

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 16 APRIL AD15
Issue III
Gen Non-Remimeo
REISSUED 24 DECEMBER 1978
CORRECTED AND REISSUED 14 OCTOBER 1985

(Correction in this type style)

(Cancels HCO PL 16 Apr. 65RA, Issue III,
ALL DIVISIONS)

ALL DIVISIONS

HANDLING THE PUBLIC INDIVIDUAL

We have learned the hard way that an individual from the public must *never* be asked to DECIDE or CHOOSE.

Examining experiences we have had, I finally saw there was a hidden datum we had not been aware of in our orgs and particularly in handling the public. I finally dug it up and here it is:

TO DECIDE ONE HAS TO UNDERSTAND.

Examining our big org chart, you can see quite plainly that *Understanding* is higher than the point of public entrance into processing.

Example: Mr. J is offered Particle A. He can accept it just because it is offered. He does not have to even perceive it or talk about it or recognize any condition. He needs to see only two things: (a) that it is being offered by somebody or something (*source*), and (b) that Particle A *exists*. All you have to do is show him where to obtain it and that it exists. This is acceptance without decision. Therefore he can have it.

Example: Mr. J is offered Particle A *or* Particle B. Now we have an entirely different situation. Mr. J must *compare* Particle A and Particle B in order to see which is best. Therefore he must see where each comes from (source), that each *exists*, establish the *condition* of each particle, *communicate* with and about them, *perceive* them, relate them to each other (become *oriented*), *understand* them, be *enlightened* and finally decide (establish own *purpose*). If he can do this Mr. J can choose which he should have, A or B. If *Mr. J* can't do all these things, Mr. J is overwhelmed, gets confused and takes neither. One has asked Mr. J to jump up a lot of levels. Actually the ordinary *Mr. J's* when raw meat and even not so raw would have to have a Grade IX Certificate to obtain a Grade I Certificate. And that of course is impossible.

The door, then, is *barred* utterly for the majority of people into *any* department or function or org, let alone the promotion and accounts functions.

The moral is very plain. Never ask anyone in the public or field to Decide or Choose.

Erase from our org patter "Which do you want, Mr. J?" Don't ask which course, or what pin or what book or which auditor or what door or what time he or she wants to start anything or which door or which road or which membership.

Cultivate totally on a staff a didactic but pleasant approach. "Your intensive starts . . ." "This is your next book. . . ." "Your next course should be taken on . . ." "Go to the third door." "I see you're a pc. You go up to the second floor. . . ."

Erase even the banal "What do you wish?" or "What can I do for you?" as even that throws confusion into it.

Example: Miss N has heard of processing. She wants some. She never did *decide* to want some. She just wants some. Now to ask her to decide *anything* about it blunts that purpose. It is a thin purpose. It quivers. Don't ask her does she want a book or want training or want a pin or want anything else. Say only "Ah. You want processing. That is a good thing to want. Be here on Monday and bring ____ funds." That's all. For heaven's sake don't *sell* her processing or books or alternate schedules or ask her if she can pay or anything. That *want* is frail at best. Don't crush it! *If* she says timidly "I only have ____ funds," say "Good. Bring them; you can owe the rest. Be here on Monday."

In short MAKE Miss N RIGHT for WANTING, thus intensifying the want. Make her RIGHT when she talks about money. Then, being right, she *can* come in Monday. Simple. Chances are, even if she works, she'll still come in.

When she comes in she says, "I'm Miss N. I'm here for my processing." Reception MUST say, "Ah. You're Miss N. Good. There's the Accounts window. Sign up there." The Accounts says, "Here's the slip. Sign here. Take the slip to Room ____." Reception says, "This way Miss N." Estimations says, "Let me have your Accounts receipt. Good. That's fine. Have you been processed before? No? Well, you soon will be. This way please. Your auditor is waiting." The auditor says, "Over here, please," adjusts the pc's chair, etc., and sits down and says, "Start of session." At its end he says, "Be in this room at ____" for Miss N's next. And so on. When she gets her grade certificate she's told, "That means you're a Grade I preclear. Get the book ____ down in Reception. It will tell you all about Grade II." Miss N throughout is *never* anything but 8C'd. The general promotion told her what to want by saying she could *have* it. She expresses the want. The org people say, "That's a good thing to want. You can have it." And gives it to her.

That's all.

Just as you'd never ask a pc which command he wanted, you never ask the public individual to decide.

You can teach them anything, particularly the truth. But never ask them to decide.

By processing up through the grades, this person will soon begin to see and be there and understand and decide. And she'll surely decide she's a Scientologist, as it's true all the way!

This is new admin tech.

You will see us knocking out now all requests to choose in all promotion and in all routing of the public in an org. If we do so we will succeed beautifully.

THE FUNDAMENTAL

There is an even deeper fundamental at work here. It is quite startling.

You cannot get a flow without agreement. Examine your ARC triangle and you'll see why.

This is why an org won't *flow* traffic when policy is out or not formed.

That's why any policy, agreed upon, is better than points of individual decision on flow lines.

It's not that people can't decide in orgs. They can. *But when* a staff member makes an individual decision not laid out by policy, the flow *stops*.

Thus all flow and traffic lines including people and money and despatches will flow smoothly and rapidly only so long as the decisions that can be made are also part of policy and are simple decisions.

THE RAPIDITY OF PARTICLE FLOW ALONE DETERMINES POWER.

Thus an org's strength and its sphere of influence and domain are all regulated by the *speed* of flow, both inside and outside an org!

And an org particle inside or outside an org (promotion, books, people, money) flows as fast as it's free of independent, unagreed-upon decision points.

Example: A flow line can go to A or B. Unless policy says, "If it's above 80 it goes to A. If it's below 80 it goes to B," then that particle becomes the subject of a decision that is not covered by policy and *the flow stops*.

You can have a lot of choices on a comm line or traffic line but *none* may be random choices made by an individual at that moment. The flow will stop, not because the decision is wrong but because the next point on the flow doesn't know what it really is and so can't handle it except slowly or by stopping it at least to think it over.

An org full of individual *decision points* not covered by group understanding is no org at all and will fail. It is a bunch of individuals working at cross-purposes—each person okay, but the combined strength of the "org" is only that of one person in a state of confusion!

When the public is *also* being asked to decide about coming into an org full of individual decision points, you get a total collapse.

The new org board overcomes all this. It has the choices laid out by policy and org form and formula. So it can grow, will be easy to work in and will remain a happy place unless somebody puts in some new decision points not on the chart. The result will be stopped flows, no traffic, no money, no org.

Never put in an "individual random decision point" on a chart! That's the moral.

Then all staff can look over and see easily on what's decided where.

A multiple decision point can work providing only that all the decisions to be made are already known to all. Take a communicator. She has to make many "decisions" that are known in advance. Which basket does what despatch go into? That's an easy multiple "decision" providing the org board is easy to read and staff understands it and is doing the jobs for which they are posted. The line stops when the posts cross or aren't being handled, or at an "individual decision point" not then easily knowable to the staff.

This was the main problem in working out the 1965 org board. For the first time even my own post was being clarified by the need for knowable decision. Every post on the board is like that. And it was all worked out. It could not have been worked out at all unless I had found some of the most fundamental formulas of this universe. The type of pattern used kept one org going for 80 trillion years, believe it or not. And to that was added some very basic laws that had been overlooked by that outfit and which caused its eventual decay. It couldn't correct itself!

We aren't actually radically changed by the org board as all our own customs are functional on it also.

But it will flow and prosper as long as the decisions to be made are known already. Example: A bill-disputed decision = deposit sum in Reserved Payment Account and get the bill straight then pay right amount. Example: Policy says Blue Students. They seem to be aquamarine colored, not blue. Report it to the Inspection and Reports Dept with all data. Inspection and Reports inspects and reports to the

Office of LRH and policy is adjusted everywhere. Now we can handle aquamarine-colored students—or see that the Office of Estimations is forbidden to wear sunglasses while estimating! And while the policy is under adjustment we stick by known policy until adjusted.

Frankly, the 1965 org board pattern, as posted, gives all the routing hats and therefore the “decisions” are already visible. If a flow stacks up or a basket fills or trouble occurs, we have an overload or an absence or an injected “individual decision point.”

Far from robbing anyone of self-determinism, the 1965 board is welcomed by sighs of relief. Even I was glad to get my own work onto it. The whole room went bright when I cognited, “Gee, this is what everyone is trying to do to *me*, make me an individual decision point!”

One puts one’s *baskets* and one’s “*hands*” into the lines and *acts* on the lines. One doesn’t put his decisions on the lines as the lines then hit him! A postulate or a decision is too close to a thetan’s identity! It confuses him and makes him feel *hit* personally by the communications when he has to newly decide on each one. If the decision is already there, A or B, he can *then* route with his “hands,” not with *himself*. If he is always newly and randomly deciding, he gets carried eventually on down the comm line himself and goes off post! A thetan can handle a vast volume of actions so long as he doesn’t have to make a strange or fresh decision in each act. We can tell in orgs *who* is making fresh individual decisions, as that person has to bring each of his own despatches in personally. (We call it “bringing a body.”) He routes himself too! Only a communication runner who is involved only with *who* and *where* can do this safely as *her* decisions are known beforehand. Thus she can move on lines with impunity. Note that she only stops when she has to figure out *who* has now gone *where* and *why* she was not informed! Otherwise a communications runner could go through fire and war with impunity without a pause so long as the *who* and *where* are known. Thus an investigation’s personnel cannot also be a communication’s personnel without going half-mad! But an investigation’s personnel with *her* set of “*who* to look for and *where*” can move swiftly too! They (the communications’ personnel and the investigations’ personnel) have entirely different *previously-known* decisions to make. Both are *who-where*s. But the comm *who-where* is the comm station of a known person. And the investigation *who-where* is composed of *types* of *whos* and *reported wheres*. The purposes are different. The comm personnel sees to *whom* and *where* and delivers. The investigation personnel sees *what* and finds out *whom* and *where* and reports. Other staff must know what decisions these two will make. Other staff sees a jam of traffic and will feel comfortable if a communicator predictably sends an expeditor to help clear the jam. Also, seeing a confused area, other staff will feel all right about it if an investigator pops up and finds out *what* and *whom* and reports it accurately for a predictable decision. Thus a staff trained in the pattern of decisions that will be taken by the various departments only complains when somebody green puts somebody else’s traffic on their lines or leaps in investigating the maintenance men when it’s a bulldog a pc brought to session that’s howling. Things get *predictable*. One sees a pile of traffic growing, one knows an expeditor will show up. One sees a student blowing, one knows an investigator will show up. One can live in a *predictable* environment. One gets nervy only in the presence of unpredictable decisions. Want to know why wog courts make people nervy? Who can predict a wog court decision? Who can even predict the sentence man to man for the same crime? It’s not knowing that makes men stupid. Part of knowing is “In a given situation what should be decided?”

Only a new knowledge of universal laws has made it possible to make such an org pattern, for its decisions are then basic in every person and the universe in which we live. We need only avoid *bank* dramatizations to own the lot.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

Adopted as official
Church policy by
CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY
INTERNATIONAL