off then by getting interiorized into organization, make-do, other things, and a great many things are demanded of a person who is the head of something that are not necessarily product at all. Oh, he has social things and he’s got this and that and the other thing, he’s got administrative lines, he has in-basket trouble and he’s got seniors way up the line are saying, “Why in hell, wrong why, wrong why,” you know, something like that. He’s got to handle that and so he really doesn’t have too much of a purity of duty, his duty is very colored by all kinds of other things hitting him. He needs in actual fact a yeoman, if you wanted to go into a large org, he needs a CO’s secretary, receptionist to handle his traffic, shake the dev-T out of it, get it in some kind of order, keep his day and tell people about appointments and things of that character. He needs a deputy to keep the yeoman or secretary’s hat on, keep that straightened out. It’s really a sort of an interesting situation that I see by experience whereas the deputy keeps this guy hatted, keeps the yeoman hatted; doesn’t use him, but just makes sure that traffic handles right. Do you see? And just by that fact alone his own job is enormously lightened. So this permits then a Product Officer to do an enormous amount of evaluation.

Now you say, “Well, evaluation is really an I and R department three action.” No, it is not. It is a top flight action because he who does not evaluate will not be able to plan, and an org is running on that fellow’s plans. If you are not in possession of fantastic quantities of information, you cannot evaluate. If you cannot evaluate, god help you, you cannot plan. So therefore the Product Officer, if he has an idea of just sitting in one place in an org, he’d better disabuse himself of it. Now, if he had enough runners and if he had enough aides or assistants or something like that to dig up this fact and dig up that fact, he might not have to run around, but orgs aren’t, at this stage of the game blessed with such a system.

What, what then does the Program Officer do, that is, the deputy? The deputy is administrative and lines. Do you see? Program. The Product Officer’s lines, the administrative functions of, and getting the program executed. Now, that in itself is an interesting trick. All programs should be published. They start with an evaluation, then they’ve got a handling and that plan is incorporated into a program. Data Series 23 and 24 give you the layout. It isn’t just a stylized layout, you skip some point of this layout, why, you hang yourself. Alright.

Copy, mimeographed copy of this, if you don’t get it around to the staff, they don’t know what you’re doing. It gives them the existing scene. So, you’ve got a folder and a mimeographed copy of that is on the left hand inside cover of this folder, and it’s marked “master” and the program hits target by target by target, are put into that folder. This folder

is marked "ED woof-woof AOLA" see, something like that. There is the side yellow tab that comes out. And the bits as they're finished go into that. Now, if the Product Officer is running somewhat single-handing, he would get that folder every time one of those targets was done. That would be put, handed to him by his deputy. Targets done, it's all CSWed; that's finished, checked, inspected, done; and it's marked over here on the little lines you see going out and it says done, alright, and it's in the folder. Now, you accumulate those things up and you get the whole thing. If he's rather suspicious of things he keeps! and see how little, in other words it's a sort of a progress report, you know?! And if the organization were running very, very well, he would simply get the one folder with all the papers in it, all targets done, bang. And that would be a very ideal!

The technique by which this is done and how these things are nudged, is contained in the LRH Comm checksheets, and the LRH Comm checksheets would be the deputy's bible by which he would go.

! musical chairs, but it may be desperate but it won't be anywhere near as desperate if you musical chair this thing to get it done. And now it will get desperate. "Oh yes, we met the target today, yes, we did today," but tomorrow the cost of making that target was disestablishment left, right, upside and down. So you have to hold the form of the org in spite of it.

Now, one of the sorriest things that you'll run into will be personnel; where to get personnel from, that is always the toughest one because when HCO was not getting new personnel, the org could only expand by musical chairs. So you will find then that the deputy Product Officer, the deputy C/O, the deputy Treasury Sec, the deputy Tech Sec, so forth, he will only be able to expand by musical chairing unless there is a personnel pool. You say, "Well yes, it's very costly to keep that many personnel hanging around and so forth and so forth." Oh, it may costly and finance may point it out to you as costly, but let me assure you it costs a hundred times as much not to have them. They didn't train auditors in the PAC area and didn't train auditors in the PAC area and didn't train auditors in the PAC area, and you put auditors on for training in the PAC area and they were ripped off for a personnel pool, and they didn't train auditors and they didn't train auditors. And then what do you hear? People talking about, well, they haven't got enough people and that costs too much and that sort of thing. But now what do you hear?

The cost of non-Sea Org auditors is so prohibitive as to have doubled the FP of the existing PAC SO orgs, and is destroying them. Now exactly how, in the name of god, did they get into that? That was just never putting out enough personnel on recruiting, and giving recruiting trained staff member or trained Sea Org member enough attention as a product. So the Product Officer has always got a target of trained staff members, trained Sea Org members. And when you see their orders you will see that that is one of their product targets. You say well that's naturally establishment. No, it isn't; no, it is a legitimate product, it's a valuable product.

Now, you could shift around a little bit and purify it and so on and say it isn't quite pure; well when it isn't, why, you're in trouble. So the Establishment Officer will mainly get in trouble over the subject of personnel. Now, there's a population explosion going on and I wish to Christ somebody would inform me how men are far scarcer in 1972 than I ever found them in 325 B.C. How could they expend them back then? I remember around the turn of the millennia and so on, there were just mobs unemployed. Well, right now they keep them all that way with relief and dough and this and that and the other thing, and they've got some workable scheme or another. One of the silly ones which you hear, we did a survey, we did a survey on people, what they liked and so on, just a general survey in the Scandinavian area, and we found what they liked best was welfare and what they hated most was taxes. Oh, brother. Outpoint to end all outpoints. But that was the result of surveys in three countries, conducted by different people and repeated and confirmed.

In other words, the whole population is living in a gorgeous outpost. They hate taxes and they love welfare. Craziest thing you ever heard of. How are you going to have welfare without taxes? You can't do it. Nobody's solved it today, not even the genius Keanes, and certainly not the lamebrains in charge of some of these areas, not necessarily Scandinavia. I'm sure somebody could figure it out, I could figure it out, I have figured it out.

I tackled it one day as a problem, found out the why just from that outpost. It really wouldn't matter how much money a government issued, providing everyone it paid was producing facilities to produce. Now, if it's got to have a huge welfare area, it shouldn't have any welfare area at all, it ought to be not public works as formerly described, and back in the Italian Renaissance and so on they always described public works as "you mustn't produce anything productive." Franklin Delano Roosevelt had that idea too, "don't build anything that's productive." It's actually stated in his speeches and his orders and so forth. A sure way to accomplish inflation. The amount of money in the country exceeds the amount of things there is to buy, that's inflation. When the amount of products in the country exceed the amount of money there is to buy things, that's deflation. Upsets, both of them upset the economic field. There's policy letters on this if you have a further interest in it.

But, what I'm talking about is they could give away money like confetti in a government, providing everybody they gave it to was providing production facilities, new production facilities. Supposing they were running around putting an atomic pile in at every thousand square miles in America; supposing they were putting express highways and rail and transport lines, harbor facilities; and supposing they were putting in raw material development areas where they could raw material in a hurry; supposing that was what the government money was spent on, spent on, spent on, spent on.! It can be solved because the country would be issuing money in double handfuls, but it would also be producing in same proportion, because somebody would have put in the basic production facilities. Do you follow?

But the basic, basic production facilities, now all of that may be very upstairs and esoteric and political, but the main, the main thing that you've got to keep your eye on is that you don't invest in non-productive personnel. And that way all of your personnel problems will solve. Just don't do it. You are not a welfare state. Now, that sounds very hard-boiled but look, the welfare state punishes actively, I don't say penalizes, but punishes actively every producer. It fines him for producing. He's making money left and right so they take it away from him and give it to somebody who isn't working. Ooo, that's a weird system when you get right down to it. In other words, neglect the guy who is working and hand it all to the downstat. The cave in of any society begins with the reward of a downstat. It's just a way of life. If you keep on rewarding downstats, you'll get just exactly what you continuously reward, you'll get downstats and the stats will go down, and the producing members of the activity will disappear because they will be too heavily overloaded. So remember that when you award a downstat, you are penalizing an upstat inevitably and invariably.

You go down the street and you give some coins to a beggar, fine, fine, it does something for your soul and so on, that's perfectly alright. But for godsakes leave it at that. Now, this sounds very uncharitable, but my experience with downstats is they're trying to be, they're trying to do themselves in. And that isn't my explanation for it or justification for it, because I found out that if a guy is down and down on his luck and you give him a leg up or something like that, why, he'll make it. But the professional downstat won't. I'm an expert at this, I'm an expert at this, I'm giving you advice which I violate all the time. I almost caused a riot once in Peking distributing coins to beggars. Damn near lost my life in the process, too. And I'll always give a guy three breaks and so forth. But recognize it for what it is, it's a frailty. But I never want to overlook the one guy who will make it, and never want to overlook the guy who's had a bad break because this universe can give a guy bad breaks. So there is no harsh, tough line asserted here, it's, you'll make the mistake yourself. Please don't continue to make it.

You know, if you're right more often than you are wrong, you will be a success, that's for sure. And don't think that you will ever run a perfect score in all directions, you won't. That's one of these impossible targets. Absolutes are unobtainable. Perfection, god almighty, it's like art, the formula for art. The fellow can go on and go on and go on trying to make a perfect picture and he's forgotten that art simply is an assistance to communication. The point where it communicates is the point where it's finished. Oh, you can fancy it up, you can go beyond that point.

A lot of our promo falls far short of being able to communicate. I was just looking with horror at a little batch of promo from an org that is doing very well and I'm about to rap their knuckles until they're raw. The copy writing on it is ghastly. They have a message to deliver in each of these pieces of promotion which is obscured in the small print. There's everything on this to attract attention except the message. Interesting, huh? The thing is just absolutely swamped in all kinds of text which doesn't mean anything at all, and if the fellow read clear down to the end and looked in the middle of a long paragraph, he might find the message in there somewhere.

So you, in your turn, you're grooving up somebody, you're grooving up somebody, you're grooving up somebody, and you're striving for perfection. Alright. At what point does it become functional? That's what you've got to determine, not at what point does it become perfect. And that is something which you really should remember, and will save you a lot of heart breaks.

So, with downstats you've got to realize that at some point you have tried, and the try is over. And that is determined on whether or not there has been marked improvement. If there hasn't been improvement,!

! that you see out here are the sharpest cats you ever wanted to see in this particular direction. They're trained on tone scale, they're trained on observation and they know every man, woman and child on the ship. And you ought to see one of them kick another one in the ankle when all of a sudden they don't know that there's been a post change someplace. In other words, they're right up with it. Why? Because they're always being asked to check up, to check up; that's when I'm handling personnel; check up, check up, check up. Personnel falls down by not having adequate records.

The best record in the world is your skull. Paper will never substitute for a bear trap memory. "Oh yeah, I know the guys in 1932! yeah," way back, see, bullpen data, bullpen data.

That's what it takes for personnel. You start going over personnel records and you say so-and-so and so-and-so and it's a so-and-so and it's a this and that, and this guy was so-and-so and now we've got this fellow so-and-so and we've got this fellow so-and-so. For instance, I've just made an appointment right now which is a risky appointment, I will remember that I have made a risky appointment, I'll be checking up on it within four or five days. I'll be checking up on it with the Establishment Officer in charge of that, also. How well does he hat, how well does he hat, how well does he hat? And he's going someplace else if he doesn't hat well because it's a risky appointment. Do you get it?

Personnel actually requires voluminous files. A Personnel Officer who doesn't know all the posts of the org and doesn't know all there is to know about every person in that org, will fail just like that because he can't make sensible appointments. He doesn't know what he's appointing the person to and he doesn't know who he's appointing to it. Those are the two things you have to know; who are you appointing to it and to what is that person being appointed to. See? That's what you have to know and you have to keep yourself briefed, briefed, briefed, briefed, briefed. I read, for instance, I read mission debriefs. It's not always true, but you go through some of these debriefs, I haven't been doing it recently, I mean I'm in an overwhelm on it. We've just had tons of observation missions out and we have got about a half a foot stack of observation missions. I've got about a two or three foot stack of

personnel missions and so forth of data, and I have not had time to go over that. It's not much of a backlog, it's just a few days.

I've got to go over all that, but the reason why I'm going over all of the observation of an area, because I've got to get some kind of an operating plan together. But I sent the mission out to get enough observation on so that an operating plan can be put together for. You see, that's data, observation, observation, observation. But along with this went personnel missions, ethics missions, that sort of thing. You get all kinds of records and so on, who exists in these areas, what are they all about, and out of that combined set of stuff, why, enough data will emerge that we will all of a sudden be able to put a plan together that is in keeping with the resources. What's the resources? It's the people we've got in the area. Alright. That'll be, we mesh that, we'll be able to mesh the people we got, see, the observation, we have to get a plan that meshes the people we've got with the observation of the area so as to make it come out right. I got a why for the area, I've also got to go over the observations of the area to check that why. It's not enough for people to keep telling me so-and-so's no good, you see, as the why. "So-and-so's no good is the why, so-and-so's no good is the why." Those are just reports.

Now, I may get enough data coming in from enough sources which, when compared with the stats, might possibly compare to a so-and-so is no good. That might possibly come in on the cross hairs of the rifle, it may all come together alright. But at that moment it is a workable truth. But the CO of an org has just pulled a blooper the like of which I have never heard of and I would have thought he has been around long enough to know better, but there's been a person across my lines three times as a tiger, great big woolly striped tiger. Every time the stats went to hell or an org went to hell, this guy was in an executive position. Just by natural selection over two or three years, this name keeps dropping out every time the stats crash. The stats have just crashed and I find out he's put this person in as registrar. He must have rocks in his head, he must not know his business. That's what you suddenly say to yourself, "He must not know his business."

Now, let's analyze exactly what he doesn't know. He doesn't know the stats and the person. We grant that he knows the form of the org, but he doesn't know the stats of the person, he doesn't have bullpen information, he doesn't keep himself informed. One bad report, one fall on the head, oh to hell with it, that, skip it. But by the time this sort of thing starts counting up, alright so this guy had a bad break, alright, you can get an outpoint on it. Well, the org stayed there, it didn't disappear. But this sort of thing keeps coming up, and another one comes up, same name, and another one comes up, same name. Oh, to hell with it. So somebody sends in a personnel proposal and says, "Let us put Glutz in as," some post that can have an influence on an org, a bad influence on an org. No, not off this desk. I won't do anything, just beyond, "No." And I will get ahold of the list and I will go over all of the personnel that are available for the area and so forth, and again out of the bullpen I will have matched up this guy and it was up, and this guy and it was up, and this guy and it was! "Yeah, we'll put him in there."

Now, if you wanted to do a perfect job of this, you would have to watch stats continuously against personnel. And you have no business not watching stats, as an Establishment Officer, against the personnel for those stats, as an Establishment Officer. There were so many hours a week, I don't even know if it was so many hours a day, that the French Surret at a time when it was really an activity; it's nothing now, it's just a bunch of totalitarian bums, ever since the Nazis have been in there, the police force has stayed Nazi; but they, detectives of Paris, way back, nineteenth century, this was before they had all kinds of fingerprint systems and it was all done by computers and Interpol; those guys spent a certain amount of time every week going through all the criminals in Paris and any international criminals and anything known about them, and they were just simply walking encyclopedias. Now I'm not saying that you're a detective, I'm just, here is an analogous system, and you're not dealing with criminals, but it's an analogous thing.

You spend some time. Who is this guy? What has he been? What has he done? What is he doing? Who was mixed up with this flap? Why are we continuously patching it up, patching it up? Who is in that area? Now, who is in that area who's doing alright? Yeah, but you might be the Dissem Establishment Officer, it's none of your business. Oh yes it is, oh yes it is, because that person might be slid sideways right straight into your lap. Now, this savors of blacklisting, it savors of all kinds of nasty things. You're always willing to give the guy a break, but not to the point that he breaks your neck. Do you follow?

Now there is this, people change. You're in an operating perimeter now where people change and they change over the years; sometimes they don't, usually they do. And you would be, you would find it's quite remarkable, some of the changes; and you would be remarkable, it's remarkable how some of the tigers of yesteryear are big successes today. You'd be surprised, see? So changes occur, so you have to make an allowance for that, but when you make an allowance, look at the record. What's the current record? Do you see?

So, personnel, personnel, names; names, posts, stats; names, posts, stats; names, posts, stats. The Establishment Officer that doesn't go down and stand in front of the stat board once in a while and say, "Gee, look at this, nice set of stats. Who was that?" and, "Holy god, look at that. Who the hell is in that area?" And who doesn't, at an Establishment Officer conference, hear about the flap that is going on in Qual or Distribution or something and hear these names are associated with it. See? If he doesn't register this, if he hasn't got a running registry! Do you follow?

The amount of data which a thetan can record and remember is infinite. He doesn't even have to put it in pictures. And you don't have to be perfect at this, you can go along on a basis of just a general impression. But before you make a decision, confirm your impression, and then you will very seldom be wrong.

OK?

Thank you.

(Thank you, sir.)