Remimeo
Sthil Staff

HCO POLICY LETTER OF NOVEMBER 17, AD14

HEALING OFFLINE AND OFFPOLICY

YOUR FULL IN BASKET
(HCO Sec. Hat Check on all Executives and send me a despatch
personally each time you have done so - I despatch per checkout)

These two data are paramount in handling Scientology Communication Lines and your
own In Basket.

1. The first duty of an executive is routing properly and seeing that others route
properly. If an executive does not do this, then the lines in his or her area will stack
up and become so tangled that nobody can follow them or get through them. This reduces
income and dissemination - producing traffic volume, and general effectiveness. By
"routing properly" is meant to see that everyone around them routes properly. Forwarding
something already improperly routed creates Dev-T and fails to handle misrouting where
it is occurring.

2. Know and make known policy. The first thought of an executive in handling a
despatch requiring a decision must be: "Is this already covered by planning or policy?"
If the executive knows existing policy he or she will find that 99% of despatches
"requiring decisions or solutions" are already cared for by policy and, the policy being
unknown or non-existent, only then requires "special handling." In short, if the matter
is (a) covered already by policy, (b) if the sender should know that policy, or (c) if
the first executive receiving the despatch knows policy, then the despatch should stop
right there. This leaves flowing only traffic where policy does not exist or despatches
about specialized matters.

The answer to put on a despatch demanding something already covered by policy is <u>not</u>
some unusual solution. The answer on the despatch should be of two kinds - (a) to a
person outside who would have no clue of policy, or (b) to somebody in an org who should
know policy. In the case where (a) originates a query, the proper answer is "Policy on
this is _____." In the case of (b) originating a query already covered by policy,
the answer is "Look up old (recent) policy on this."

To outside people, policy is largely unknown. Thus one has to look up the policy
or recall it to handle. But such seldom have questions needing subtle points and field
policy is very well known in orgs such as "Give them what we promised if it was promised."
"Keep entheta to a minimum" etc. etc. A simple "Sorry, it's against policy," is the
simplest (and usually best) solution to outside wild queries or ideas. Why explain?
You're not training a staff member.

Where a staff member is involved, it is expected he or she will know policy or can
look it up.

If an executive gives the despatch querying for policy an "unusual solution" where
policy already exists, then a problem will occur as this solution will clash with the
<u>other</u> existing policy and the staff member goes spinning off to no-policy no-org. And
the organization eventually becomes paralyzed. Any org that has an executive who doesn't
keep up with policy and general planning and who is always replying to queries with
unusual solutions of his own will soon find its income dropping out the bottom as it's
being stuck on the track with counter-solutions. Soon, nobody will know what policy is,
so in disagreement the org disintegrates. It is no longer an org - only a bunch of
individuals working at cross purposes.

MISROUTING

Routing consists of forwarding a <u>proper</u> communication to its proper destination or,
more pertinent to an executive indicating how types of despatches are routed to staff
members who route org despatches

Misrouting would be misrouting indeed if one forwarded an improper despatch to any-
one else and failed to shoot it back to its originator.

An improper despatch is one which hasn't any business on the lines. This is the
soul of Dev-T (developed Traffic) - the forwarding of improper despatches. One can for-
ward all the proper despatches in the world without causing Dev-T. The moment one for-
wards an improper despatch <u>to anyone but the originator</u>, one has involved other terminals
and blocked their lines too.

When you forward a despatch which should never have been written you become a party
to the original Dev-T. Because the despatch is improper it will do nothing but snarl up
In baskets all the way along the line. The ONLY correct action is to send it to the
originator as improper.

IMPROPER

By improper we don't mean insulting or obscene. We mean:

(a) Has nothing to do with the person to whom it is sent or forwarded to, or
(b) Is already covered by policy which should be known to the originator or the
forwarding person.

Under (a) we get nonsense despatches, despatches to the wrong people, obvkous lies,
"everybody says" despatches, despatches calculated only to make trouble, useless entheta
and so on.

Under (b) we have (A-Ha discovered!) the staff member who is ignorant of what's
going on or what policies cover his or her post. We reasonably expect that, let us say,
a Registrar has read those policies, old and new, that cover registration. From a general
staff member we expect general planning to be at least known as general policy letters
all go into his or her basket and so have been available.

OFFLINE

A despatch is offline when it is sent to the wrong person.

OFFPOLICY

A despatch is offpolicy when originated by or forwarded by someone who should know
that the matter is already covered by policy.

DEV-T

Traffic is developed (developed traffic, Dev-T) by originating or forwarding an off-
line or offpolicy despatch to anyone but the sender. This may seem obscure when we say
a person originating an offpolicy despatch should not send it to anyone but the sender -
i.e. himself. He has the policy letters and general planning just as available to him-
self as they are to anyone in Scientology orgs. So querying by despatch about a policy
that can be looked up is just being too lazy to look it up, isn't it? And putting the
load on one's seniors to do one's own work.

When you forward an offpolicy despatch to anyone but the sender, you, if you're
an executive:

(a) Involve other lines and
(b) Fail to take the opportunity to spot a staff member weak on policy.

Your duty as an executive is to send the despatch to its source with orders to look
up policy on this. Your duty is not to quote policy. He or she (the originator) is
the one in mystery. Let the originator do the work. Nay, worse, prowl about that
person a bit and see how bad it is and order if needed a full check out of the person
on policy letters applying to his or her post. That's one's job as a senior executive.
Not being a computer for the org that turns out answers.

Those staff member who habitually forward queries or something adequately covered
in write ups of their own duties to others are DYNAMITE in an organization. The policy
on them has always been THEY LEARN THEIR JOB AND DO THEIR JOB OR THEY GO. We can't
afford them. They can cost us the whole organization, and in two or three cases
almost have.

They're too expensive when they don't learn their hats and general policy or push
their duties off on others. One of them in an org costs at least two additional staff
members to take care of their Dev-T and duties. Actual fact. Even where the Dev-T
doesn't blow up an org. I could not possibly exaggerate their dangerousness to an org,
fellow staff members and Scientology.

People who won't or can't learn policy or who continually alter it have not pro-
gressed case-wise to Level I. They cannot receive a comm so can't answer or respond
properly and they do awfully wild things. They never dig what we're at, so they create
a mess.

DUTIES OF AN EXECUTIVE

An executive keeps the organization on the road by getting people to get the job
done. He may also have his own work and does that too and probably works very hard at
it. But his organization duties are concerned mainly with enforcing proper routing
and making people learn and adhere to policy. If an executive won't do that his post
area or org is in a continual mess.

FLOODED IN BASKETS

All you have to do is look at an Executive's In Basket to know whether he or she is
performing his or her executive duties. Although he or she may empty it daily, if
there's much org traffic flowing through it you know at once that the person does not
properly handle offline or offpolicy despatches.

This executive may be working day and night on the In Basket. It's the volume of
org despatches that says the executive is not handling offline and offpolicy despatches
or who has not provided proper routing in his post area. Such an executive works him-

self or herself half to death and is still unable to get his people out of the red.

If the In Basket is merely stacked up, and isn't being handled at all, it tells us that this person simply doesn't do any job at all but is kidding people. In actual experience when we find a stacked up, unmoving In Basket we also find (a) pretended busyness or (b) just plain no action on post or (c) outright lies. But these conditions cause an area of upset in the org because somebody else above or below that person on the org board is unable to get his job done because of that "camouflaged hole" (means post not filled but only appears to be, thus leaving a hole in the line up.) Such people always cause overwork by persons above or below them and are pretty dangerous to have around.

POLICY ON DEV-T

Our policy on finding an habitually full In Basket which never gets handled is to (a) attempt to get the person's hat on and if that fails (b) transfer them to a post they really can do and if they don't work there (c) dismiss. We don't ever add "processing" into our policy of handling such people as they are well below Zero and take too much work on them to make them useful.

Policy now regarding the executives who work hard but have fantastic staff despatch volume is (a) have them read this policy letter and if their volume doesn't reduce (b) hat check them on this policy letter and if their volume still doesn't fall to very little traffic (c) have them do the org board in clay, do Scientology orgs over the world in clay, do their post in clay and review all policy letters relating to their post and the org and planning in general.

The complaint is not that this executive isn't working. The complaint is that this executive is not putting his post area together and helping, through discipline of off-line, offpolicy despatches to put an organization there and put Scientology across over the world.

Such an executive, freed of the burden of handling offline and offpolicy despatches will begin to do hiw own work industriously, will come out of protest and begin to handle and disseminate Scientology and will cease to flood Scientology lines by forwarding offline and offpolicy despatches.

Further, the executive will also supply routing directions for his general traffic that brings about a smooth flow in his unit or department or org or continent.

SUMMARY

You never send further an offline or offpolicy despatch. You always route it back to the source, the staff member who sent it.

On an offline despatch you see to it that the source routes it properly whether it comes from above or below and that the originator of an offline despatch from below studies the org board. On this last you must also be sure the org board reflects the actuality of the real organization and is functioning. When you skip doing that you can't of course get offline routing cured as there isn't a visible line. Nobody has put the org board there to be known. Hence, lots of offline despatches.

On offpolicy despatches, you yourself must be familiar with policy in order to tell if something is covered by policy. In order to get somebody to follow policy you must of course be sure that the policy is available and that you have done everything you could to help get policy easily found and known. Time spent on the study of policy is very well spent. And when I ask for clarification of or existing policies in your area you should give that top priority as you won't be able to do your job unless you help on policy when needed. And the way to help on policy is to write up all the policies for your hat or area and send them to me if I ask for them so I can review and publish them. A group cannot function at all without agreed upon policy and of course it can never grow. It's In Baskets get too full. There's no way to get a post filled and working. There's no real comm, only Dev-T. The resulting confusion stops any expansion. So the org stays tiny and works madly and stays poor. No policy. All Dev-T. Each person present wears all the hats and also wear them all differently. That's not an org. It's a bunch of auditors pooling their confusions.

We are suckers for origination acceptance. Being trained auditors we are conditioned to letting people originate. But that's in session. You're not auditing when you're an executive. An improper despatch is actually not an origin at all. It's a confession that one isn't on staff or should be trained to come on staff. Such a "staff member" is still a field auditor knocking around in the org if he doesn't know policy. Critical, blundering, creating Dev-T, fouling up lines. Pretty grim. An executive's job is first to put an org there by providing comm lines amongst the group and from the org to public and public to org. That's the first, the very first responsibility of an executive whether Assn Sec or PE Director or D of T or any executive.

ROUTING

When routing arrangements are made _inside_ the org - from staff member to staff member - we call it ORGANIZING.

When routing arrangements are made or communication invited from org to public and public to org we call it PROMOTION.

The executive duties of an executive are primarily concerned then, with ORGANIZING and PROMOTION and seeing that the arranged actions are executed.

Having put the lines there, the executive must see that they truly exist and go on existing. We call this "getting people's hats on" and "keeping people's hats on" inside the org, and public to org and org to public we call "making sure promotion is executed."

The bulk of any executive's job is seeing that things are _executed_. Seeing that lines are followed, policy followed, promotion carried out. Even the D of T making sure students are taught only straight technology, is executing policy. The D of P seeing that pcs get gains, is really only following policy and _making sure it is followed_.

For a very senior executive to actually forward further on a query he has received from a staff member the answer to which is already covered by policy is a _very_ serious thing. Why? Because the action says this senior executive doesn't know policy, or at the verly least isn't putting on the hats of his staff members and juniors and so hasn't got a functioning org.

For a very senior executive to forward an already misrouted despatch is a confession of the most gross ignorance of his or her own org board.

HARD WORK

It is not saintly then for an executive to merely work hard. In fact, where that work is mainly invested in handling the In Basket, the hard work is just causing hard work in other places too. It is quite stupid to get tied down to an In Basket full of staff despatches. The _only_ way this can happen (countless staff queries or infos) is by failing to spot offline and offpolicy despatches and return them to source, saying "Misrouted. See Org Board." for offline. Or saying for offpolicy, "Policy already exists on this. Look it up, please." or saying "This is contrary to general planning. Please look up recent policy letters."

MAKE THEM WORK

The surest cure for such floods of despatches is _always_ to make the source work harder because he or she goofed by sending an offline or offpolicy despatch.

Some offline offpolicy despatches are originated out of pure laziness. "Takes too long to look it up, I'll ask the HCO Sec" is the usual line of thought. The poor HCO Sec, already too overworked to look up policy, gives in desperation an unusual solution. This really messes it up. The solution given can only be as good as the data offered and if that data is wrong, the solution is very wrong, and as the query originated in laziness it is probably wrong in data and so _any_ effort to answer it at all will only louse things up.

Hence, it is contrary to the best interests of the org to give the source the proper routing for offline despatches. If you do, you don't handle the real trouble - the staff member doesn't know it's an org yet and so will not be able to do his or her job. You _must_ get that staff member familiar with the org board or you'll have betrayed the org. You see, _other_ staff members also suffer with the offline originations from this person. And as an executive you aren't protecting your own people from offline origins if you don't handle the person doing it when spotted. Cure it and you help not just your In Basket - you'll take a very heavy load off other staff members too. You see, yours isn't the only In Basket in the org, and if you are an executive you're the one who _must_ handle the routing for only you have the immediate authority to do so. Expansion depends chiefly on your taking that action.

On _offpolicy despatches_, by which we mean the staff member doesn't know his policy and so does things contrary to it or wants to know if it is policy, why should _you_ study up your policy letters? You are probably fairly well up on them. The person who isn't is the source of that despatch. So you _must make sure that that_ person gets industrious on the subject of policy and burns _some midnight oil on_ old and _new policies_ and general planning.

So again, by your looking it all up for the offender, you cripple your organization by leaving uncared for an area in it that will goof. And that staff member's goof can destroy the whole org! That's no exaggeration.

Why are you working so hard as an executive to put the org there and make it grow if there aren't elements around that are destroying it? If there were no such elements your

Org would just grow and all your work would be promotional or service. That you are always continuously creating your department, unit or org or defending it somehow means there must be something knocking it down. The symptom of that something is the offline or offpolicy despatch.

For you to be totally effective you yourself must know routing (the org board) and know policy and the general planning in progress.

And for an org board to be known it must exist and be real and must say what departments, units and staff members do.

And for policy to be known it must exist and be findable.

To make minor changes on an org board and double assign (2 or more hats to one person) is quite usual in an org. To make major changes such as Adcomm in Charge of HCO or training done by the Accounts Unit would be a gross violation of policy. And so your org board must to that degree be a standard org board. But you still have to do routing on it and provide routing for it.

To invent policies or supplement policies without sending them through channels as completed staff work (which means routed to the board, with all related policy letters clipped to the requested change and the new policy letter all written ready for issue) will break down the Scientology lines in that area.

You don't believe it? Australia got into its whole enquiry mess because the senior executives either did not know or follow the long standing policy concerning the prompt return of money to a dissatisfied pc. That cost the org thousands and thousands, a year of grief, and risked getting Scientology banned in Australia. A policy not known or altered is death. Not from me but from the community in which the org operates.

Still don't believe it? Washington D.C. either did not know or did not follow the explicit policy concerning receiving favours from preclears but only half-heartedly reported them to an uninformed HCO which didn't know or didn't follow the full intent and spirit of the policy and never told me as was implied in the original policy letter. The wife of that person giving favours brought on the whole FDA mess that cost us tens of thousands and two years of grief and almost knocked out Scientology in the U.S.

Policy is survival for a group.

ONLY PRACTICAL POLICY AGREED UPON AND FOLLOWED PROVIDES THE ARC THAT IS THE LIFE ITSELF OF ANY GROUP. It's the mores, the policies whatever you want to call them that makes a group or an organization alive and breathing.

Bad policy, bad mores, and you have dying group, a dying organization. Governments whose policies are unreal are perishing. They act like criminals. There's where anyone gets his distaste for "policy" - he has looked at the policies of dying groups and is imitating how they are regarded.

But as in control there is good control and "bad control" so in policy there is good policy and bad policy. It has a bad name with some people. It bores them. They also kill groups. So if your organization is going to live it must have real, living policy and respect it and use it.

All right, so we're serious now. Org boards and policies must exist and be followed and the person who makes sure of that is a Scientology executive.

The clue to violations is the continuously full In Basket, whether moving or not. If an executive's In Basket is always full, then he or she either isn't (a) working at all or (b) is working like mad but is not handling offline or offpolicy despatches by getting the lines in and the policy known.

You can't escape it, there it is.

There is nothing wrong with working hard as an executive. I do. There is nothing wrong with having lots of traffic through an In Basket. A busy org does. There is everything wrong with an executive having a lot of staff traffic because 99% of it is offline and offpolicy and if you don't act to correct it you not only don't have time to breathe, you also will wind up with no income and no org.

Fact.

LRH:jw.pv
Copyright (c) 1964
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD