BPI =   HCO BULLETIN OF SEPTEMBER 12th, AD9.

Programming

Dianetics and Scientology have never suffered from lack of programs. There have always been programs. And there will always be better programs and maybe for dissemination purposes, the PERFECT program.

But what happens to all these programs?

Alas, I found out the facts of this some years ago, and out of it came the organisational pattern which is working so splendidly in Central Orgs. But the facts that I found out had all to do with execution of programs.

We get a wonderful idea. Its a slayer. It will tear the tops right off the skyscrapers and send them in for a book. And months later we wonder what happened to this marvellous program.

Well I'll tell you what happened. Nobody did it.

Thats the swansong of almost every program that gets thought up. It was great but nobody did it...

And before you think I am being critical of all the Staffs, I'll give you the rest of my findings on this subject.

Programs didn't get done because everybody was so overloaded with what they were already doing that they didn't have a chance to start the new program no matter how good it was. Programs were already in the run. Many of these were so fundamental - such as sale of books or answering letters to incoming PCs and students - that nobody could start on the new program. And as a result the new program didn't get started no matter how marvellous it seemed to be.

The reason Executives used to keep pulling people off post all the time was this thing programming. The Executive had, he thought, a better idea or was trying to carry out an old idea. And to get it going he would draft the whole staff to do it and the basic programs would go begging.

Do you know that nearly every function of a Central Org. was at one time a brand new wonderful program? Well, it was. And this gradually sifting out of activities brought us to a rather final form with one more step to go and that step is programs, a Dept. of Programs. A Department which can carry through new or stunt programs without bringing the whole place in ruins by tearing everybody off their standard programs.

Programming is important enough to pay a lot of attention to. And there is a lot of gen about it. And the gen all adds up to no matter how many programs you have, each one consists of certain parts. And if you don't assemble those parts and run the program in an orderly fashiontlissit just won't spark off. These are some of the principles about programs. And you had better have them because your new HAS Co-Audit Course is a program and has to be done like a successful program. And your PCs are a program and have to be done like a program. If you don't know these facts of life, here they are:

Maxim One: Any idea no matter if badly executed is better than no idea at all.

Maxim Two: A program to be effective must be executed.

Maxim Three: A program put into action requires guidance.

Maxim Four: A program running without guidance will fail and is better left undone. If you haven't got the time to guide it, don't do it: Put more steam behind existing programs because it will flop.

Maxim Five: Any program requires some finance. Get the finance into sight before you start to fire, or have a very solid guarantee that the program will produce finance before you execute it.

Maxim Six: A program requires attention from somebody. An untended program that is everybodys child will become a juvenile delinquent.

Maxim Seven: The best program is the one that will reach the greatest number of dynamics and will do the greatest good on the greatest number of dynamics. And that, my people who want to become victims by going broke, includes dynamic one as well as dynamic four.

Maxim Eight: Programs must support themselves financially.

Maxim Nine: Programs must ACCUMULATE interest and bring in other assistance by virtue of the program interest alone or it will never grow.

Maxim Ten: A program is a bad program if it detracts from programs which are already moving successfully or distracts staff people or associates from work they are already doing. Doing that is adding up to successful execution of other programs.

Let us now take a squint at this all in one piece. Wrong example: We decide to run an Ad in the Hatmakers Weekly to attract people into the PE Course. We place the Ad. We forget the time this special course is to start. We have nobody there to answer the phone on enquiries as to the Course. We have nobody there to greet the people and make them feel at home when they arrive. We have nobody to instruct the Course. We get a bill for monies three weeks later that we can't pay.

Right example: We decide to hit the Hatmaker Trade as a source of PE. We rule out seven other programs in favor of this one. We have a staff meeting on it and gen everybody in on the existence of this program. We see that we have made a lot of money from Co-Audit enrollments and we earmark this to pay for the advert, for the salary of the person who will run the program. We appoint a special person to administer this program. When the advert. has been placed and appears, our person appointed to it goes on to it full time. Reception is genned again to send all Hatmaker calls to this person and to refer to this person all Hatmaker bodies. All persons who may also be acting as Reception are genned with this data. The person appointed doesn't sit back to wait for the business to come in. This person reaches for Hatmakers with letters and phone calls. This same person that has been contacted by the Hatmakers is then on deck the zero hour evening to greet them all and get them into their seats and make sure the instructor is there and to instruct it himself if no instructor appears. If the program is sweepingly successful in terms of new enrollees then we make sure we leave the person appointed for it in the first place right on duty pushing Hatmakers into the PE. And we have a program. And it was successful. And we got somewhere.

A pitiful wrong example of the above was when I was running the first AmCollege PE as the experimental set-up some years ago. We started to get in Longshoremen by the squad. And they brought in other Longshoremen. The person in charge thought Longshoremen were low cast and tried to get intellectuals instead, thus switching off the program. You never saw a program dwindle quite so fast as the Longshoremen did. The correct action would have been to notice that Longshoremen were responding heavily and to put _ somebody maybe even out of their ranks onto the payroll to pressure away at Longshoremen. A million pound program was let go up in a puff of nowhere.

A wonderfully right example is the D of P staff auditor set up of a Central Org. That was once just a program. It prospered. Its still with us. Every Field Auditor looks at it with envy and snarls and tries to copy it. But he doesn't program. He is doing everything else in the shop. He can't program a special clinic drill with his attention everywhere at once. Its now thoroughly against the law in a Central Org. to let a D of P take preclears. Thats how far it goes. And we get wonderful results and all is well and the only squawks you hear about HGCs are from pure green-eyed jealousy or maybe an occasional real goof that the Central Org. jumped on days before anybody else did.

Programming requires execution. It requires carry-through. It requires judgement enough to know a good program and carry it on and on and to recognize a bad one and drop it like hot bricks.

There's nothing wrong with the will to do amongst Scientologists.. Now let's see if we can't up dissemination by adherence to good, steady programming that wins.

L. RON HUBBARD.