

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 4 MARCH 1965
Issue II

General
Non-Remimeo
Sthil Execs

HAT MATERIAL
DIVISION 1 (HCO)

TECHNICAL AND POLICY DISTRIBUTION

The HCO Secretary (WW, Continental or Area) passes on and makes available for issue all

1. Staff Releases.
2. Releases to HGC.
3. Releases to Academies.
4. Franchise releases.
5. Major magazine releases.
6. Minor magazine releases.
7. Org letters.
8. Brochures.
9. Ads.
10. Instructors' answers.
11. Public lectures.

Bulletins and policy letters and articles may be

- A. Culled from files.
- B. Obtained newly written from LRH.
- C. Copied from LRH tapes and rewritten.
- D. Summarized from A, B and C without injecting new materials, policies or technology.

All Bulletins, policy letters and articles from A, B, C and D must bear the LRH by-line.

No other material is permitted on lines 1 to 11 above than straight Scientology. No interpretations are permitted.

All materials released, used or sold must be straight Scientology as given in the writings or lectures of LRH.

Under the Copyright hat, all HCO Secretaries must make certain that all materials published are properly copyrighted in the name of LRH. No org copyrights are permitted.

Books may not be advertised for sale or the advertisement paid for from the HCO Book fund except LRH books. To advertise and sell any other book requires HCO Sec WW clearance in writing for that one time.

No technical articles or letters by another person than LRH are permitted in Scientology publications. Only data written by others on application, use or results of Scientology may appear and any tech data if non-standard must be deleted from the article or letter.

Lectures by others on application, use and results only are permitted in public lectures of any kind including Congresses.

Use of Scientology technical or policy data in testimony is forbidden. Only application and results may be testified to. Only low level works may be read as part of any testimony and no Scientology words may be used in such instances.

All staff members looking for data to release, use or print must look to their HCO Secretary. If the HCO Secretary is in doubt, he or she should consult the next higher HCO Secretary.

No effort should be made by HCO to censor opinion or comment on policy or technology, the whole effort is to be directed to the dissemination and use of correct Scientology technical and policy materials only. As there exists a correct technology and policy structure, alteration of it becomes a retarding factor in organizational solidarity and expansion. The prime cause of alter-is in tech and policy is ignorance of it or stupidity.

POLICIES GOVERNING RELEASE

1. DISSEMINATE SCIENTOLOGY

That is the governing policy of all the rest.

2. DATA SHOULD BE CHanneLED TO THE RIGHT SOURCES.

If promotion is to one-legged men, don't send them materials about eyesight.

The dissemination materials are designed for the more able members of society who seek self-betterment. Don't channel them toward psychiatric cases or strata they would not have an effect upon.

Example: A person in charge of an org or HGC is psychoanalytically oriented and seeks only "patients" as preclears and handles them as such. The org declines because this is a wrong target since promotion was aimed at quite different people.

Example: An office is successful handling workers and longshoremen but new direction of that office seeks to pull in only idle intellectuals who would never act in any case, and the office declines. In either case, the source of success was not spotted and when direction of reach altered everything declined. The old public that was being reached was offended and the new public was useless. The above two examples are actual.

3. THE WORKABLE AND PROVEN MATERIALS OF DIANETICS AND SCIENTOLOGY ONLY MAY BE RELEASED.

This at once excludes all squirrel or off-line materials by others. Experience has shown that no significant or lasting developments have arisen off-line in 15 years following a whole track of very murderous technology other than Dianetics and Scientology.

This truth emerged in the first 3 years after 1949. Every effort was made to encourage other development. The LRH research hat was put on LRH solidly by others.

Every group and organization devoted to off-line materials that came into being—E-Therapy, Howes, others others others—all wound up discredited and rejected by everyone even their early promoters and adherents. Thus by the test of time and of continued use only, show that if an org adventures on off-line materials it will decline markedly or cease to exist. All groups that have departed or "dreamed it up themselves" have perished. Even psychology, psychoanalysis and psychiatry are dying, supported now mainly by governments, detested by the public. So this is not propaganda, this is a Survival fact; groups that use squirrel material fail.

4. ALL EFFORTS TO DISCREDIT THE PERSONS OF ANY LEADING OR REPUTABLE SCIENTOLOGISTS MUST BE SAFEGUARDED [AGAINST] IN ALL RELEASES, ESPECIALLY LRH.

This means more than it seems to say.

The near-collapse of one org was traced back to a whispering campaign by its principals against LRH and MSH. All of "the data" was false. By newspaper standards it should have been listened to avidly. Instead, the public deserted the org and it nearly collapsed and the person who did it was eventually driven out of Scientology by fellow Scientologists although no discipline was ordered and the matter ignored.

The public buys only "our brand" despite newspaper publicity, government actions, whispering campaigns and rumour. This again is from actual experience. Orgs that apologize for its tech or people or LRH suffer a declining public.

It is a pure survival fact that failure to protect the names and repute of Scientology leading personalities and LRH collapses an org. The only proof is that those orgs that haven't aren't here any more and those orgs that strenuously have are thriving.

Protecting names and repute may also sometimes involve selection of correct materials. Example: Despite explicit orders to the contrary, mainly Level V materials were released at the Australian Enquiry. The org suffered heavily and not wholly from the government. The foolishness of it came home to most well-trained Scientologists.

Sending Level VI works to Level 0 people is easy to see and intercept. But an instructor teaching Level IV to Level II students is not always found until somebody blows. This comes under protecting names and repute as well as properly targeted tech because the recipients can't understand it and so may think it's silly.

Releasing unfavourable photographs, badly recorded tapes or films all come under this policy.

5. THE PUBLIC MUST BE PROTECTED AGAINST ABUSERS OF TECHNOLOGY OR POLICY.

Persons who try to use Scientology lines to get loans or funds for fraudulent purposes must always be exposed by HCO Secretaries by public postings when proven and Committees of Evidence when doubt exists.

A complaining pc does not come under this heading but more likely under the policy of correct technology or who to accept for processing, unless less auditing was given than paid for or no auditing at all was given, at which time it comes under this policy.

Anyone using a Scientology mailing list for purposes other than the greatest good for the greatest number of dynamics should be heavily censured and brought to book.

The Scientology public and any mailing lists are the exclusive property of HCO. It does not matter how the mailing list was gathered or if we ever saw it before. If someone used Scientology to collect names, that's a Scientology mailing list. It's ours and comes under this policy.

6. DELIVER SCIENTOLOGY WORKS, TRAINING, PROCESSING AND RESULTS.

Although actual training and processing is under Division II, whether or not it was or will be delivered (past and future but not current) is up to HCO.

By making the right materials available for publishing and use in training and processing, HCO expects them to be employed.

If they are not employed, then the matter falls back on HCO to act.

The reason I had to continue research and writing myself as a lonely action was because nobody else developed anything despite my expectations and despite the money they spent. The reason I had to enforce use was because other technology crept in and failed, causing org emergencies. HCO then furthers my own hat, assumed for research in July 1950, and for control of things, to be sure tech wasn't altered or misapplied in 1952 and after. So long as those two things have been watched and kept in effect we have prospered. Where they haven't been watched carefully and where no control existed to get them in effect everything died as our history clearly shows.

Even when I strayed on research, we still did better than with the strayings of others. The public knows rightly that I correct any errors as soon as I discover them and that errors grew less as research went on.

Therefore HCO issues the best material it has for the right targets and notes carefully any lack of results because of misapplication and retains the authority and control necessary to correct bad delivery under its Justice hat as well as its certificate and awards hat.

The formula is "Issue the correct data properly, correct use when delivery is poor or non-existent."

Early HCOs had some trouble in executing this policy because (a) they were operating on a technology that was advancing and therefore always changing. Now and then HCOs are held up by (b) my not being able to write up and issue or issue the needed materials because of comm line jams. The best solution for (a) is to issue what has *been* working and the best solution for (b) is to excerpt tapes or what you have and issue. However (a) has now vanished because of completed technology and (b) is becoming no problem to the degree I can get it written up and issued.

7. INSTRUCTION AND ADMIN POLICY ARE ALMOST AS IMPORTANT AS TECH.

Completely aside from developing Scientology tech itself it took 14 years to develop the technology of instruction (how to communicate the data and make auditors). It took 15 years to fully develop the technology of our administration.

Admin publicly is looked down on, like 19th century psychology, because it was not developed. Teaching and business admin alike have been quite low paid or in disrepute in the civilization. They were not Sciences. For instance business admin students in a University are renowned for falsifying exams more than students of other

subjects. That's because there was no subject there anyway.

Why we had to know how to teach is self evident.

In Scientology, to keep our orgs going and live through bad times we have had to develop a whole new subject—Admin. We had to have its laws, the economic factors that regulate business and all the rest.

We are pretty good. People with “formal training” in subjects used in our orgs are seldom as good as Scientologists who just studied with us as part of their job.

The main thing to know, like in studying our tech, in *our* teaching and admin there *are* two subjects there to be studied and used. Our teaching is Scientology type teaching. Our admin is Scientology admin. Both are regulated by Scientology policy. Orgs prosper when they know and use them and fumble and get poor when they don't.

Holding teaching and admin policy and releases in is best handled by insistence they exist and are ours and are not what the person thinks they are—borrowings from the schools or business world. The business world already borrows from us. The biggest management association in the world since 1958 or so has been duplicating (as well as it could) everything we do in business admin and planning. Of course, having no HCO, they squirrel and it's hard to see how they twist our stuff so far around. But it *is* our material. Even their “Congresses” have the same number of days and lectures and have programmes printed on our *exact* format.

When we have our teaching materials (not just “study”) all written up you will see the universities use them. We already have some universities trying.

As we write our Admin up in books, business will use it all the more. But the point is, *we* lead in this field, others follow. We only develop and use Scientology Admin to help us as we go toward freedom. But we still use it and only it. Because it's more modern and it's what we need.

The thing to guard against in releasing teaching and Admin policy letters is the change factor. Teaching and Admin evolved with our formative years. Thus patterns and policies, like our tech, grew better. Growing better, some of it became obsolete.

When re-releasing an old policy letter, always blue pencil out everything gone old and contradicted by later policy letters. You can still salvage a lot that still applies—a surprising amount. But try to cut out the contradictions with our modern policy where they exist. After all, we were children when we first tackled teaching and Admin. As we grew, we became wiser. But even our Admin childhood has wisdom in it and in some places even more fire and interest.

Don't release contradictory hats where you can help it. Modernize them with a blue pencil whether you retype them or remimeo them or not.

That way none get a chance to invalidate a really great achievement—teaching that works despite aberration and Admin that works amongst Men.

8. ISSUE TECH AND POLICY AS BROADLY AS POSSIBLE WITHIN ECONOMIC LIMITS.

It costs money to issue anything. The way to sustain issue is get it paid for one way or another. Total subsidy of all tech and policy issue can stop its being issued for it is no longer economical to issue it.

Thus to disseminate over any long period, the data must somehow be paid for or dissemination ceases. Actually you can't give away Scientology really. Money, credit or favours will flow back. But often only after many years. And meanwhile people eat.

Unless you pay attention to the economics of dissemination you will cut the dissemination line even if only temporarily.

If you have data, don't try to throw it all away by frantic unpaid for dissemination. Use some of the data as a leader (to announce with) and sell the rest of it.

This applies to magazines, books, training and processing, all of them.

People don't respect data they read in magazines anyway. For some reason they respect books. The public believes books and hoards them and throws magazines away. Even paperbacks suffer. A book has to have a hard cover to gain respect.

Thus a magazine article on tech ideally should point up a book to buy. Tons of

bulletins are less well received than one book.

The point is, don't invest a lot of money on the quality and thickness of magazines or other temporary media. Put the data between hard covers and sell it as a book.

Don't give a lot of free courses or free admittances to Academies or courses or free intensives in HGCs and call it dissemination. It isn't. Beyond a small amount it cuts your ability to disseminate. The cost of the give-away does not come back in and you can't finance more outflow because you gave it all away.

This can even happen to an HCO in its publishing to the org, mimeos and new books. It gives away all its materials to the org and suddenly finds the org "can't pay for more mimeo paper" or a new mimeo machine. The way to handle is not to charge for bulletins and policy letters directly but to insist the org profit by the tech and admin by promoting harder for the org.

My policy on this has always been to promote more business than the org can handle and then let *it* solve the jams thus brought about. Orgs I founded have never failed to handle such problems providing one demanded they did. The only problem an org *can't* handle is "no dough"; the only weak point of orgs, traditionally, has been promotion. They are sometimes even afraid to promote for fear they'll get too big (something wrong with the top exec's comm lines is the usual cause). I have seen an old time psychiatrically oriented D of P *book* pcs 6 months in advance rather than hire more than 6 auditors and a queasy D of T seek to shut everyone out of an Academy "because they would not be socially acceptable".

Such persons in the wrong positions will rail against promotion—because it makes pcs and students crowd in too hard. So you get plans "to train more only when we have instructors" or "few pcs until the next Academy class graduates so we have auditors".

Instructors, auditors, that's Division 2's problem. HCO ignores it.

So part of paying for dissemination and ads is promoting to drive in more business than the org can handle and making it make more money than it can waste. An org always manages to handle the business and it always wastes lots of money.

So in issuing materials, remember to promote them too. Then there's always enough money flowing back to pay for more printing, more bulletins and policy letters, more books and tapes.

If you don't become strenuous on this point of policy you will cease to disseminate. And I have always waived aside all objections to honest, appealing, clear-cut, heavy promotion as treasonable suggestions. Let somebody "doing the mag" complain about the "hard sell" in it (insistence people buy) and I always find myself somebody else and do the mag and go on promoting.

Therefore people who (a) want us to give it all away and thus end our ability to pay for more and who (b) shudder at the possible inflow, I always carefully note down in my little black book for transfer. And an HCO Sec anywhere would do well to advise higher authority in all cases where efforts to reduce our ability to pay for our dissemination get in our way.

Whereas this possibly may seem unreasonable, it works. And every time I've not followed it ruthlessly, as a policy, we've come a cropper.

9. OFFER ANYTHING YOU OFFER AT A HIGH APPEAL LEVEL AT HIGH VELOCITY AND HEAVY IMPACT.

If you know it works and is the way, you will have no trouble with this policy.

If you don't, you will have trouble.

The answer to this policy is to have a good subjective and objective reality on Scientology. Then you couldn't keep yourself from following it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.cden
Copyright © 1965
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED