

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 4 APRIL 1972

Remimeo

Establishment Officer Series 14
ETHICS

The normal level of an unhatted Dev-T non-producing org is out ethics. The reason you see so many heavy ethics actions occurring—or situations where heavy ethics actions should occur if they aren't—in such an org is that it has its EXCHANGE flows messed up. It is important to know this fact as this factor alone can sometimes be employed to handle persons in the area whose ethics are out.

CRIMINALITY

Unless we want to go on living in a far nowhere some of the facts of scenes have to be confronted.

An inability to confront evil leads people into disregarding it or discounting it or not seeing it at all.

Reversely, there can be a type of person who, like an old-time preacher, sees nothing but evil in everything and, possibly looking into his own heart for a model, believes all men are evil. Man, however (as you can read in HCO B 28 Nov 70, C/S Series 22, "Psychosis"), is basically good. When going upon some evil course he attempts to restrain himself and caves himself in. The Chart of Human Evaluation in *Science of Survival* was right enough. And such people also can be found by the Oxford Capacity Analysis where the graph is low and well below a center line on the right.

This sort of thing can be handled of course by auditing but the Est O does not depend on that to handle his staff's problems.

Criminal actions proceed from such people *unless checked* by more duress from without not to do an evil act than they themselves have pressure from within to do it. Criminality is in most instances restrained by just such an imbalance of pressures.

If you have no ethics presence in an org, then criminality shows its head. Such people lie rather than be made to confront. They false report—they even use "PR" which means Public Relations to cover up—and in our slang talk "PR" means putting up a lot of false reports to serve as a smoke screen for idleness or bad actions. Unless you get Ethics in, you will never get Tech in. If you can't get Tech in you won't get Admin in.

So the lack of Ethics permits the criminal impulse to go unchecked.

Yes, it could be handled with Tech. But to get money you have to have Admin in. Unless there is Ethics and ways to get it in, no matter how distasteful it may seem, you will never get Tech and Admin in.

Of course there is always the element of possible injustice. But this is provided against. (See HCO PL 24 Feb 72, "Injustice".)

When Ethics is being applied by criminal hands (as happens in some governments) it can get pretty grim.

But even then Ethics serves as a restraint to just outright slaughter. Omitting to handle criminality can make one as guilty of the resulting crimes as if one committed them! So criminality as a factor has to be handled. It is standardly handled by the basic Ethics P/Ls and the Ethics Officer system.

EXCHANGE

The unhatted unproducing staff member, who is not really a criminal or psychotic, can be made to go criminal.

This joins him to the Criminal ranks.

The Ethics system also applies to him.

However there is something an Est O can do about it that is truly Est O tech.

This lies in the field of EXCHANGE.

If you recall your Product Clearing, you will see that exchange is something for something.

Criminal exchange is nothing from the criminal for something from another. Whether theft or threat or fraud is used, the criminal think is to get something without putting out anything. That is obvious.

A staff member can be coaxed into this kind of thinking by PERMITTING HIM TO RECEIVE WITHOUT HIS CONTRIBUTING. This unlocks, by the way, an age-old riddle of the philosophers as to "what is right or wrong". HONESTY is the road to SANITY. You can prove that and do prove it every time you make somebody well by "pulling his withholdings". The insane are just one seething mass of overt acts and withholdings. And they are very physically sick people.

When you let somebody be dishonest you are setting him up to become physically ill and unhappy.

Traditional Sea Org Ethics labeled Non-Compliance as Liability and a False Report as Doubt.

And it's true enough.

When you let a person give nothing for something you are factually encouraging crime. Don't be surprised that welfare districts are full of robbery and murder. People there give nothing for something.

When exchange is out the whole social balance goes out.

Every full scholarship ever given by an org wound up in a messy scene. When you hire a professional pc who just sits around making do-less motions while people audit him and contribute to him DO NOT BE SURPRISED IF HE GETS SICKER AND SICKER. He is contributing nothing in return and winds up in overwhelm!

Similarly if you actively prevented someone from contributing in return you could also make him ARC Broken and sick.

It is EXCHANGE which maintains the inflow and outflow that gives a person space around him and keeps the bank off of him.

There are numbers of ways these flows of Exchange can be unbalanced. It does not go same out as comes in. Equal amounts are no factor. Who can measure good will or friendship? Who can actually calculate the value of saving a being from death in each lifetime? Who can measure the reward of pride in doing a job well or praise?

For all these things are of different values to different people.

In the material world the person whose Exchange Factor is out may think he “makes money”. Only a government or a counterfeiter “makes money”. One has to produce something to *Exchange* for money.

Right there the Exchange Factor is out.

If he gives nothing in return for what he gets the money does not belong to him. In product clearing many people it was found that some considered their food, clothing, bed and allowance were not theirs because they produced. They were theirs “just by being there”. This funny “logic” covered up the fact that these people produced little or nothing on post. Yet they were the first to howl when not getting expensive (to the org) auditing or courses or tech! Thus such a person, not hatted or made to produce, will get ill.

It is interesting that when a person becomes productive his morale improves. Reversely it should be rather plain to you that a person who doesn’t produce becomes mentally or physically ill. For his *exchange* factor is out.

So when you reward a downstat you not only deprive upstats, you also cave the downstat in!

I don't think Welfare States have anything else in mind!

The riots of the ancient city of Rome were caused by these factors. There they gave away corn and games to a populace that eventually became so savage it could only enjoy torture and gruesome death in the arena!

A lot of this exchange imbalance comes from child psychology where the child is not contributing anything and is not permitted to contribute.

It is this which first overwhelms him with feelings of obligation to his parents and then bursts out as total revolt in his teens.

Children who are permitted to contribute (not as a cute thing to do but actually) make non-contributing children of the same age look like raving maniacs! It is the cruel sadism of modern times to destroy the next generation this way. Don’t think it isn’t intended. I have examined the OCAs of parents who do it!

So if a person is brought up this life with the exchange all awry, the Est O has his hands full sometimes!

He is dealing with trained-in criminality!

WHAT HE CAN DO

The remedy is rather simple.

First one has to know all about EXCHANGE as covered in the Product Clearing policy letters.

Then he has to specially clear this up with people who do not produce. He should get them to work on it as it relates to ALL THEIR DYNAMICS IN RELATIONSHIP TO EVERY OTHER DYNAMIC.

That means he has to clear up the definitions of dynamics with *care* and then have the person draw a big chart (of his own) and say what he gives the 1st Dynamic and what it gives him. Then what he gives the second dynamic and what it gives him. And so on up the dynamics. Now, have him consider “his own second dynamic”. What does his second dynamic give his first dynamic? What does his second dynamic give the second dynamic and what does it give him? And so on until you have a network of these exchange arrows, each both ways.

Somewhere along the way, if your TRs are good and you have his attention and he is willing to talk to you he will have quite a cognition!

That, if it's a big one is the End Phenomena of it.

And don't be surprised if you see a person now and then change his physical face shape!

CONDITIONS BY DYNAMICS

An Ethics type "action" can be done by giving the person the conditions formulas (pages 189, 237, 245, 247, 249 of Vol 0, Basic Staff Hat. HCO PL 14 Mar 68—page 247—gives one the table.) Method 4 the person on the Table of Conditions and pick up any other misunderstandings. Have the person study the *formula* of each of these Conditions in the table so that he knows what they are and what the formulas are.

When he has all this now with no misunderstood words you must clear up the words related to his dynamics I to 8 and what they are.

Now you're ready for the billion dollar question.

Ask him what is his condition on the first dynamic. Have him study the formulas. Don't buy any glib PR. Don't evaluate or invalidate. When he's completely sure of what his condition really is on the first dynamic he will cognite.

Now take up the second dynamic by its parts-sex, family, children. Get a Condition for each.

Similarly go on up each one of the dynamics until you have a condition for each one.

Now begin with the first dynamic again. Continue to work this way.

You will be amazed to find he will come out of false high down to low and back up again *on each dynamic*.

Somewhere along the line he will start to change markedly.

When you have a person in continual heavy ethics or who is out-ethics (Ethics bait, we say) and who is floundering around, you can do an S & D on him and quite often save his future for him. When you have such a person you do this one first before you do the Exchange by Dynamics. In other words, you use this on "Ethics bait" and then when he's come out of such, you do Exchange by Dynamics on him.

SUMMARY

When all looks black, and you are getting false reports, and the things said done were not done and what was really being done were overt products and despite all your work, the stats just *won't* go up, you still have three answers:

1. GET IN ETHICS ON THE ORG.
2. GET EXCHANGE DONE ON INDIVIDUALS.
3. GET IN CONDITIONS BY DYNAMICS ON THE ETHICS BAIT.

And after that keep a strong just Division 1 Dept 3.

You'll be amazed!

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder
LRH:sb.rd

Copyright © 1972

by L. Ron Hubbard [Modified by HCO PL 9 May 74, *Prod-Org, Esto and Older Systems*
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED *Reconciled*, in the *Management Series 1970-1974*, page 438.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 9 APRIL 1972

Remimeo

ETHICS

(Cancels HCO P/L of 7 Feb 70

“Danger Condition 2nd Formula”)

CORRECT DANGER CONDITION

HANDLING

When the correct formula for handling a Danger Condition is not done, an org or activity or person cannot easily get above that condition thereafter.

When we had the 2nd Danger Formula apparently it was applied but the real Danger Formula wasn't. This made some orgs and people remain in or below Danger and made it very hard for them to get above that state.

A prolonged state of emergency or threats to viability or survival or a prolonged single-handing will not improve unless the actual Danger Formula is applied.

DANGER FORMULA

The original formula follows:

1. By-pass (ignore the junior or juniors normally in charge of the activity and handle it personally).
2. Handle the situation and any danger in it.
3. Assign the area where it had to be handled a Danger Condition.
4. Handle the personnel by Ethics Investigation and Comm Ev.
5. Reorganize the activity so that the situation does not repeat.
6. Recommend any firm policy that will hereafter detect and/or prevent the condition from recurring.

The senior executive present acts and acts according to the formula above.

A Danger Condition is normally assigned when:

1. An emergency condition has continued too long.
2. A statistic plunges downward very steeply.
3. A senior executive suddenly finds himself or herself wearing the hat of the activity because it is in trouble.

FIRST DYNAMIC FORMULA

The formula is converted for the 1st dynamic to

1st 1. By-pass habits or normal routines.

1st 2. Handle the situation and any Danger in it.

1st 3. Assign self a Danger Condition.

1st 4. Get in your own *personal ethics* by finding what you are doing that is out-ethics and use self-discipline to correct it and get honest and straight.

1st 5. Reorganize your life so that the dangerous situation is not continually happening to you.

1st 6. Formulate and adopt firm policy that will hereafter detect and prevent the same situation from continuing to occur.

JUNIOR DANGER FORMULA

Where a Danger Condition is assigned to a junior, request that he or she or the entire activity write up his or her overts and withholds and any known out-ethics situation and turn them in at a

certain stated time on a basis that the penalty for them will be lessened but if discovered later after the deadline it will be doubled.

This done, require that the junior and the staff that had to be by-passed and whose work had to be done for them or continually corrected, each one write up and fully execute the FIRST DYNAMIC DANGER FORMULA for himself personally and turn it in.

ASSESSMENT

If the necessity to by-pass continues or if an area or person did not comply, use a meter and assess or get assessed the following questionnaire.

THE TROUBLE AREA

QUESTIONNAIRE

Person's Name Post Date

To be done on the person by one who can correctly operate a meter.

The list is done by telling the person you are about to ask him some questions on a meter and then just assess this list for reads.

Mark each read properly.

- (a) Are you doing anything dishonest? _____
- (b) Are you more interested in something else than your job? _____
- (c) Are you falsely reporting about anything? _____
- (d) Are you doing something harmful? _____
- (e) Are you doing little or nothing of value? _____
- (f) Are you pretending? _____
- (g) Are you in disagreement with something? _____
- (h) Do you have overts? _____
- (i) Are you withholding something? _____
- (j) Do you know of some out-ethics around you? _____
- (k) Don't you know what your post product is? _____
- (l) Are the products of others around you unknown to you? _____
- (m) Do you have things about your post you don't understand? _____
- (n) Do you have words on your post you don't understand? _____
- (o) Don't you know grammar? _____
- (p) Is there some reason you are not quite on post? _____
- (q) Is someone giving you orders you don't understand? _____
- (r) Are you getting orders from too many places? _____
- (s) Don't you have a post? _____
- (t) Don't you know what your post is? _____
- (u) Have you really not read your hat? _____
- (v) Are you here for some other reason than you say? _____
- (w) Were you planning to leave? _____
- (x) Is your post temporary? _____
- (y) What about your post purpose? _____
- (z) Are you in any way misemotional or upset about your post? _____
- (aa) Are you actually doing fine? _____

When this has been assessed on a meter one then takes the largest read or TA blowdown and handles it.

This is done by writing the question letter and the person's answers.

Each question that read is given two-way communication until each question that read has attained a floating needle.

The form used and the worksheets are placed in the person's folder so that other handling can be programmed and done as needed.

Operator's Name

Probable WHY _____

WHY

The above questionnaire can also be used to *help* find a WHY (it will not directly find one as the Why has to be rephrased for each individual). A WHY should always be found for individuals in a Danger Condition.

TROUBLE AREA SHORT FORM

Person's Name Post Date

A short form can be done on someone who is an "old hand" and knows the tune.

SF 1. Out-Ethics? _____

SF 2. Overts? _____

SF 3. Withholds? _____

SF 4. Disagreements? _____

SF 5. False Reports? _____

SF 6. Product Unknown? _____

SF 7. Products of others Unknown? _____

SF 8. Post purpose? _____

SF 9. Situations not understood? _____

SF 10. Misunderstood words? _____

SF 11. Misunderstood grammar? _____

SF 12. Wrong WHY? _____

SF 13. Omitted materials? _____

SF 14. Misemotional? _____

SF 15. False passes? _____

SF 16. Invalidation? _____

SF 17. Wrong Orders? _____

SF 18. Not understood? _____

SF 19. No situation? _____

SF 20. Doing fine really? _____

(Handling is the same as in the long form.)

Probable WHY _____

Operator

ENDING A DANGER CONDITION When production has again increased the Danger Condition should be formally ended and an Emergency Condition assigned and its formula should be followed.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH: mes.rd

Copyright © 1972

by L. Ron Hubbard

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED